

# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**EUROPEAN HISTORY**

**9981/03**

Paper 3 Historical Interpretations

**For examination from 2027**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Specimen**

---

This document has **6** pages.

## Generic Marking Principles

All examiners must apply these general marking principles when marking candidate responses. Examiners must apply them alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptions for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme must 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 descriptions for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptions 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 descriptions.

### 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 descriptions in mind.

**Guidance on using levels-based mark schemes**

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more levels.

Once a best-fit level has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

- If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level, award the highest mark.
- If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range (where middle marks are available).
- If the candidate's work **just** meets the level, award the lowest mark.

**Table A:****AO4 Historical interpretations**

Candidates should be able to:

- Understand, explain and analyse how historians have interpreted and approached aspects of the past.

Use this table to give marks for candidate response for Question 1.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 6</b>	Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Explain all elements of the historian's interpretation.</li> </ul>	18–20
<b>Level 5</b>	Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	15–17
<b>Level 4</b>	Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the extract, but only demonstrate partial understanding of the interpretation and approach(es) of the historian.</li> <li>• Identify elements of the historian's interpretation, but without adequately explaining them, typically explaining other less important message(s) as equally or more important.</li> </ul>	12–14
<b>Level 3</b>	Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate understanding that the extract contains interpretations, but those explained are only sub-messages.</li> <li>• Use a part of the extract to argue for an interpretation that is not supported by the whole of the extract or refer to multiple interpretations, often a different one in each paragraph.</li> </ul>	9–11
<b>Level 2</b>	Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarise the main points in the extract.</li> <li>• Focus on what the extract says, but explanations of the extract as an interpretation lack validity.</li> </ul>	5–8
<b>Level 1</b>	Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include references to some aspects of the extract.</li> <li>• May include fragments of material that are relevant to the historian's interpretation.</li> </ul>	1–4
<b>Level 0</b>	Responses: No creditable response.	0

**Table B:****AO1 Historical knowledge**

Candidates should be able to:

- Recall, select and use appropriate historical knowledge.

Use this table to give marks for candidate response for Question 1.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 6</b>	Responses: Demonstrate detailed and accurate historical knowledge that is entirely relevant.	18–20
<b>Level 5</b>	Responses: Demonstrate detailed and mostly accurate historical knowledge that is mainly relevant.	15–17
<b>Level 4</b>	Responses: Demonstrate mostly relevant and accurate knowledge.	12–14
<b>Level 3</b>	Responses: Demonstrate generally accurate and relevant knowledge.	9–11
<b>Level 2</b>	Responses: Demonstrate some accurate and relevant knowledge.	5–8
<b>Level 1</b>	Responses: Demonstrate limited knowledge.	1–4
<b>Level 0</b>	Responses: No creditable response.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it?</b></p> <p><b>Use the extract and your knowledge of the origins of the First World War to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is <u>that the historian blames those European leaders in 1914 who knew the risks they were taking but wanted war regardless and because they thought that victory would solve the international problems they faced</u>. Showing complete understanding of the interpretation will involve discussion of <b>both</b> these aspects. The interpretation is an explicit rejection of Lloyd George’s ‘slide to war’ thesis. The historian does not blame a single country or side. The willingness for war was shared by almost all the major powers, driven by a belief that they would win, and that victory would resolve the vulnerabilities they all felt. Answers achieving L6 will identify and explain both aspects of the main interpretation, whilst those identifying and explaining one aspect will achieve L5. Answers in L4 will explain part of the main interpretation but will also include significant misinterpretation of another aspect of the extract, for example by viewing one country e.g. Germany as being particularly blamed. Answers in L3 will argue that the extract has a main interpretation different from its actual one.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> Early post-First World War interpretations tended to blame Germany, but quickly a reaction against this occurred, with a variety of interpretations blaming other nations. This may be termed revisionism.</p> <p>The turning point in the historiography was Fischer’s work of the early 1960s which went back to blaming Germany – sometimes known as anti-revisionism.</p> <p>Since then, there has been a vast variety of interpretations, looking at the importance of culture, individuals, contingent factors etc., with no clear consensus, though most historians would still place a significant burden of responsibility on Germany.</p> <p>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