Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY **9769/52**

Paper 5b Special Subject: The Crusades, 1095–1192 **For examination from 2020**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Specimen

This specimen paper has been updated for assessments from 2020. The specimen questions and mark schemes remain the same. The layout and wording of the front covers have been updated to reflect the new Cambridge International branding and to make instructions clearer for candidates.

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **12** 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.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2019–2021 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

(a) This question is designed 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.

(b) Examiners will 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.

(c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

(d) In marking an answer, examiners will 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 demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 3: 8–10 marks

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 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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 1: 1–3 marks

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.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)

Band 4: 16–20 marks

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 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.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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 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.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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 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.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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 while understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2019–2021 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

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

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

(b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.

(c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.

(d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 still be able to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account.

(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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

(f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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.

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 marks

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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 some irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may 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.

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

The answer 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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 while investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**How far are Richard's character and crusading objectives as revealed in Document B corroborated by the events described in Document A?** Richard's letter (Document B) shows Richard in apparently confident mood after the siege of Acre. The capture of Acre appears to have been without incident – he omits any mention of the massacre described in Document A. His mention of Philip Augustus suggests that he feels betrayed by him, and he is clearly deeply suspicious of Philip's motives for leaving. He remains confident, however, although the last sentence implies that he is anxious to get home as soon as possible. In A, Richard is portrayed as impatient (which is to some extent corroborated by the last sentence of B) and unnecessarily cruel, which, unsurprisingly, is not something which we find in B. Beha ed-Din suggests that Richard might have been seeking revenge, and this is to some extent corroborated by B in his desire to return home to deal with Philip, but Beha ed-Din also suggests that military prudence was a motive. Whether this is implied in B is debatable – it could be argued that the penultimate sentence suggests that Richard has a clear plan, but equally it suggests that he is determined to achieve his aim at any cost.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Richard I was an effective and respected crusading leader? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).** The focus of this answer should be a judgement on Richard's wisdom in leaving the crusade unfinished – whether it was prudent to leave when he did, or whether he could have achieved more. Knowledge of the weaknesses within Saladin's army by 1192, although not in the sources, will help to inform this judgement. Candidates could also consider other aspects of what constitutes 'greatness'. In Document A, Richard is portrayed as impatient and unnecessarily cruel to his Muslim opponents, although it is also suggested that there might have been a strategic motive behind his actions, which were militarily prudent. As a Muslim view of Richard, it is not surprising that it highlights Richard's cruelty, although it does, perhaps surprisingly, suggest more positive motives for what Richard did, and candidates might point out that it was not uncommon for Muslim chroniclers to view Richard with a degree of respect – this implies that he was well regarded even by his enemies. In Document B, Richard is portraying his recent actions in a positive light, although candidates may infer that he was keenly aware of how dependent he was on the support of Philip, and how the latter's departure compromised his ability to continue. The last sentence in B reveals a degree of anxiety about the need to return home. Document C is a Muslim account of Richard's victory at Arsuf, which is one of the events on which his reputation rests. It suggests that his victory comes about as a result of a last-ditch charge – not surprising in a Muslim source, but other chroniclers suggest that the victory was not as easy as it might have been and that Richard actually lost control of the military orders, who made a unilateral decision to charge. Document D is an account of the truce of 1192, and candidates might note that Richard appears to be in a desperate situation by this stage as a result of illness and depleted forces. The truce is therefore prudent in the circumstances, and the last sentence in D suggests that he faced considerable criticism over it at the time. Document E is an attempt to reach a balanced conclusion about Richard's achievements.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Why was the second wave of the First Crusade so much more successful than the first?** AO1/AO2 – Issues which are likely to be relevant here include qualities of leadership (Peter the Hermit as against the leaders of the second wave), the make-up of the armies and the attitude of, and towards, the Byzantine Empire. Candidates might point out that the issue of leadership is not straightforward; in some ways (e.g. recruitment) Peter was tremendously successful, and the leaders of the second wave frequently fell out with one another, displaying unity only at crucial moments. On the other hand, the first wave clearly loses control at crucial moments, not least in its pogroms against the Jews and its skirmishes on the journey through Europe. Although the first wave failed, the second wave went on to capture Jerusalem, and candidates could quite reasonably consider the reasons for the success of this campaign outside the context of the first wave. In this case, the weaknesses and disunity within the Muslim world would need to be discussed. Candidates should make sharp comparisons between the two campaigns within a thematic structure. There is no significant historiographical controversy here, but candidates might show awareness of recent works by France, Asbridge and Phillips.	**30**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**'Muslim weaknesses, rather than the strengths of the settlers themselves, best explain the survival of the Crusader States up to 1144.' Discuss.** AO1 – Candidates should show awareness of the weaknesses within the Muslim world: the Sunni/Shi'ite divisions and dynastic problems of the Caliphate are significant. These weaknesses start to be overcome as the period progresses, and the Battle of the Field of Blood (1119) demonstrates growing Muslim strength, as does the rise of Jihad under Zengi and Nur ad-Din. On the other hand, the Crusader States benefit from a degree of dynastic stability in the early years, at least in Jerusalem. But then again, they also show some weaknesses – a chronic lack of manpower in particular. It could be argued that neither is in a particularly strong position in 1100, but that the rise of Jihad demonstrates that the Muslim world recovered from its weak position, whereas the Crusader States are never in a position of any real strength. AO2 – Candidates should evaluate the significance of Muslim weakness as a reason for the survival of the Crusader States as against other factors. Candidates should consider the change in circumstances of the two sides over the timeframe of the question.	**30**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**How justified is the claim that the reign of Baldwin IV of Jerusalem (1174–1185) was a period of weakness and instability?** AO1/AO2 – This question invites candidates to evaluate the qualities of Baldwin's leadership and the achievements of his reign. Some assessment of military successes and failures is important, as is an evaluation of his ability to deal with the factionalism at court and the significance of that threat to the kingdom's stability. Evaluation of the role of key figures such as Reynald of Chatillon, Guy of Lusignan and Raymond of Tripoli is to be expected, especially in the context of the regency. Baldwin's leprosy is also significant and there is some debate as to whether this was a weakness or a strength (the suffering leader as a symbol of Christ himself). Candidates might broaden the answer out into an assessment of the state of society in the kingdom during Baldwin's reign, and of the vigour of its religious life. Candidates might include an assessment of the reign in the context of what followed up to 1187. Answers should take an evaluative approach to the qualities of Baldwin's leadership, perhaps looking at different aspects of it in a thematic way. The main historiographical controversy here centres around the views of earlier historians such as Runciman, who argued that Baldwin was a weak figure, and Bernard Hamilton's more positive reassessment of Baldwin's career. Some assessment of the significance of the years of Baldwin's reign as against the years which immediately followed it and which led to the disaster of Hattin might also be expected.	**30**

BLANK PAGE