



Pearson

Mark scheme

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel
GCE History (9HI0/1A)
Advanced

Paper 1: Breadth study with
interpretations

Option 1A: The crusades, c1095–
1204

Generic Level Descriptors: Sections A and B

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section C

Target: A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. • Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Section A: Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate is it to say that the rule of Baldwin I was significantly different from that of Baldwin II in the years 1100–31.</p> <p>Evidence and argument that the rule of Baldwin I was significantly different from that of Baldwin II in the years 1100–31 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baldwin I offered strong leadership whereas Baldwin II was unable to prevent rebellion from his nobles in 1123 • Baldwin I gained over-lordship of the Church whereas Baldwin II faced an attempted takeover of Jerusalem by the Patriarch • Baldwin II, unlike Baldwin I, spent long periods away from Jerusalem and thus allowed discontent to surface • The reign of Baldwin II, unlike that of Baldwin I, ended in a succession crisis, stemming from his seizure of the crown and his displays of favouritism. <p>Evidence and argument that the rule of Baldwin I was similar to that of Baldwin II in the years 1100–31 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both kings saw military campaigning as the essential duty of kings and campaigned vigorously against the Muslim threat • Both kings intervened effectively to support stable government in the crusader states where succession crises arose, e.g. Tripoli in 1109 and Antioch 1119–24 • Both kings fought successfully and won battles of decisive importance for the protection of the kingdom of Jerusalem, e.g. both the battle of Ramla in 1101 and the battle of Azaz in 1125 • Both kings pursued the policy of extending and consolidating crusader territory through conquest and castle building. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far they agree with the view that the main consequence of the failure of the Second Crusade was limited European support for the crusader states in the years 1149–92.</p> <p>Evidence and argument to support the suggestion that the main consequence of the failure of the Second Crusade was limited European support for the crusader states in the years 1149–92 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Second Crusade exacerbated the European tendency to see support for Jerusalem as their main duty, e.g. Antioch's urgent appeal to Louis VII for help was ignored, resulting in defeat at the battle of Inab in 1149 • European leaders ignored seven appeals for help between 1157 and 1184, despite the Pope recommending that assistance be sent • Louis VII of France and Henry II of England ignored the embassy of Archbishop Frederick of Tyre in 1169 • The embassy of Amalric in 1171 found no support in the West until the launch of the Third Crusade. <p>Evidence and argument to challenge the suggestion that the main consequence of the failure of the Second Crusade was limited European support for the crusader states in the years 1149–92 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to take Damascus in the Second Crusade led to the city becoming a centre of Nur ad-Din's power • The failure of the Second Crusade to retake Edessa led directly to the consolidation of Muslim power in the North East and the subsequent loss of further crusader territory • The failure of the Second Crusade in the north led to energies being directed against the Fatimids in Egypt and led to Baldwin III capturing Ascalon in 1153, thus expanding crusader power in the south • The failure of the Second Crusade exacerbated divisions between Antioch and Jerusalem, e.g. the dispute over control of Shaizar. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section B: Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the religious enthusiasm of Nur and Saladin was the most significant reason for increased Muslim unity in the years 1146–92.</p> <p>Evidence and argument that the religious enthusiasm of Nur and Saladin was the most significant reason for increased Muslim unity in the years 1146–92 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intervention of the caliph of Baghdad in 1157 who encouraged Nur ad-Din to rally Muslims against the Christians • Nur's defeat by the Franks in 1163 led him to seek religious support and thereafter he promoted future campaigns as <i>jihad</i> and began to emphasise the spiritual significance of Jerusalem for Muslims • Saladin paid for <i>madrasas</i> (religious schools) and Muslim charitable works to cement his appeal across Muslim territory • Saladin used <i>hadith</i> (sayings of the Prophet) to underscore his dispensation of justice and his renowned magnanimity. <p>Evidence and argument in favour of other significant reasons for increased Muslim unity in the years 1146–92 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nur consolidated his power in Syria by waging war on Muslim rivals until 1157, and uniting them under his power rather than religion • Shirkuh's expansionist desire and seizure of Egypt in 1169 brought unity between Muslims there and those in Iraq and Syria • Both Nur ad-Din and Saladin created a united leadership by appointing family members on the basis of loyalty rather than religion • Division among the Franks emboldened Muslim advances, e.g. the succession crisis after the death of Baldwin V assisted Saladin with the offer of a truce in 1185. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far they agree that the motives for crusading changed in the years 1095–1192.</p> <p>Evidence and argument that the motives for crusading changed in the years 1095–1192 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political motives for calling crusades were much stronger in the First Crusade, e.g. the influence of the Investiture Controversy on Urban II • The First and Third Crusades were focused on taking Jerusalem for Christianity, the Second Crusade was not • Chivalric values encouraged knights to go on crusade after the success of the First Crusade and were more important in the Second and Third Crusades • The motive of acquiring land for crusaders was strong in the First Crusade but declined as a motive thereafter, e.g. Richard I and Philip had large European kingdoms already. <p>Evidence and argument that there was little if any change to the motives for crusading in the years 1095–1192 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Religious motives remained fairly consistent throughout the period, e.g. Jerusalem continued to be of great spiritual significance to Christians • Papal motives in calling crusades continued to be concerned with extending and preserving the authority of the Holy See • The Christian perception of Muslims as a threat to the Christian territory was constant, and consistently featured in pre-crusade propaganda • Military training, tournaments and jousting continued to stimulate knightly zeal for Holy War. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section C: Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.</p> <p>Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the Fourth Crusade was diverted to Constantinople due to the limited abilities of the crusader leaders.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The crusader leaders were unfit to make decisions affecting the Fourth Crusade • The leaders had a limited understanding of Byzantium and were contemptuous of Byzantine military capabilities • Byzantium was a weakened power and was seen by Christians as a liability in the fight against the Muslims • The wealth of Byzantium was a feature of the crusaders' motives for the diversion. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Venetians were unhappy about transporting the crusaders to Egypt where they enjoyed good commercial relations • The Venetians were untrustworthy and had aided the Muslims in the past • Prince Alexius's appeal to the crusaders was enthusiastically supported by the Venetians • Venice had the crusaders within their power because of the Treaty of Venice. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Fourth Crusade was diverted to Constantinople due to the limited abilities of the crusader leaders. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Crusade was not led by kings and decision making was taken by the crusader body as a whole, which led to prevarication • The crusaders had failed to recruit the knights and money to meet their obligations in the Treaty of Venice, which led to the need for wealth acquisition to pay off their debts • The crusader leaders failed to listen to the response of Innocent III to the attack on Zara, and repeated their error by attacking Constantinople. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Fourth Crusade was diverted to Constantinople due to the limited abilities of the crusader leaders. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The responsibility for the Fourth Crusade was Innocent III's, who called the Crusade in the first place, and then failed to control events thereafter

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 174 1390 275">• Prince Alexius's offer made a lot of sense to the indebted crusaders as he was a Christian who would turn Byzantium into a better ally, and they were not to know his claims were exaggerated<li data-bbox="347 304 1385 398">• The crusader leaders were military men who saw themselves serving the Christian cause through fighting, and saw the diversions to Zara and Constantinople as furthering their cause to retake Jerusalem.