

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/52

Paper 5b (Special Subject: The Crusades, 1095–1192),
maximum raw mark 60

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result, not all answers fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Question 1 (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

Question 1 (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the band. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected or, especially at the lower end of the band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear, there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated, but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

- 1 (a) **How far are the reasons for the fall of Nicaea in Document B corroborated by Document A?** [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. The reasons for Crusader success in Document B focus mainly (although there is one reference to the Byzantine army firing arrows on the order of the Emperor) on Alexius, who is shown to be innovative in his approach to the design of siege engines, suspicious of the Crusaders' 'fickleness', happy to use tactics which deceive the enemy, wealthy, and happy to use his patronage to win over the Sultan and the inhabitants of Nicaea. All this is presented in a positive light, written as it is by his daughter. In A, the initiative for the surrender of the city comes from the Turks rather than from a plan by Alexius, although he is still described as 'full of vain and evil thinking.'

In A, it is the Crusaders who mount a successful attack on the city walls of Nicaea, in collusion with the Byzantine army. They are understandably (it is a Crusader source) portrayed as brave and successful in their attack on the city walls, supporting B, but then undermined by Alexius' plan to have the city surrender to him. Candidates might point out that the lack of trust each felt for the other emerges strongly from these documents, and this affects the view which each document gives for the reasons for the fall of the city.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the success of the First Crusade was the result of the superior military skill of the Franks over their Muslim enemies?**

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as the documents in this set (A–D). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The set of documents should be seen in broad context.

Evidence for the Crusaders' military success is given in Document A, although this is attributed more to bravery than to skill. Divine protection is also suggested here, as is the weakness of the Turks in fleeing the attack and seeking to come to terms with Alexius. Although the Turks were not, of course, the Crusaders' opponents at Jerusalem, this perhaps highlights the fractured nature of the Muslim world. In B, the capture of Nicaea is attributed to the skill and cunning of Alexius in the face of an untrustworthy Crusader force. The Crusaders' military success is mentioned once, in their piercing of the walls of the city, although this is not attributed specifically to skill – unsurprisingly given that the author is Alexius's daughter. It could be said that A and B together show the suspicion which existed between the Crusaders and Byzantines, which did more to hinder than to help the Crusade, at least in its early stages.

Document C illustrates the Crusaders' good military organisation during the break-out from Antioch, but it also mentions their religious devotion. The second half of the document portrays the Muslim army as poorly organised and led, although candidates might express

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

surprise that a Crusader source is able to record the precise words of a conversation between Kerbogha and Merdolin. The sense of poor organisation that it gives, though, is backed up by the poor nature of the Muslim response to the attack. In D, the Crusaders' ecstatic devotion, combined with the brutality of the attack on Jerusalem is portrayed by Fulcher of Chartres; he passes no judgement on this. There is a suggestion, from Raymond's actions, that the attack was successful more because of this than because of military tactics or organisation. Candidates might also refer to the rapid flight of the Muslims in the sight of the Crusader attack.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

2 Why did Urban II's call for a Crusade receive such an enthusiastic response? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates may refer to the appeal made by Urban at the Council of Clermont (1095), economic factors such as the agricultural crisis of the 1090s, the issue of the younger sons of the nobility seeking land in the East, civil unrest in France, the preaching of Peter the Hermit, the lure of the indulgence, Jerusalem as an aim, and the Crusade as pilgrimage.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The main thrust of the candidates' response is likely to focus on the issue of religious as against economic motivation for the First Crusaders. The 'religious argument' focuses on the piety of the Crusaders, the importance of the indulgence, and the Crusade as a pilgrimage. The primary importance of these as motivating factors has been stressed by Riley-Smith, Phillips and Asbridge amongst others. Against this should be set arguments of economic motivation: the agricultural crisis of the 1090s and the issue of younger sons of the nobility seeking land are key factors to mention here. Mayer stressed the latter in his work, although Riley-Smith has attempted to discredit this view. In addition, candidates might consider such factors as the social conditions in France, with the seemingly endless conflicts between castellans, and the charisma of leaders such as Peter the Hermit. Candidates would do well to distinguish between the two waves of the Crusade in their answers, and to consider whether Crusaders might have been motivated by a variety of factors.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2. Attention is drawn to the rubric: *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance, and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

3 How important were the Military Orders to the survival of the Crusader States up to 1144? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question, which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The foundation of the Templars (1120) and the transformation of the Hospitallers into a military order are clearly central to this question, but candidates should also show knowledge of the social and political conditions in the Crusader States at the time, as well as the Muslim world.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The Templars and Hospitallers provided a dedicated military defence force for the Crusader States. The Hospitallers provided medical support for pilgrims. The Orders built castles, they fought in a number of key battles, and their wealth was important in funding defence, but they were relatively small in number. The Templars in particular were increasingly unpopular. Against this should be considered other factors which helped in the defence of the Crusader States: the divisions within the Muslim world, alliances with Muslim states, and the skill of the leaders, particularly the Kings of Jerusalem. All of this, of course, came under increasing pressure with the growth of jihad in the Muslim world, and it is arguable that, in the end, growing pressure from the Muslim world made successful defence impossible, and that, until 1144, the Crusader States had done well to stave off defeat.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2. Attention is drawn to the rubric: *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance, and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	52

- 4 'The death of Frederick Barbarossa and the departure of Philip Augustus doomed the Third Crusade to failure.' Discuss. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Knowledge of the events of the Third Crusade is obviously vital here. Candidates will need to demonstrate knowledge of the events surrounding Frederick's death and Philip's departure after the siege of Acre, but also be able to consider their consequences and weigh them against the role of Richard I and the extent to which Saladin provided strong opposition to the Crusade.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Frederick's departure deprived the Crusade of potentially its main leader. He had already won a victory at Iconium, he had experience of the Second Crusade, and he had a vast army. Philip's departure also deprived the Crusade of resources, but arguably its greater effect was to unsettle Richard I to the extent that he became anxious to complete the Crusade and return home to defend his lands in France. Richard was worried by the perceived strength of Saladin's army, although it is clear that this army was divided and close to collapse by 1192, unbeknown to Richard. Candidates may evaluate the relative importance of the two factors mentioned in the question, but also weigh them against other factors which led to the failure of the Crusade. They might also wish to consider the extent to which it was a failure, as Richard did secure control of much of the coast and intended to return to complete his campaign within three years.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2. Attention is drawn to the rubric: *Where appropriate your essay should make use of any relevant documents you have studied as well as contextual knowledge.*

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance, and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of presentation.