

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/52

Paper 52 (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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 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 2010	9769	52

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 2010	9769	52

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 2010	9769	52

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 2010	9769	52

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 2010	9769	52

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 2010	9769	52

- 1 (a) **How far, and why, do the views expressed about the qualities of Frankish leadership in Documents A and D differ?** [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. Document A is an account of the shortcomings of Guy's leadership in the 1180s, with specific reference to the events at Tubaniya, where he allowed Saladin to ravage part of the kingdom without challenge, preferring to shadow him rather than engage him in battle. William of Tyre was, of course, critical of Guy and his faction, believing their shortcomings to be a critical factor in the weakening of the Crusader States. The reference to 'sins' and 'wickedness' suggests that William sees the decline of the States as a morality tale. Ibn al-Athir's account, on the other hand, describes Balian of Ibelin's bravery at the siege of Jerusalem in 1187, threatening to 'die with honour' before surrendering the city. It suggests that the defence of the city had been half-hearted up to this point in the hope of honourable surrender, but that the threat of death will spur the crusaders on to a braver stance. The fact that the city was in this position is, of course, an indication of the weakness of previous leadership but it shows how Balian's bravery at the last had an impact even on his enemies. Candidates may reflect on the irony that it is a Frankish source which is critical of the Crusader States' leadership, and a Muslim source which highlights its bravery.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Crusader States in the 1180s were a society in decline? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as 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. Candidates will need to clarify how the term 'society in decline' might be defined; themes such as the capability of the States' leadership, quality and quantity of manpower available, the state of the Church and economic health are important here, as is administration and military capability. Document A suggests that tension within the leadership of the Crusader States was causing military indecisiveness of which the Muslim armies were able to take advantage. Candidates should gain credit for knowing that it was the memory of this incident which caused Guy to attack Saladin's army at Hattin, when advised against doing so by Raymond of Tripoli. This in itself shows a lack of judgement and confidence on Guy's part. Document B again illustrates tensions within the leadership, in this case the quarrel over Guy's marriage to Sybilla – a problem which would continue after the death of Baldwin IV. Candidates might also refer here to the factionalism between the Ibelins and Courtenays. Document C suggests that knight service in the kingdom was recorded, indicating a degree of administrative competence. Knights are owed from all areas of the kingdom, and both sides of the Jordan. The total number of knights, just before the Battle of Hattin, is small given the precarious position of the kingdom – although this was bolstered by the sergeants and other members of the knights' entourages, and, at Hattin, by the garrisons of the towns, although this fatally weakened the towns' defences in the aftermath of the battle.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	52

Document D shows the desperation of the defenders of Jerusalem in 1187. Their initial half-heartedness suggests a lack of fighting spirit in the aftermath of Hattin, but when faced by Saladin with the prospect of certain death should he capture the city, they are inspired to greater aggression. It is Saladin's brutality, though, which inspires this fighting spirit. Document E gives a more positive image of the condition of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. It states that negative perceptions of the defensive capabilities of the kingdom are influenced by hindsight and that the kingdom was relatively strong during the reign of Baldwin IV – although not, necessarily, afterwards. Candidates should be given credit for an awareness of Hamilton's wider arguments about the relative strength of the kingdom of Jerusalem during the reign of Baldwin IV.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	52

2 How is the success of the First Crusade best explained?

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is a set of explanations for the success of the First Crusade rather than, say, a narrative of events or an account of its causes. The issue of recruitment, while relevant, is not central to the argument and candidates should not be sidetracked onto this. The best answers are likely to provide some sort of hierarchy of reasons or emphasise the centrality of one reason over others. Factors which need to be considered include: the military strengths of the Crusaders, in particular their ability to learn new techniques as the Crusade progressed; the importance of strong leadership at crucial times (Bohemond at Antioch, Raymond at Jerusalem); the disunity of the Muslim world at the time; Alexius's (albeit reluctant) help at Constantinople; the piety and devotion of the crusaders; and the importance of luck, not least at Antioch. Candidates might also point out the Crusade overcame a number of obstacles, not least the failure of the first wave, Alexius's reluctance to help, and tension within the leadership.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography, and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. In this essay, the work of Jonathan Riley-Smith, John France and Thomas Asbridge may be cited. 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 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	52

3 How successfully did the settlers in the Latin East meet the challenges they faced in the years 1099–1144? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will need to focus on both the challenges and the responses, with the best candidates reaching a judgement about the *extent* of the settlers' success. Challenges include: leadership problems in the first year of settlement; the need to gain control of the coast; the establishment of Tripoli; the Byzantine Empire and its threat to Antioch; tension between the states; the need to set up an effective administration; the lack of manpower; tensions between natives and settlers; and the growing Muslim threat. Candidates should attempt to judge the effectiveness of the response, considering such factors as: the establishment of the kingdom and royal family of Jerusalem; the conquest of coastal ports; Bohemond of Antioch and his successors and their relations with Byzantium; alliances with Muslim leaders; the use and adaptation of existing administrative structures; the introduction of feudalism; calls for military aid and the west's response.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography, and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates will need to consider the concept of 'success' in the context of early twelfth-century Outremer and consider a variety of threats to the security of the states. The challenges were of course both internal – the need to establish security and an administration, for example, and external- the need to protect against the Muslim threat. Better answers might highlight how the sometimes positive relations with the local Muslim leaders in the early years contrasts with the greater threat posed by the rise of jihad.

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 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	52

4 How far do you agree with the view that the failure of the Second Crusade was caused by 'over-confident leadership and military errors'? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will need to assess the importance of leadership and military competence against other factors which led to the Crusade's failure. Examples of 'over-confident leadership' might include the initial call for a crusade and the disappointing response to it; Conrad's high-handed attitude to Byzantine advice at Constantinople, leading to his defeat; and the decision of the Council of Acre to attack Damascus. In contrast to this, it could be said that Louis took a more realistic view of his prospects of success once he reached Antioch, and decided not to continue with the campaign against Edessa. 'Military errors' might focus on Louis' failures, particularly during the journey across Anatolia, and the mistakes made at Damascus, although here it could be argued that events left the crusaders with little choice but to switch the direction of attack. Other factors which need to be considered include the lack of a clearly defined goal, Manuel's attitude to the Crusade and his attempts to undermine it, the threat of Nur ed-Din, the behaviour of Raymond of Antioch and, if we are to believe St Bernard, the sin of the Crusaders.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography, and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates may be expected to sharpen the argument by evaluating the relative importance of the issues. Candidates will need to weigh up the relative importance of the issues highlighted by the question against other factors in order to come to a balanced judgement. The recent work of Jonathan Phillips might inform their answers here. 'Over-confident leadership' could of course refer to any of the leaders of the Crusade, and to those present at the Council of Acre.

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.