



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9489/03

Paper 3 Interpretations question

For examination from 2021

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Specimen

This document has **8** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

General levels of response

Process for awarding marks:

- Markers review the answer against the AO4 marking criteria, and award a mark according to these criteria.
- Generally, the subsequent mark awarded for AO1 will be the same level. In exceptional cases, markers could award marks in different levels for the two AOs. This is because the ability to recall, select and deploy relevant historical material will be central to any effective analysis and evaluation of the interpretation.
- Responses that focus on contextual knowledge without reference to the interpretation cannot be rewarded.

Underlining is used in this mark scheme to indicate the main interpretation of the extracts.

AO4	Analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented.	Marks
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses use the extract in a detailed and accurate manner and demonstrate a complete understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. These responses explain all elements of the historian's interpretation. 	18–20
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses use the extract in a detailed and accurate manner and demonstrate a sound understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. These responses engage with elements of the historian's interpretation, but without explaining it as a whole – they are consistent and accurate, but not complete and may cover less important sub-messages. 	15–17
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses use the extract, but only demonstrate partial understanding of the interpretation and approach(es) of the historian. These answers identify elements of the historian's interpretation, but without adequately explaining them, typically explaining other less important message(s) as equally or more important. 	12–14
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrate understanding that the extract contains interpretations, but those explained are only sub-messages. Responses may use a part of the extract to argue for an interpretation that is not supported by the whole of the extract, or may refer to multiple interpretations, often a different one in each paragraph. 	9–11
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses summarise the main points in the extract. Responses focus on what the extract says, but explanations of the extract as an interpretation lack validity. 	5–8
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses include references to some aspects of the extract. Responses may include fragments of material that are relevant to the historian's interpretation. 	1–4
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

AO1	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and effectively.	Marks
Level 6	Demonstrates detailed and accurate historical knowledge that is entirely relevant.	18–20
Level 5	Demonstrates detailed and mostly accurate historical knowledge that is mainly relevant.	15–17
Level 4	Demonstrates mostly relevant and accurate knowledge.	12–14
Level 3	Demonstrates generally accurate and relevant knowledge.	9–11
Level 2	Demonstrates some accurate and relevant knowledge.	5–8
Level 1	Demonstrates limited knowledge.	1–4
Level 0	Demonstrates no relevant historical knowledge.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><i>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 origins of the First World War to explain your answer</i></p> <p>Interpretation/Approach</p> <p><u>The main interpretation is that Austria (Berchtold) was responsible for launching war against Serbia. However, Austria could not have done this without the support of Germany (who therefore shares responsibility).</u></p> <p>Showing sound understanding of the interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. Any answer perceiving this as the interpretation and the approach(es) used by the historian, and using the extract to show how this conclusion was reached, can be placed in Level 5.</p> <p>To award marks in Level 6, an answer must meet the Level 5 criteria and in addition make the point that, while the extract explains responsibility for war against Serbia, it does not directly address the issue of responsibility for the general European war that followed. This may be done by explaining the extract as indicating how a general war became more likely, but not dealing with the specific circumstances that took all the Great Powers to war.</p> <p>Awareness of what the extract can, and cannot, explain must be made clear, and answers that assume the extract simply offers an explanation of how the First World War came about cannot achieve more than Level 4.</p>	40

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Interpretation/Approach</p> <p><u>The extract is about Jewish resistance. The historian sets out to define resistance, and reaches a broad interpretation of it as any act of disobedience to the Germans. Any form of resistance was preferable to acceptance, but only a minority resisted.</u></p> <p>Showing complete understanding of the historian’s interpretation will require explanation of both these aspects. Candidates need to recognise that the extract does not directly address the issue of responsibility for/causation of the Holocaust, but instead focuses on the responses of the victims. Ideally, in explaining this extract, candidates will show awareness of how different historians have dealt with the issue of how Jews reacted to the Holocaust (though this is not essential).</p> <p>Where answers attempt to label the extract, e.g. as Intentionalist. Incorrect labelling alone should not be taken as evidence of lack of understanding. However, a developed attempt to argue for the label would indicate a sufficient lack of understanding and would limit the response to Level 3.</p> <p>Candidates may use some/all of the following terms:</p> <p><i>Intentionalism</i> – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start;</p> <p><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;</p> <p><i>Functionalism</i> – 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;</p> <p><i>Synthesis</i> interpretations – these are interpretations which show characteristics of more than one of the above.</p> <p>Assess how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract is used to support it.</p>	40

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Interpretation/Approach</p> <p>The extract focuses on the USA, with a revisionist view that prime responsibility for the Cold War rests with the USA.</p> <p>The historian's interpretation is that after the Second World War <u>the USA was an aggressive expansionist power, with a hostile and pessimistic view of relations with the Soviet Union.</u> The implication is that aggressive US policies around the globe were the driving force behind the Cold War, and US–Soviet relations were only a subset of a wider global struggle conducted by the USA against what it saw as undesirable social changes. Showing complete understanding of the historian's interpretation will require explanation of both these aspects.</p> <p>The interpretation definitely does not argue for blame being shared, or for neither being to blame, or that the USSR was to blame. Some will, however, argue that it does, i.e. that it is post-revisionist or traditionalist. This cannot be awarded higher than Level 3.</p> <p>Candidates may use some/all of the following terms:</p> <p><i>Traditional/Orthodox</i> interpretations of the Cold War – these were generally produced early after the Second World War; they blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War;</p> <p><i>Revisionist</i> historians challenged this view and shifted more of the focus onto the USA, generally through an economic approach which stressed the alleged aim of the USA to establish its economic dominance over Europe;</p> <p><i>Post-revisionists</i> moved towards a more balanced view in which elements of blame were attached to both sides.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Assess 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

BLANK PAGE