



**Cambridge Assessment International Education**  
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/52**

Paper 5b The Crusades, 1095–1192

**May/June 2018**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Published**

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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

---

This document consists of **13** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Special Subject: Source-based Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

- (a) This question is designed 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.
- (b) Examiners will 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.
- (c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will 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 3: 8–10 marks**

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 marks**

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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 1: 1–3 marks**

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.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Question (b)****Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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.

**Band 3: 11–15 marks**

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 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.

**Band 2: 6–10 marks**

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 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.

**Band 1: 1–5 marks**

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 be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Special Subject: Essay Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 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 4 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 5: 25–30 marks**

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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.

**Band 4: 19–24 marks**

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.

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 marks**

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 or reference to relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

**Band 2: 7–12 marks**

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 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.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 1: 1–6 marks**

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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.



## Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>How far does the account in Document D corroborate Louis VII's account of his experiences in the Second Crusade given in Document C?</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Differences - when considering the differences between Document C and Document D, candidates may say that: the prosperous journey is mentioned in Document C, but not in Document D; military defeat of the Emperor is not mentioned in Document D; lack of money is not mentioned in Document D; and, the affair regarding his wife, Queen Eleanor, is not mentioned in Document C.</p> <p>Similarities: when considering the similarities between Document C and Document D, candidates may refer to: the religious devotion felt in crusade being common to both documents; the problems with rulers in situ being mentioned in both; and, both documents saying that initially things were better than they became.</p> <p>Candidates may also say that the documents describe different stages of the Second Crusade and offer different nature of evidence. Document C was written during the Crusade while Document D was looking back.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that religious devotion was the main motive for the Second Crusade? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>On the one hand, there is evidence that religious devotion was not the main motive for the Second Crusade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document A places religious devotion at the heart of the crusade: Bernard sees it entirely in these terms, but the events of the crusade itself suggest that it was not always the motivating factor.</li> <li>• Document B suggests some reasons why people might go on the crusade: the idea of avenging the dishonour done to God; the chivalric idea of the crusade as a tournament.</li> <li>• In Document C, Louis suggests that, although he is motivated by religious devotion, and sees the crusade as a devotional exercise, the Emperor Manuel is deceitful, and this is a cause of failure, as are Louis' own military shortcomings.</li> <li>• Document D is highly critical of Raymond and Eleanor, and clearly their lack of religious devotion was damaging to the crusade. William of Tyre, though, is writing in the 1170s and 1180s, and sees events through the prism of the growing weakness of the Christian presence in the East.</li> <li>• Document E reflects the contemporary view that it was indeed lack of devotion that caused the failure of the crusade.</li> </ul> <p>On the other hand, there is evidence that religious devotion was the main motive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bernard, in Document A, sees it as the main motivating factor.</li> <li>• Document B speaks of the chance of 'paradise' for those who go on the crusade.</li> <li>• Louis displays religious devotion throughout, and this is reflected in Document C and Document D.</li> </ul> <p>It appears that in the end, although religious devotion was present in the crusaders, it was not strong enough to overcome the difficulties and external pressures which the crusade faced.</p>	20

## Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Assess the contribution of Bohemond of Taranto (Antioch) to the success of the First Crusade.</b></p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should present a sharp response to the question, displaying accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Knowledge of the First Crusade is of course essential here, and in particular: the career of Bohemond; his background as a southern Italian Norman adventurer who had already been a thorn in the side of the Byzantine Empire; his involvement in the campaign of the First Crusade; and, his capture of Antioch.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates should demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, and present a clear, focused and analytical explanation which weighs up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, to arrive at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.</p> <p>Candidates may offer the following as evidence of Bohemond’s assistance on the First Crusade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• his military involvement with a large contingent of southern Italian troops.</li> <li>• his accommodation with Alexius, despite his history of aggression against the Byzantine Empire.</li> <li>• his military leadership, especially at Antioch.</li> </ul> <p>On the other hand, they may could argue that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bohemond’s capture of Antioch and refusal to continue the crusade put the crusade at considerable risk.</li> <li>• He caused tension at Constantinople over Alexius’s insistence on an oath.</li> <li>• Other factors were important, such as: the leadership of others (Raymond and Godfrey, in particular); lack of Muslim unity; help from Byzantium; and, luck.</li> </ul>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>How complete was the control exercised by the rulers of the Crusader States over their territories in the years 1099–1144?</b></p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. They may focus on Jerusalem and possibly Antioch. Knowledge of the reigns of Baldwin I and II, Fulk, Melisende and Baldwin III are important here, as well as of the rulers of Antioch, Tripoli and Edessa, although candidates could focus on Jerusalem.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates should demonstrate an understanding and awareness of the historical concepts, and present a clear, focused and analytical explanation which weighs up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, to arrive at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance their response as will an ability to engage with controversy.</p> <p>Candidates should describe the challenges that the Crusader States faced in exerting control, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need to establish control of ports for supply</li> <li>• continuing disputes with Byzantium over Antioch</li> <li>• the need to deal with the Muslim threat, which increased especially after the Battle of the Field of Blood (1119)</li> <li>• administration of a disparate population</li> <li>• court intrigue, especially under Fulk and Melisende.</li> </ul> <p>On the other hand, candidates could say that they managed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintain control and survive</li> <li>• establish a workable administration</li> <li>• stave off the Muslim threat, at least in the short term</li> <li>• maintain a stability of succession in Jerusalem.</li> </ul>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>‘The Kingdom of Jerusalem was already fatally weakened before the Battle of Hattin (1187).’ Discuss.</b></p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. They should describe the events in the kingdom in the period up to 1187, especially the reign of Baldwin IV, and the period of instability after his death in 1185.</p> <p>AO2 - Candidates should demonstrate an understanding and awareness of the historical concepts, and a present clear, focused and analytical explanation which weighs up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, to arrive at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.</p> <p>Candidates’ discussion of weakness could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the divisions before and during the reign of Baldwin IV: Courtenays, Ibelins and court faction.</li> <li>• the destabilising activities of Reynald of Chatillon.</li> <li>• Guy of Lusignan’s weak leadership, leading to defeat at Hattin.</li> <li>• the rise of Saladin and increasing Muslim unity.</li> </ul> <p>On the other hand, candidates could argue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baldwin IV was strong enough to hold the kingdom together, and to keep Saladin at bay.</li> <li>• The idea of clear-cut factions is an over-simplification of the situation, although there was undoubted instability in the leadership, especially after 1185.</li> <li>• The unity of the Muslim world under Saladin was to some extent an illusion, as is shown by its unravelling during the Third Crusade.</li> <li>• Baldwin argues that during these years trade was flourishing and religious life thriving in the kingdom.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will also need to consider the effects of the Battle itself, with a weakened kingdom falling rapidly to Saladin’s forces, until the fall of Jerusalem itself in October.</p>	30