
HISTORY

9389/32

Paper 3 Interpretations Question

October/November 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

General levels of response

| AO2(b) | Analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Level 5 | Demonstrates a complete understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. Explains the interpretation/approach(es) using detailed and accurate references both to the extract and to historical context. | 17–20 |
| Level 4 | Demonstrates a sound understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. Explains the interpretation/approach(es) using the extract and historical context. | 13–16 |
| Level 3 | Demonstrates understanding of aspects of the interpretation. Explains points made using the extract and historical context. | 9–12 |
| Level 2 | Summarises the main points in the extract. Demonstrates some understanding of the historical context. | 5–8 |
| Level 1 | Writes about some aspects of the extract. Includes some accurate factual references to the context. | 1–4 |
| Level 0 | Response contains no relevant discussion. | 0 |

| AO1(a) | Recall, select and use historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of History in a clear and effective manner | Marks |
|---------|---|-------|
| Level 5 | Demonstrates detailed and accurate historical knowledge that is entirely relevant, and is able to communicate this knowledge clearly and effectively. | 17–20 |
| Level 4 | Demonstrates detailed and generally accurate historical knowledge that is mainly relevant, and is able to communicate this knowledge clearly. | 13–16 |
| Level 3 | Demonstrates mainly accurate and relevant knowledge, and is able to communicate this knowledge adequately. | 9–12 |
| Level 2 | Demonstrates some accurate and relevant knowledge, and can communicate this knowledge. | 5–8 |
| Level 1 | Demonstrates some knowledge, but ability to communicate is deficient. | 1–4 |
| Level 0 | Demonstrates no relevant historical knowledge. | 0 |

Interpretation of the General Levels of Response

The critical decision in marking is on the correct level in AO2 in which to place an answer. All depends on the meaning of certain key words:

L5 – complete understanding of the interpretation: these answers show a consistent focus on the Big Message, with appropriate support from the extract and knowledge (which can be knowledge of interpretations as well as contextual knowledge).

L4 – sound understanding of the interpretation: these answers engage with elements of the Big Message, but without explaining the BM. They may only cover part of the BM. They may think the extract has *other* BMs, which actually are only sub-messages. They will also be properly supported.

L3 – understanding of aspects of the interpretation: these answers see the extract as an interpretation (i.e. the creation of an historian), but only engage with sub-messages which are supported, or identify aspects of the BM without properly supporting them.

L2 – summarises the main points in the extract: at this stage there is work on the extract but this is simply on what it says. There is no valid explanation of the extract as an interpretation.

L1 – writes about some aspects of the extract: these answers barely engage with the extract. There are merely fragments of relevant material.

In L4 and L5, you may allow minor slips in accuracy, relevance, consistency etc. as long as you judge that they do not undermine the argument as a whole.

Section A: Topic 1 The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 1 | <p>What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the British Empire to explain your answer.</p> <p>Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is that <u>there were both advantages and disadvantages for the Indian economy under British rule, but on balance the Indian people probably benefitted.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The focus of the extract is on economic considerations; it is significant that little attention is given to the political and social impacts of empire. The attempt to reach a balanced conclusion about the impact of British rule using economic factors alone suggests that the historian has overall a favourable view of the British Empire.</p> | 40 |

Section B: Topic 2 The Holocaust

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 2 | <p>What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Holocaust to explain your answer.</p> <p>Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is that <u>the West could have done more to rescue more European Jews, but they did not do so because they did not wish to.</u> [Note: the extract does not say the Allies did nothing.] Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract is about bystanders, and adopts the critical approach typical of early bystander interpretations. It states that the Western governments were making excuses for not helping Jews whilst being willing to help other refugees. In effect, it accuses these governments of anti-Semitism, or at least of fearing the anti-Semitism of their own populations. The extract does not address Holocaust causation, so attempts to use the labels defined below will not work.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> Candidates may use some/all of the following terms: <i>Intentionalism</i> – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start. <i>Structuralism</i> – interpretations which argue that it was the nature of the Nazi state that produced genocide. There was no coherent plan but the chaotic competition for Hitler’s approval between different elements of the leadership produced a situation in which genocide could occur. <i>Functionalism</i> is closely related to structuralism. It sees the Holocaust as an unplanned, ad hoc response to wartime developments in Eastern Europe, when Germany conquered areas with large Jewish populations. Candidates may also refer to <i>synthesis</i> interpretations, i.e. interpretations which show characteristics of more than one of the above. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.</p> | 40 |

Section C: Topic 3 The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 3 | <p>What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Cold War to explain your answer.</p> <p>Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is that <u>American policy towards the SU was driven by their economic ideology and that the unwillingness of the USA to compromise on this made agreement between the two sides impossible.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The focus on US economic ideas being the prime determinant of their political actions is typical of revisionist historians, and this extract goes a long way towards blaming the US for the Cold War, making it clear that the Soviet Union posed no comparable threat to the USA's existence. If labelling of the interpretation is used, conclusions that argue the interpretation is anything other than revisionist will not be acceptable in L4/L5.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> <i>Traditional/Orthodox</i> interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after WW2. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War. <i>Revisionist</i> historians challenged this view and shifted more of the focus onto the United States, generally through an economic approach which stressed the alleged aim of the US to establish its economic dominance over Europe. <i>Post-revisionists</i> moved towards a more balanced view in which elements of blame were attached to both sides. Since the opening of the Soviet archives post-1990 there has been a shift to attributing prime responsibility to Stalin – a <i>post-post-revisionist</i> stance which often seems very close to the traditional view. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.</p> | 40 |