



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

---

**HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)**

**9769/52**

Paper 5b Special Subject: The Crusades, 1095–1192

**May/June 2019**

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

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

---

This document consists of **12** 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>To what extent does the evidence in Document A corroborate the description in Document B of the situation in France in the 1090s?</b></p> <p>Both documents agree on the turmoil in Western Europe in the 1090s. In Document A, Urban refers to the ‘private warfare’ of the French nobility and the use of mercenaries by some. Document B also refers to civil war but gives more detail about how conditions, which also include famine and sickness, not mentioned in A, had affected ‘common’ people. People had become subject to ‘heavenly signs and revelations’ and had visions of Jerusalem, and there are also reports of nature being out of order. It could be argued that Document A assumes that people would be open to spiritual reward – indeed the source says that they ‘gave thanks to God’ – but Document B provides evidence of this spiritualism.</p> <p>In terms of difference, Document B refers to a wider range of problems than Document A, which focuses on the barbarity of life and does not mention visions and spiritual experiences, which might of course make the people open to its message. Document A is more focused on the rewards the Pope is offering to the people and referring to the quality of their life to strengthen his argument.</p> <p>In terms of provenance, one would expect Urban’s speech to focus on the barbarity of life to highlight the opportunity he is giving the people through the offer of a plenary indulgence. Document B, on the other hand, although written by a German rather than a French monk, is more likely to show understanding of the reality of life for people as he may well have encountered them, or reports of them, on his journey in 1101.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the First Crusaders were motivated mainly by religious devotion? 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>Document A is Urban’s speech at Clermont, in which he offers a plenary indulgence to participants in the First Crusade. While this does not explicitly state that religious devotion was a motivating factor, we may infer that it was, offering as it does ‘eternal reward’. In Document B, religious devotion takes a different form; it speaks of the ‘signs and revelations’ received by some and describes some of the miracles that are supposed to have occurred. The author, a German monk who participated in a later wave, is likely to have heard of some of this first-hand. Document C speaks of religious fanaticism, although whether this equates to devotion could be debated, describing as it does the attacks on Jewish communities in Germany. Here religious motivation is a wholly negative force, although answers recognising that the Church sheltered some of the victims ought to be credited. Document D downplays the religious aspect of the Crusade, but it does refer to Peter’s ‘pilgrimage.’ The emphasis is much more on the Crusade as a powerful and destructive force, though this is to be expected from the daughter of Alexius, who came to mistrust the Crusaders and whose people suffered at their hands.</p> <p>Other motivating factors are also present in the documents: in Document A, Urban refers to the warlike nature of the French and his desire to divert this destructive force to more constructive use. He also refers to the need to aid fellow Christians in Byzantium. Document B refers to the economic and social deprivation which may have motivated some. Answers which develop this explanation with knowledge of the 1090s should be given credit. Study of Document C could give rise to a discussion as to whether the attacks on Jews were motivated by religious fervour or by the desire for economic gain. In Document D, Anna Comnena portrays the Crusade as an attempt by Peter the Hermit to exact revenge for his bad treatment at the hands of the Turks on an earlier pilgrimage; the extent to which this amounts to religious devotion could be discussed. Document E suggests that the economic and social conditions in north-western Europe were a strong motivating factor to emigrate.</p> <p>There is no set answer to this question and, ultimately, answers might conclude that a variety of motivations could have co-existed within the crusading host, and even within each individual crusader.</p>	20

## Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>How is the survival of the Crusader States in the period 1099–1144 best explained?</b></p> <p>AO1 – Answers should consider the following: the Templars and Hospitallers providing a dedicated military defence force for the Crusader States; the building of castles; victory in a number of key battles, the wealth of the Orders in funding defence; the divisions within the Muslim world; alliances with Muslim states; and the skill of the leaders, particularly the Kings of Jerusalem.</p> <p>AO2 – Answers could discuss: the strength of the Orders as a means of defence and the support network which they created, but also their increasing unpopularity; the complexity of the alliances created with the Muslim world, and the move from co-operation in the early years to more confrontation in later years; the skills and actions of the leaders of Antioch, Edessa and Jerusalem, taking advantage of Muslim weakness and division, but also the gradual growth of unity in the Muslim world under Zengi so that by the end of the period, the position of the Crusader States was increasingly precarious.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>‘The failure of the Second Crusade was a failure of leadership.’ Discuss.</b></p> <p>AO1 – Answers may consider the leadership of some key figures: Bernard of Clairvaux as the initiator of the Crusade, Louis VII, Conrad of Germany, Raymond of Antioch, Baldwin III of Jerusalem, even, arguably, Eleanor of Aquitaine.</p> <p>AO2 – Answers may choose to look at the leadership of some key individuals, but also how their collective failure led to defeat. They should also look at alternative explanations: the lack of a clear aim, the lack of Byzantine support, and the greater unity of the Muslim world by the 1140s. It could be argued that most or all of these still amounted to a failure of leadership. Answers might also consider Bernard’s view of the failure as God’s judgement.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p data-bbox="316 248 1246 313"><b>To what extent was the Third Crusade a personal conflict between Richard I and Saladin?</b></p> <p data-bbox="316 349 1326 548">AO1 – Answers might consider the view of the Crusade as a personal battle between the two men – certainly they seem to dominate popular portrayals of the Crusade, and many of the sources, being biographical, tend to lend themselves to this portrayal. Answers might, therefore, look at the key aspects of the campaigns which involved the two men: Acre, Arsuf, the two marches on Jerusalem, and the diplomatic exchanges between the two men.</p> <p data-bbox="316 584 1310 784">AO2 – Answers should balance the role of the two men against other powerful factors which affected the outcome of the Crusade: the role of Frederick Barbarossa and the impact of his death; Phillip Augustus; the role of other leaders on both the Christian and Muslim side; and, the strategic, political and logistical difficulties which both men faced, and which ultimately made it impossible for Richard to maintain his grip on the Holy Land.</p>	30