



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **History 1041**

## *Specification*

### **Unit HIS1A**

# **Report on the Examination**

## *2009 examination – June series*

**This Report on the Examination uses the [new numbering system](#)**

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2009 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.

---

# Unit HIS1A

## Unit 1A: The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095–1204

### General Comments

Candidates' performance in this new alternative continued to impress, in a similar fashion to the first paper in January 2009. The questions appear to have been accessible, allowing the candidates to produce work of some quality; their detailed and well-argued responses were clearly the product of sustained effort and interest. However, the quality of responses varied considerably, with marks awarded across the range. Most students had a clear understanding of the structure of the examination and answered two questions. Question 1 (01/02) was answered by almost all the candidates, while nearly twice as many answered Question 2 (03/04) as Question 3 (05/06). Timing was an issue for some candidates with too much time devoted to one question at the expense of their second. A few candidates ignored the rubric and answered three questions; in such cases, the best two answers are credited.

### Question 1

- 01** In this 12 mark question the candidates were expected to analyse the different reasons why Pope Urban II called the First Crusade, with a particular focus on the importance of Byzantium. Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the demands of the question and expanded upon issues such as the request issued by Emperor Alexius to the council of Piacenza. Useful context was also provided on the political situation in the near East in the aftermath of the battle of Manzikert. At their best, candidates were able to achieve the highest marks by prioritising reasons, for example, the importance of religious motivation and the schism of 1054, or the needs of Byzantium, the fate of Eastern Christians and propaganda, and the primacy of Jerusalem as a motive.
- 02** This essay question was well-answered, with candidates providing a useful range of factors which contributed to the success of the First Crusade. One general weakness was illustrated in many of the specific paragraphs on the key issue of Muslim disunity; weaker candidates tended to describe the context of Muslim disunity in the early 1090s, rather than analysing the impact of this issue during the actual crusade. Better responses expanded upon the impact of Muslim disunity at key points such as the battle of Doryaleum and the siege of Antioch. Again, stronger candidates referred to the impact of issues such as religious fervour by relating the impact of events such as the finding of the Holy Lance rather than simply making generalised assertions. Many candidates produced balanced arguments with precisely selected evidence and were rewarded for doing so.

### Question 2

- 03** Some students found this 12 mark question on Bernard of Clairvaux's motives rather challenging; in particular there was weakness in technique as well as historical understanding. Candidates often provided descriptive narrative on Bernard's preaching rather than clearly identifying three to four reasons why he preached the crusade. Better candidates were able to prioritise between issues such as the events in the near East, papal control over the crusading movement and the crusade as a spiritual route to salvation, as well as other issues such as his wish to halt the anti-Semitic attacks in the Rhineland.

- 
- 04** This essay on the failure of the Second Crusade was answered well by many candidates, with well-balanced analysis of a range of factors. However, some candidates chose to ignore the issue of lack of clear aims however, and lost marks for doing so. A good evaluative response must analyse the suggested reason even if it decides it is of less relevance than other factors. Some historical understanding must be shown.

### **Question 3**

- 05** Answers to this question on why Guy of Lusignan was made King of Jerusalem in 1186 were among the weakest on the paper. The key issue was one of exam technique rather than lack of historical knowledge. Many candidates chose to provide descriptive overviews on the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the 1180s; these were often substantial with good understanding of the situation, but they were not analytical, failing to identify specific reasons why Guy was made King. For some indication of the type of detailed analysis provided by more able candidates, please consult the mark scheme which gives a range of issues such as the succession crisis, the lack of a suitable alternative, the role of Sibyl and the extent of support for Guy. Do note that the detailed mark scheme is given as an indication of some of the material candidates could put forward; it is not an indication of what they must provide, either in range or depth.
- 06** In this 24 mark essay question candidates were asked to evaluate the different reasons for the collapse of the Crusader states in 1187 to 1188, especially the role of King Guy's weak leadership. Most candidates were able to do so, focusing on his decisions and tactics in the summer of 1187. Useful evaluation and range were provided with material on Saladin's tactics and numbers at Hattin. More able candidates expanded on a range of factors including long-term geographical and numerical weakness, and also the deep divisions within the leadership of Outremer. Some of the best responses evaluated the culpability of other characters such as Raymond of Tripoli, Reynald of Chatillon and Gerard de Rideford. In contrast, several of the weaker responses seemed to base their analysis of Guy on the character in Ridley Scott's 'Kingdom of Heaven'.

### **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.