



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In History (9HI0/1A)

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

1A: The crusades, c1095–1204

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2022

Publications Code 9HI0\_1A\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Question 1 asked candidates to consider whether Saladin was motivated mainly by personal ambition in the years 1169–92.

A minority of candidates opted for this section A question. Candidates who did this question generally did it well. A minority of candidates failed to engage with what personal ambition meant. There was good knowledge on display over all, and certainly Saladin's military successes and failures were in evidence.

Successful candidates showed good knowledge of Saladin's aims across the period with his personal ambitions, generally framed as a desire for power and glory, juxtaposed with his public commitments that included jihad, Muslim welfare and Islamic culture. At the top end candidates tended to argue that Saladin's main motive was to unite the Muslim world, and that this involved establishing his own authority over diverse Muslim cities and territories. Saladin's success was exemplified above all by the numbers he could bring onto the battle field.

Less successful candidates tended to narrate Saladin's story and make weak links to his motivations. Weaker candidates spent too much time on Saladin's military strengths and often went into great detail concerning the battle of Hattin. The main feature of responses at the bottom end was an absence of criteria by which the question could be judged.

Question 2 asked candidates to consider how far they agreed that Christian enthusiasm to free and hold Jerusalem was the most important factor motivating the First and Second Crusades.

This was by far the more popular question in section A and produced some very good responses. Centres seem to have prepared candidates well on reasons for the crusades, and the vast majority of candidates were able to cite a range of reasons for the crusades.

Successful candidates showed an understanding of what Christian enthusiasm to free and hold Jerusalem meant in terms of the First and Second Crusades. For the First, many referred back to Urban mentioning the holy city at Clermont and in his letters, and its importance as a destination of pilgrimage in the eleventh century. For the Second, more nuanced answers recognised that although Jerusalem did not spark the crusade and was not its goal, the threat to it was felt after the fall of Edessa, and its pull meant that crusaders such as Louis VII were drawn there to fulfil their vows as pilgrims. This factor was then weighed up and evaluated against the other religious, political and social factors that motivated these crusades.

Less successful candidates tended to assert the importance of Jerusalem with little supporting evidence, or links to other crusader motivations. This tended to limit the criteria by which the question could be judged, and prevented evaluation involving other factors.

Question 3 asked candidates to consider the extent to which the nature of knighthood in the Third Crusade was different from the nature of knighthood in the First Crusade.

The nature of knighthood is a specified topic for this option, and yet a considerable number of candidates struggled with it. Many candidates made the motivations of crusaders the central focus of their answer and therefore could not access level 4 and above. Others compared what knights did on the two crusades. Many answers recognised that the development of chivalry should form an important component of their answer but lacked a confident understanding of the concept.

Successful candidates recognised that this is a similarity and difference question with the First and Third Crusades acting as chronological reference points in the evolution of knighthood.

Points of similarity included that the military role of the knight changed little in the period as the shock charge remained the key tactic across the period. Also, the feudal role of knights remained the same, although only a few could define that in terms of knights being tenants-in-chief of a lord. Points of difference included the evolution of chivalry as an aristocratic and martial ethos for knighthood that included its development and dissemination through the troubadours and romances; the development of the tournament as a training ground; and crusading as an increasingly religious obligation. At the top end candidates expanded on the roles of the Military Orders as a key component of their answer.

Less successful candidates often fell into a description of what knights did in the two crusades and took military campaigns as the nature of knighthood. Many at the bottom end wrote much on the role of Richard I, who allegedly exemplified chivalric values, but was not a knight.

Question 4 asked candidates to consider how far they agreed that, in the years 1100–92, Queen Melisende provided the most significant example of good governance in the crusader states.

This question was done relatively well in that good knowledge was shown of the governance of the Latin states in breadth over the period. The best answers were able to provide detailed evidence both for and against the statement in the question before comparing Melisende with the other rulers in the period. However, knowledge of Melisende, sometimes referred to as ‘the Magnificent’, was narrower than we expected.

Candidates tended to consider the criteria for ‘good government’ to be victory in battle (conquest) or castle building (consolidation), and this tended to reject Melisende’s government on these grounds. More knowledge of her involvement in factional issues was displayed.

Successful candidates, at level 4 and above, were able to establish clear criteria by which the question could be judged. At the top end candidates declined to simply condemn Melisende for the factional disputes that arose, and pointed to her preparation to rule as one of Baldwin II’s nominated heirs. At this level candidates also accepted that her treatment of Fulk of Anjou showed both authority and wisdom. Nevertheless, the majority of successful candidates still declined the invitation to consider Melisende’s reign as one of good governance, and the majority chose criteria that would point to other rulers being more successful.

Less successful candidates tended to gloss over Melisende’s reign with little supporting evidence. At the bottom end candidates tended to extol the virtues of Baldwin I and Baldwin II without reference to Melisende. Good governance was taken as meaning victory in battle.

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider whether Innocent III’s poor preparations were responsible for the failure of the Fourth Crusade.

Answers to this question were pleasing as most candidates treated the extracts as interpretations to be analysed and debated rather than statements of fact to be added to. Centres seem to have prepared candidates well for section C questions.

Successful candidates were able to use the extracts to consider the many issues that led to the failure of the Fourth Crusade, and developed the strengths and weaknesses of Innocent’s ambitions with reference to later developments.

Successful candidates developed and criticised the extracts claims about the recruitment of monarchs to lead the crusade, as well as the financial shortfall that allowed the Venetians to influence later events. The best answers showed confidence in their appraisal of the individual

claims made and were able to contextualise and/or challenge these with precisely selected evidence of their own.

Less successful candidates tended to either stick closely to the content of the extracts, or simply answer the question using their own knowledge. At the bottom end the extracts tended to be used as a body of information to be mined and acknowledged.