



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY**9769/52**

Paper 5b The Crusades, 1195–1192

October/November 2020

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 October/November 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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>How far are the divisions amongst the leading men and women in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, as depicted in Document A, corroborated by Document C?</p> <p>In A we are told that the illness of Baldwin has led to the appointment of Guy as regent. There is support for Guy from some of the nobility – some out of loyalty to the king, but some out of self-interest and the possibility of self-advancement, although it appears that the rejection of his appointment by others is on the grounds that he is not capable or qualified.</p> <p>In C, Guy is now rejected as a leader and seen as incompetent by nearly all. Sybil is to be crowned queen to prevent Guy achieving power, which is a new development. Sybil at least is firm in her support for Guy, even though he seems to have had very little support from anyone else. She outwits the nobility and chooses Guy as her husband and therefore as king, suggesting they have little influence over events, but the approach of Saladin may have some impact on these events – there is an implication that this hastens her decision so that the kingdom will have strong military leadership and that the nobility are ‘astonished and amazed’ but in the circumstances not necessarily angry.</p>	10
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Guy of Lusignan was an unpopular and incompetent leader? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Evidence that he was unpopular and incompetent:</p> <p>A: Some nobility unhappy at his appointment as regent as they saw him as incompetent. But William of Tyre was critical of Guy and his faction and writes with a view to explaining the reasons for the descent of the kingdom into chaos by the 1180s.</p> <p>B: Baldwin has lost confidence in Guy as a leader by 1184. Guy defies the king by failing to appear when summoned.</p> <p>C: Astonishment from many that Sybil chose Guy as her husband and therefore king.</p> <p>D: Evidence that Guy was an incompetent military leader, leaving behind his supplies of food and water – also evidence that he was easily swayed in his opinions.</p> <p>Evidence that he was not unpopular and incompetent:</p> <p>A: Some nobility happy at his appointment as regent as they saw this as a chance for them to rise in influence on his coattails. So he may be popular but not necessarily competent.</p> <p>B: Some evidence of support for Guy within Ascalon. Again, he may be popular but not necessarily competent.</p> <p>C: Clearly Guy is popular with Sybil. Implication that he was chosen by her (and possibly supported in this by some of the nobility) because of the threat of Saladin, suggesting competence too – but this is dubious as evidence, coming from his wife.</p> <p>E: Tyerman suggests Guy was influenced by his earlier much-criticised decision to shadow but not attack Saladin’s army in 1183, and by his mistrust of advice from political enemies.</p>	20

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Was the success of the First Crusade more the result of Christian unity or Muslim disunity?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should consider the following: the varying unity of the first crusaders – the People’s Crusade and the main wave of the crusade, which although frequently disunited achieved unity at crucial moments; and the disunity of the Muslims, between Turks and Arabs, and between Sunnis and Shi’ites over Jerusalem.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates could discuss: the degree of unity amongst the People’s Crusade – although this does not help to explain the crusade’s ultimate success as the campaign failed – and the degree of unity of the main wave of the crusade, which travels separately as far as Constantinople, achieves a degree of unity there but then suffers from the desertion of Baldwin to Edessa, Bohemond’s capture of Antioch, and divisions over strategy in early 1099 between Raymond and Godfrey. Divisions with Byzantium could also be brought in here.</p> <p>On the other hand, it could be argued that at crucial moments, at Antioch and then outside Jerusalem, the crusaders do achieve unity. The Muslim world was of course disunited and this showed in the performance of Kerbogah’s army outside Antioch and the failure to provide adequate defence for Jerusalem. Better answers might point out the ways in which the crusaders exploited Muslim division in their diplomatic advances to the Egyptians in 1098.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>How secure was the Kingdom of Jerusalem by 1144?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should consider security in a number of ways – military, dynastic, administrative and possibly from the point of view of assimilation.</p> <p>AO2 – Aspects of security include: the military strengths of the kingdom, castle building, the contribution of the military orders, relative dynastic security under the early kings, administrative effectiveness and flexibility and the evidence of cultural and administrative assimilation.</p> <p>On the other hand the Muslim threat was growing under Zengi, and Edessa fell in 1144; the kingdom had suffered a number of defeats such as the Field of Blood (1119); the number of westerners was still relatively small and appeals for more settlers were constantly going out, and there had been some dynastic insecurity under Fulk and Melisende and Baldwin III himself was childless. Candidates might consider that mere survival by 1144 was something of a triumph</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Assess the role of Louis VII in the preparations for, and course of, the Second Crusade.</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should consider Louis' role in the initiation and recruitment of the crusade in France, the journey to the East, relations with Byzantium, the delay at Antioch and the siege of Damascus.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates would be expected to consider the role of Louis VII at various stages of the crusade. Recruitment proved difficult in the early months – though this might not be the fault of Louis alone. His decision to split his army at Attalia proved flawed although it could be argued that he had little choice given Manuel's obstructive behaviour, which could also be explored. The affair between Raymond and Eleanor hastened Louis' departure from Antioch which might have contributed to the failure, and siege of Damascus was disastrously managed. The best answers will consider the role of Louis in the light of the other pressures which were on him.</p>	30