

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

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 demonstrated.

Question (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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

Question (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 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

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 demonstrated.

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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

- 1 (a) **How far are the reasons given in Document C for people to go on the First Crusade corroborated by Document D?** [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.

In Document C, Urban tries to inspire crusaders by flattering the French with the greatness of their earlier rulers, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, referring in particular to their campaigns against, presumably, the pagan Saxons and the Muslims in Spain. There is also reference to the poor economic conditions in France at the time, and the damaging and violent effects this has had on society. It ends with a call to arms, enticing them with the prospect of land and implying that they are a 'chosen race' just like the children of Israel. D elucidates the references in C to economic problems and also refers to the problems of endemic warfare. There is reference, too, to the idea that they are travelling to the 'Promised Land' – also implying, perhaps, that they are a 'chosen race'. D also refers to the appearance of 'certain prophets' – not mentioned in C – encouraging people to go on crusade. There is no reference to the examples of earlier kings which appear in C. Some candidates might point out that the last sentence of D suggests that crusaders had not taken the advice contained in line 4–5 of C.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the First Crusaders were motivated predominantly by greed? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).** [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. Candidates need to consider a wide range of factors. Document A is an account of the appeal made to Alexius, rather than a motivating factor for the crusaders. Nevertheless, its contents were passed on to the crusaders in Urban's speech. It focuses on the need to help the Byzantine Empire and, whilst this does not on the face of it suggest greed as a motivation, some candidates might point out that the wealth of Constantinople would have been known to some of the crusaders. Jerusalem is cited as the prime motivating factor in B, and crusaders are encouraged to liberate the centre of the Christian world. The final sentence is the promise of an indulgence: many would see this as the antithesis of greed as a motivation, but others might argue that the crusaders were 'greedy' for eternal glory in heaven. In C, a form of flattery is used, reminding the crusaders of the greatness of their forbears and asking them to live up to ideals which they set in fighting non-Christians. They are specifically encouraged not to be greedy as they set out, but the implication of the promises it makes for the land of 'milk and honey' could be interpreted as appealing to people's greed. On the other hand, the implication here – as in D – that the crusaders are the chosen race going to the Promised Land suggests rather higher ideals. It should be noted, of course, these are accounts of Urban's speech and do not give direct evidence as to what motivated the crusaders. We can infer, of course, that these would have been important motivational factors, as he would have been concerned to make the enterprise attractive and knew what would appeal to his audience. D gives an account of the appalling economic conditions in Western Europe at the

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

time. A desire to escape this would certainly have motivated the crusaders, although candidates might discuss whether this constitutes greed. The fact that many of the crusaders took with them their wives and goods suggests an intention to settle in the Holy Land. Finally, Document E is an account of the historiographical debate surrounding this issue, suggesting that it was piety and spirituality which was the prime motivating factor. Candidates should gain credit for showing awareness of this debate, between historians such as Runciman and Mayer on the one hand and Riley-Smith, Phillips and Asbridge on the other.

2 Who was more to blame for the failure of the Second Crusade: Louis VII or the Emperor Manuel Comnenus? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The question requires candidates to compare the roles of these two men in the failure of the crusade. In discussing the role of Louis VII, reference might be made to initial recruitment problems, to poor diplomacy at Constantinople, and to his failures of military leadership on the journey and in the east. On the other hand it could be pointed out that in the end recruitment was healthy, that he was not the only leader – some would say that Conrad should bear considerable blame, and the fateful decisions at the Council of Acre were collective ones. Manuel, although a fellow Christian, had not called for the Crusade and, although he allowed it through his territory, did his best to limit its ability to harm his empire. For him, survival of the empire was paramount. On the other hand it could be argued that at times his good advice was ignored, and that decisions taken once the crusade had reached the Holy Land were nothing to do with him.

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 well as an ability to engage with controversy. In this essay, the recent work of Phillips on the Second Crusade might be cited as well as works by Riley-Smith and Tyerman. Candidates may be expected to sharpen the argument by evaluating the relative importance of the issues.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

3 How much responsibility for the Frankish defeat at Hattin in 1187 lies with King Guy of Jerusalem? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will need to consider the significance of Guy's poor leadership in relation to other factors. Issues to consider are his vacillation over tactics at Hattin, his wider tactical ineptitude and his involvement in the divisions at court in the 1180s. On the other hand it could be argued that Saladin presented a uniquely dangerous threat, having united the Muslim world under the banner of jihad; the Crusader States were by now impossibly isolated and requests for help from the west had gone unanswered; Byzantium was no longer able to offer help; and other figures such as Reynald of Chatillon should shoulder some of the responsibility.

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 well as an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should gain credit for showing awareness of long- and short-term causes of the defeat; they might also wish to challenge the notion of Guy's military ineptitude given that he had adopted the opposite tactics, without success, at an earlier confrontation in 1183. Guy has few supporters in modern historiography; the work of Hamilton might be cited here, along with Smail's study of crusading warfare.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5b

4 How far should the failure of the Third Crusade be attributed to poor leadership? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The question requires candidates to balance considerations of leadership alongside other factors in considering the reasons for the failure of the Third Crusade. Philip Augustus's reluctant participation and early departure are clearly important here, and candidates might also engage in a discussion of Richard's leadership qualities. His military skill is undeniable, although his treatment of the garrison of Acre scandalised the Muslim world. His skill was shown to good effect at Arsuf; was his decision to seek a truce a sensible decision in the circumstances, or was it an act of cowardice? Did the departure of Philip leave him in an impossible position? Candidates need to balance consideration of leadership alongside the other factors which led to failure – long-term problems of isolation and lack of supplies; the legacy of years of weakness in the Crusader States; lack of Byzantine help, and Saladin's undoubted leadership qualities. Ultimately, candidates might challenge the notion of failure; after all, the truce was intended to be temporary and Richard intended to return to complete the campaign.

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. Candidates might choose to tackle the notion of 'failure' here, as well as considering the relative importance of different factors leading to the end of the crusade.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

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.