



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative A Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2008

Alternative A: Crusading Europe, 1046–1223

AS Unit 1: The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095–1192

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of 'earthly profit' (line 3) in the context of the motives behind the First Crusade. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. the issue of greed as a motive for participants in the First Crusade. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. details on the issue of greed and booty, the cost of crusading and the debate between historians over issues such as landless younger sons. Context may contrast with this with the goal of pilgrimage and importance of the Holy places in crusader motivation. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source C** differs from the views expressed in **Source B** about the importance of military skill in the First Crusade. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain 'own knowledge'. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to 'pieces' of factual content.

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. Source B emphasises cohesion, boldness and skill, while Source C discusses the lack of unity among the Muslims. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. Source B gives military skill, leadership and luck as means of success, while in Source C Muslim unity is argued. Own knowledge may expand on the references to particular battles, Doryaleum (implicit), Antioch and Mersivan. **3-5**
- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source C, e.g. as above, and with depth on the issue of Muslim disunity, perhaps with detail of Antioch and the defeat of Kerbogha. **6-7**

- (c) Refer to **Sources A, B and C** and use your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of Muslim disunity, in relation to other factors, in explaining the success of the First Crusade in 1099. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions but will have valid links.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Source A provides evidence of the strength of religious motivation amongst the crusaders, Source B focuses on the issue of military skill and various forms – cohesion and leadership for example, while Source C suggests Muslim disunity was of paramount importance. General reference may be made to a variety of other reasons for the capture of Jerusalem, e.g. spiritual commitment and the confidence imbued by piety, or the impact of finding the Holy Lance. Reference could be made to the variety of other concerns, the role of Byzantium, the role of key individuals such as Bohemond of Taranto or Adhemar of Le Puy. Key moments such as Doryaleum or Antioch may be developed, or the motivation which drove on key participants and social groups. Muslim disunity should not simply describe splits between Sunni and Shia, Fatimid and Abbasid and the caliphates of Baghdad and Cairo, but must relate these divisions to the course of the crusade, for example, the lack of support for Kerbogha at Antioch, or the Fatimid capture of Jerusalem.

At Level 1, candidates are likely to launch into narrative accounts of the crusade, or will make simple statements about military skill, either from sources or own knowledge. At Level 2, responses should be more precise, using either extracts or own knowledge, selecting relevant

examples such as the sieges at Antioch and Jerusalem. The implications of the question will not be accepted without question, but such answers will be partial and lack both weight and balance. By Level 3, answers will be predominantly analytical, material will be drawn from both own knowledge and sources in some depth. Level 4 answers will have a well-balanced analytical approach with a sustained focus on evaluating the issue. Candidates might usefully counter Muslim disunity with judgement on a specific alternative. Level 5 answers will show independence of thought with judgement sustained and buttressed by wholly relevant evidence – historiography could include recent work by Riley-Smith or Phillips.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by ‘barons of the kingdom of Jerusalem’ (line 1) in relation to the Third Crusade. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. that this was the leaders of the Crusader states after the loss of Jerusalem in 1187. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. that the term refers to Guy of Lusignan and Conrad of Montferrat in particular. Details of the succession crisis after the death of Guy’s wife, Sibylla. The role of King Richard and King Philip in the dispute. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick Barbarossa’s expedition failed. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because Frederick died. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the decision to follow the land route through Asia Minor, lack of Byzantine support, bad luck and the details of Frederick’s death in June 1190. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. the issue of personal leadership, the weakness and priorities of Frederick of Swabia. **6-7**

- (c) 'The Third Crusade was a complete failure.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, either from the source or own knowledge some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, either from the source or own knowledge, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- Or***
Demonstrates by limited selection of material both from the source and from own knowledge implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion.
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, either from the source or own knowledge, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material either from the source or own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

To answer this question, candidates need to analyse the intentions behind the Third Crusade, its outcome, and perhaps reasons for the failure of the Third Crusade. Analysis should focus on the relative importance of divisions within the leadership. General reference may be made to a variety of issues; candidates need to identify and evaluate the relative importance of Richard's successes in regaining the coastal cities, victories such as Arsuf and the issue of failure and the treaty of Jaffa. At Level 1, most candidates will make simple statements about the failure of the crusade either from the source or own knowledge. Most are likely to agree with the statement. It is likely that examples of failure are simply described with little or no comment and/or development, for example, the failure to retake Jerusalem. At Level 2, responses will be more precise, selecting relevant examples and relating them and their importance to the question of failure. At Level 3 the answers will be predominantly analytical, and while the debate over failure is clearly understood, judgement may be implicit or partial. In arguing against the question candidates may focus on outcome and aftermath. Level 4 answers will have a well-balanced analytical approach with sustained focus on the issue and clear evaluation. That is, judgement on the issue will be clearly shown with a wide range of well-selected material. Candidates might usefully look to historiography. Level 5 answers will show clear conceptual awareness of the issue and independence of thought; they may directly challenge the

implications of the question and show clear conceptual understanding of this complex issue. Historiography will be fully integrated within the argument, not simply rehashed illustrative quotations.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by 'hawks' (line 2) in relation to the Crusader States. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. that this was the group in the Crusader states which sought war, as opposed to the 'Doves'. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. reference to the factions and key figures such as Guy and Reynald of Chatillon as well as their opponents, Raymond of Tripoli and the Ibelins. Their views on tactics and the need for passive/active responses to the threat of Saladin. Context may expand on the succession crisis during the period. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the Battle of Hattin took place. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. reference to the Hawks, tactics, Guy's weakness. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Saladin's invasion, Guy's weakness, the siege of Tiberius, the role of Raymond and his wife, Eshiva, or Guy's decision to seek battle and march from Sephoria to Tiberius. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as Level 2 and specific detail on the issue of tactics and Guy's decision making. Saladin's use of *Jihad* and need for a battle. **6-7**

- (c) 'The Crusader States were lost in 1187–1188 because Saladin successfully united the Muslim world.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material either from the sources or from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material either from the sources or from own knowledge, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- Or**
Demonstrates by limited selection of material both from the sources or from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers while relevant will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material both from the sources or from own knowledge, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material both from the sources or from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

To answer this question, candidates will analyse the issue of the collapse of the Crusader States in 1187–1188 and evaluate the relative importance of Muslim unity under Saladin. Quality of leadership, numerical strength and commitment through *Jihad* will be central with as particular focus on the tactics at the Battle of Hattin. General reference may be made to a variety of other reasons for collapse, e.g. crusader leadership and the weakness of King Guy. Reference could be made to the variety of other concerns, the role of key individuals such as Gerard de Ridefort and Reynald of Chatillon. Key themes will include issues such as weak kingship and the nature of the Crusader states as the product of a religious pilgrimage/crusade. Key moments of weakness such as 1174 or 1185 may be developed, or the motives of the participants and social groups – Hawks versus Doves for example.

At Level 1, candidates are likely to launch into narrative accounts of the Battle of Hattin, or will make simple statements about numerical weakness, either from sources or own knowledge. At Level 2, responses should be more precise, selecting relevant examples such as Saladin's use of *Jihad* or the extent of his power. The implications of the question may not be accepted

without question, but such answers will be partial and lack both weight and balance. By Level 3, answers will be predominantly analytical, material will be drawn from both own knowledge and sources in some depth. Level 4 answers will have a well-balanced analytical approach with a sustained focus on evaluating the issue. Candidates might usefully counter Muslim unity with long-term weakness with judgement on a specific alternative. Level 5 answers will show independence of thought with judgement sustained and buttressed by wholly relevant evidence – historiography could include recent work by Riley-Smith or Phillips.