

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/03**

Paper 3

**For Examination from 2015**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**1 hour**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 40**

---

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.

## General levels of response

For the purposes of marking, the *interpretation* is taken to be what the historian says in the given extract, the nature of the claims made and the conclusions drawn. The *approach* is seen as what the historian brings to their study of the topic, what they are interested in, the questions s/he asks, the methods they use. There is a close inter-relationship between the interpretation and the approach, since the former emerges from the latter, and marking will not insist on any rigid distinctions between the two.

**Marks will be awarded according to the following criteria. Markers will be instructed first to determine the level an answer reaches in relation to AO2(b), and to award a mark accordingly. In general, the mark subsequently awarded in relation to AO1(a) will be in the same level, since the ability to recall, select and deploy relevant historical material will be central to any effective analysis and evaluation of the interpretation. However, in exceptional cases, generally where answers lack effective contextual support, markers will have the discretion to award marks in different levels for the two assessment objectives.**

| <b>AO2(b): Analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways</b> |   | <b>Marks</b> |
|---|---|--------------|
| <b>Level 5</b>  | 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        |
| <b>Level 4</b>  | 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        |
| <b>Level 3</b>  | Demonstrates understanding of aspects of the interpretation. Explains points made using the extract and historical context.   | 9–12         |
| <b>Level 2</b>  | Summarises the main points in the extract. Demonstrates some understanding of the historical context.   | 5–8          |
| <b>Level 1</b>  | Writes about some aspects of the extract. Includes some accurate factual references to the context.   | 1–4          |
| <b>Level 0</b>  | Response contains no relevant discussion.   | 0            |

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

## Indicative content

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

- 1 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. [40]**

*Interpretation/Approach*

The extract argues that the nature of imperial rule was determined at the periphery, and not in the metropole. In its focus on rulers it adopts a top-down approach, while it also shows how Empire was shaped by the mentalities of those who ruled. It rejects many of the usual explanations of motivations for Empire in stressing the primary importance of the cultural attitudes of imperial administrators. This leads to an interpretation which emphasises the fragmented, decentralised nature of the Empire.

### Section B: Topic 2 The Holocaust

- 2 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. [40]**

*Interpretation/Approach*

The extract is an extreme example of the Intentionalist approach. The focus is directly on Hitler's responsibility for the Holocaust, tracing its origins back to *Mein Kampf*, and asserting that plans for the Final Solution clearly predated the invasion of the Soviet Union. The interpretation is based on inferences which are made from statements by Hitler and other members of the Nazi elite. It is notable that the interpretation entirely ignores alternative views and glosses over controversies, notably about the extent of Hitler's *direct* involvement, that have engaged other historians. This is a top-down interpretation which sees the Holocaust as created at the centre, and almost ignores what was happening 'on the ground' under the pressure of events.

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

- 3 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. [40]**

*Interpretation/Approach*

The extract shows a post-revisionist approach in refusing to attribute the blame for the Cold War on either side. Instead the argument is that, with greater understanding and awareness, the Cold War could conceivably have been avoided altogether. It argues that the basic cause was a mutual lack of understanding that made it impossible for practical post-war problems, most importantly Germany, to be solved. As a result, US policy evolved from an initial wish to work with the Soviets towards containment.

