

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/52**

Paper 5b (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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>52</b>

### 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	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.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>52</b>

### 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.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>52</b>

**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.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>52</b>

**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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	52

Nominated topic: The Latin East, 1099–1144, and the rise of Zengi

- 1 (a) How far is the view of the life of western settlers in the east given in Document A corroborated by Document B? [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. The author of B, writing very much from a western perspective, lists the achievements in terms of overcoming hardships, which is very different from the more positive view of the settlements portrayed by A. According to B, the settlers have overcome problems caused by the intolerable heat and disease in the east; they have brought help to Christendom; they have overcome fear of attack, and they have themselves attacked enemy cities. Nevertheless they were 'ready to remain without hesitation'. A corroborates this to the extent that it shows how the settlers have become permanent. However, it places much greater emphasis on their integration and adaptation, in terms of lifestyle, language and even intermarriage. B suggests that only a small number remained; A implies that many more did so, although when one thinks of the possible purpose of A, trying to make the east sound as attractive as possible in the west in order to attract more settlers, it perhaps illustrates the very point which B makes more explicitly.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	52

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that lack of settlers from the west was the greatest problem facing the Crusader States in the period 1099–1144?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all 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. At face value, A paints a positive picture of life in the east. Culture, language, and lifestyle have become integrated and there is no suggestion of a crisis. It tells of how the settlers are joined occasionally by their families, but this is not portrayed as a necessity. The purpose of A, though, may well be to encourage more settlement by painting such a positive picture, which suggests that lack of assistance may well have been a problem, and we know that there were requests for help in this period. The problems created by lack of assistance are highlighted by C, which tells of how King Baldwin encouraged Christians living under Muslim rule to come to live in the Kingdom of Jerusalem to make up the shortfall. B mentions the shortage of numbers, but not as a problem – the military prowess of the settlers is enough to overwhelm their neighbours. Its description of the problems of living in the east might also explain why help was in such short supply. In E, Zengi is portrayed as worried about the potential of the Franks to launch an attack, which suggests that by 1144 they had more resources at their disposal. This could, of course, be stated by this Muslim chronicler out of ignorance of the reality, or to emphasise Zengi's achievements even more.

Other problems are also highlighted by the documents. As stated above, B highlights the difficulties caused by geography: the heat, disease, and the constant fear of attack. D and E outline, respectively, the threat posed by the Byzantines and the rise of jihad under Zengi. It could be argued, though, that both of these were exacerbated by lack of assistance from the west. Antioch was, of course, able to come to a settlement with the Byzantines, but the dispute resumed in the 1140s and the often hostile attitude of the Byzantine Empire to their existence meant that the Crusader States could never be confident of peace on their northern border.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>52</b>

**2 To what extent was Urban II's call for the First Crusade motivated by a desire to strengthen the position of the papacy? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are several arguments which candidates could present to suggest that Urban wished to strengthen the papacy: his desire to improve relations with the Orthodox Church after the schism of 1054; his attempts to consolidate and strengthen the Church in the context of the Gregorian reform movement; his desire to develop the concept of indulgence, already used in Spain; and his desire to extend the 'Peace of God' movement in France by removing those who posed a threat to peace. On the other hand, candidates might consider the genuine desire to help threatened Christians in Byzantium, and a desire to liberate Jerusalem from Muslim control. It could be argued, of course, that all of these reasons would in some way reflect well on the papacy if the crusade were successful.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as well as an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may choose to put this question in a number of contexts: the Gregorian reform movement, the development of the concept of crusading and indulgence in Spain; and relations between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. Candidates might also consider the extent to which these events would have strengthened the papacy, as opposed to, or in addition to, Urban II's own reputation.

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	52

**3 'Poorly planned, and thereafter doomed to failure by poor leadership.' Discuss this view of the Second Crusade. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The essay is in two parts; consideration should first be given to the issue of planning. The early stages of the Crusade are often criticised for poor planning: Louis failed to galvanise support in France, possibly because, as Phillips argues, he was trying to launch the crusade before Pope Eugenius's bull, containing the indulgence, was known. The lack of a clear aim (Edessa or Jerusalem) might also have been problematic. Once Bernard of Clairvaux took charge, however, his charisma resulted in a far more successful recruitment campaign, at Vezelay, and then in England and Germany. He extended the indulgence to include campaigns in Eastern Europe, and Christians in Spain were also granted crusading indulgences. The fact that he had to rein in those who attacked the Jews in the Rhineland suggests, though, that he did not always have control. Leadership issues might focus on the role of Louis VII and his military mistakes as well as his decision to leave Antioch early, for better or worse, Conrad's defeat at Dorylaeum, and the fiasco at Damascus. On the other hand, candidates might consider the role of the Emperor Manuel in inhibiting the Crusade's progress. They might also try to defend Louis's decisions at Antioch in the light of Raymond's obvious personal ambition, and the attack on Damascus can be seen as a sensible option in the circumstances of 1148, if poorly executed. The pressure of a growing Muslim threat might also be considered.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as well as an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might wish to consider the two parts of the question separately or together. The concept of 'planning' a crusade needs some consideration – little is known of the logistics, but Bernard's charisma undoubtedly had a galvanising effect. Whether the crusade might have succeeded with better leadership is hard to say: it is possible to argue that the leadership was as good as it could be in very difficult circumstances.

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	52

- 4 Discuss the view that the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 was a disaster of the Crusader States' own making. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates would be expected to consider the role of Guy of Lusignan, both as king and as military commander at Hattin, the responsibility of Reynald of Chatillon for provoking Saladin's invasion, Raymond of Tripoli and, looking further back, the weaknesses of the kingdom under Baldwin IV and the growth of factionalism. On the other hand it could be argued that Guy did the best he could in difficult circumstances, that Reynald's activities had a degree of rationale behind them, and that under Baldwin IV the kingdom had considerable strengths. The role of Saladin in bringing together the Muslim world is also important to consider, of course, as it could be argued that the long-term weaknesses of the Crusader States, such as geographical isolation and lack of resources, made it impossible to withstand an attack from a unified Muslim army.

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. 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. Candidates could take a number of approaches to this question: they might wish to consider short- and long-term factors, the role of individuals or a more historiographical approach considering, for example, the work of Hamilton in reappraising the reputations of men such as Reynald and Baldwin IV.

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.