



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel

In GCE History (8HI0/1A)

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

Option 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 or 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.

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

Summer 2022

Publications Code 8HI0_1A_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

8HI01A

Q1.

Question 1 asked candidates to consider whether violent disorder in Europe was the main reason for the First and Second Crusades. This was by far the more popular question in Section A. Most candidates understood that violent disorder in Europe referred to conflicts involving kings, nobles and their retainers, as well as the impact they had on churchmen. A range of alternative and related reasons for the two crusades was on offer too, and this meant that candidates generally performed well.

More successful candidates were able to deal effectively with the stated factor of 'violent disorder in Europe' and effectively compared it to other factors such as religious motivations, the political ambitions of the papacy and the desire to gain land and goods. Reasons for the crusades were evaluated rather than listed, and a few candidates successfully showed how a variety of causes overlapped and worked together.

Less successful candidates tended to be a little vague about why violent disorder prompted the popes to call crusades, and tended to list other causes for the crusades. These candidates tended to offer a simple analysis or description of the events leading to the crusades and judgements were asserted rather than reasoned.

Q2.

Question 2 asked candidates to consider whether divisions within the ruling elite were the main consequence of the rule of the 'leper king' Baldwin IV in the years 1174-85. The few candidates who answered this question offered good knowledge on Baldwin IV and the nature of his disease as well as the factional disputes among the ruling elite. Candidates tend to struggle with consequence questions and often turn a consequence into a causation response. On this occasion candidates knew enough about other consequences of the rule of Baldwin IV, including his military successes and proactive involvement in securing an heir, to offer an evaluative and focussed response.

Q3.

Question 3 asked candidates to consider how significant problems of leadership were in the Second and Third Crusades. This question proved to be quite popular and was accessible. Most candidates answering this question knew about the problems of leadership in both crusades. Reference to the leaders of the Second Crusade failing to retake Edessa and subsequently Damascus, and leaders of the Third Crusade being divided over their rivalry were common and enabled many candidates to access upper level 3 or level 4.

More successful candidates focussed on the second order concept of significance in the question. Problems of leadership were discussed in terms of divisions between individual leaders, and the mistakes made in each crusade. Some candidates were able to offer an analysis of the shifting balance of power between crusading and Muslim forces that helped them develop a sustained analysis.

Less successful candidates tended to criticise the leadership of the Second Crusade for not retaking Edessa, and praising the ultimate leader of the Third Crusade (Richard I) in terms of martial vigour but failed to focus on significance. This led to a weak analysis describing the two crusades in broad terms and making an asserted judgement.

Q4.

Question 4 asked candidates to consider the extent to which the Muslim response to the crusades changed in the years 1095-1192. Slightly fewer candidates in Section B chose to answer this question, but generally there was sufficient knowledge to demonstrate that Muslim power grew and strengthened. The majority of answers were competent at going through the stages of Muslim power.

More successful candidates focussed on change over time and were able to exemplify the Muslim response to the crusades in terms of increasing military successes. With some detailed and well selected evidence these candidates could access level 4, although only a minority considered the extent to which the Muslim response to the crusades did not change, eg in terms of military tactics.

Less successful candidates tended to focus on the parts of the period they were most comfortable with and the second order concept of change and continuity was left implicit.

Q5.

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that the Fourth Crusade failed because of Innocent III's errors. Candidates were generally well versed in Innocent's preparations for the crusade and his overbearing character.

Successful candidates centred their answers on the different interpretations that the extracts offered. The interpretation of extract 1 that Innocent failed to strongly forbid attacks on Christians was contrasted with the view in extract 2 that Alexios and the crusader leaders should carry the blame too. At the top end candidates selected relevant knowledge of their own to develop the arguments used in the extracts and work towards a sustained analysis, counter posing the rival interpretations of the extracts. The best answers connected the various causal factors in order to offer a nuanced evaluation.

Less successful candidates tended to pick out points from the extracts and offer a comment on whether this could be sustained or was known to be true. The own knowledge deployed at the bottom end was mostly accurate but was not used to develop or critique the extracts, and this generally prevented access to level 3 or above, because it was largely descriptive.