



# **Examiners' Report** **June 2024**

**GCE History 9HI0 1A**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2024

Publications Code 9HI0\_1A\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this year's A Level paper 1A, which deals with the crusades: c1095-1204. This year's paper proved to be accessible and well received by candidates who produced some excellent responses. Answers were broadly in line with the indicative content in the mark scheme, but some candidates offered information and analysis beyond that which we anticipated. In section C the extracts offered no difficulties for the majority of candidates and provided an accessible interpretative framework.

The advice offered to centres and candidates remains unchanged from last year.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity/ difference and significance with a time frame of not less than ten years. Section B offers a further choice of essays using an extended time frame of not less than one third of that offered by the specification as a whole. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence offered by both the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

## Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to consider how far they agree that castle building was the most important feature of Baldwin I's consolidation of crusader territory in the years 1100-18.

This was the more popular question in section A of the paper and candidates found it accessible and straight forward, being able to offer some material on the defensive requirements of the crusader states and the importance of castles therein. Although the main focus was rightly on the defensive role of castles quite a few candidates explored the role of castles as centres of administration, as well as their role in helping to establish a European, feudal polity.

At the top end candidates were able to grasp the precarity of the newly conquered territories and understood consolidation in terms of defence and the development of a dominant Christian power. A few candidates, after considering castle building, developed a compelling argument about the primacy of Jerusalem providing a centre of political and religious authority without which consolidation would have been more difficult. There was also a very good grasp of the importance of seaports and trade with about half the candidates making the case that this was more important than castle building in the consolidation of the crusader territories.

The majority of candidates were able to develop an answer round the given factor of castle building and weigh this against other factors. Candidates could generally name at least one important castle and offer some understanding of the difficulties in pegging back the Muslim attacks. On the whole this question was well answered.

Less successful candidates tended to assert the importance of castle building without providing evidence, and turned the answer onto areas they were more familiar with such as seaports. Some candidates struggled with the time frame and brought in material from the reign of Baldwin II. In particular, quite a few candidates referred to the role of the military orders and the threat of Nur al-Din.

The consolidation of crusader territory was essential to the survival and establishment of the crusader states from 1100-18. An important part of this was the building of castles as they provided protection from the Turks. However, while important castles were not as ~~ever~~ significant as seaports and the dynamic leadership Baldwin I. It is evident that all of these factors played a role and led to a more secure overland, but you can not ignore the context of the Muslim response at the time.

When the Crusaders took Jerusalem in 1099, they began to set up a group of crusader states. The problem they faced was that they had no natural boundaries to the East, leaving them vulnerable to attack; attempts to take Aleppo and Damascus had been unsuccessful and this removed any chance of protection. The Crusaders were also left with a small force of 300 knights in Jerusalem and 700 knights in Antioch, further showing their vulnerability to the Turks. Even villages showed a need for fortification and defence as archaeological research by Ellenblum on villages such as Ramat in Jerusalem showed how they would always be fortified, stay away from the Eastern boundary with Galilee, and stay near indigenous Christian settlements. It was ~~obvious~~ clear that a defensive strategy was required against the Turks as they ~~would~~ could not risk a battle that would diminish their forces any further. The separate states all had castles that they relied on which provided much needed defence from the Turks. Edessa was a large state with a very small

population and so the castle of Turbessel was vital to its survival. Antioch was under constant Byzantine threat especially at the port of Latakia so the castles of Margat and Soan were needed. In Tripoli, the castles of Giblet and Mount Pilgrim were very important. In Jerusalem there was Kerak. All these castles were essential to the consolidation of the crusader states.

However, seaports proved to be much more important as they provided the crusader states with help from outside. When the crusaders first set up the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the only port in Jerusalem was Jaffa and its importance was clear to see. In 1107, Caesarea was taken with the help of the <sup>Genoese</sup> ~~Venetians~~ and they were given a quarter of the city. In ~~1107~~ 1102, Acre was taken. In 1104, Tyre was taken with the help of Venetians who were given a quarter of the city. These seaports provided a lot to the crusader states; they provided trade with Byzantium, the Latin West and Egypt. They also brought in population, a problem that Outremer had been having since its establishment as well as the actual materials that were needed to build the castles. They helped establish crusader dominance in the Mediterranean over the Turks with the help of the Genoese. It is clear that seaports were more important than castles for consolidation of crusader territories.

Furthermore, what was most important in the consolidation of the crusader states was Baldwin I himself. His dynamic leadership was the fundamental reason for the establishment and survival of the

crusader states. when he became king, he instantly established the primacy of Jerusalem in Outremer and set up a feudal system called palatinates. he effectively used this when deploying Tancred of Hauteville to shore up the Eastern border with Galilee. Baldwin is also the one who brought in the help of the various Italian states to help with the capture of seaports and offered them quarters of the cities to incentivise them. He to oversee the building of all castles and the fortification of old ones. Additionally, he also went North many times to help in Antioch. It is clear that all success from castles and seaports in terms of consolidation was due to Baldwin's leadership.

The Muslim response can not be ignored in the context of this success in Outremer as fundamental divisions allowed the crusaders breathing room. There were still divisions between the Sunni and Shia that meant they could not unite against the crusaders. There ~~was~~ still political fragmentation after 1094 which Ibn Taghribirdi referred to as "the year of the deaths of caliphs and commanders." It was also apparent that there was no desire for response, as the Damascene scholar Al-Sulami would preach jihad to a small crowd in 1205. This fragmentation demonstrates the division in the Muslim world and how it could not properly respond to the crusaders.

In conclusion, while it is clear that castles were important for consolidation of the crusader states, their importance was or less than that of seaports which provided population and wealth erode. However, both of these factors

are not as essential to the consolidation of Outremer as Baldwin I's dynamic leadership which allowed for the building of castles and the capturing of seaports. On the other hand, the lack of Muslim response can not be ignored as the fragmentation in the Muslim world did allow the crusaders a lot of freedom to establish the various states.



This is a clip from a response at the top of level 4. The candidate offers some good analysis of the defensive value of castles and their importance in consolidation. There is a range of other factors that contributed to consolidation, including Muslim divisions, the dynamic rule of Baldwin himself and the capture of seaports. There is some discussion and an evaluative conclusion. Clearly this response meets the level 4 descriptor of establishing the criteria by which the question can be judged.

It falls short of the sustained analysis required at level 5 but is a secure level 4 response.



This question asks candidates to assess the importance of castle building in the consolidation of crusader territory. So, candidates need to know something about both castles and the role they played in consolidation. The mark scheme looks for candidates deploying 'the criteria by which a judgement is reached', and this means that candidates should show how building castles led to one aspect of consolidation such as the defence of seaports, or the defence of a particular county.

It is not enough to say that Baldwin I built castles and fortified towns, so he must have thought it important. While this is true, it is much better to nail it down with a specific link to consolidation. Unless we think about making our argument concrete we fall into the trap of simply offering good information on a range of factors without getting to grips with how important each of them is.

## Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider how accurate it is to say that Saladin's power, in the years 1169-87, came mainly from his control of Egypt. There were some very good answers to this question. Clearly students have enjoyed learning about this topic. The majority of candidates had good knowledge concerning Saladin's life and how he rose to power.

At the top end candidates understood how vital control of Egypt was in the balance of power between Christian and Muslim forces. Saladin was shown to have carefully cultivated his power over Egypt after he became vizier, and most suggested that Saladin clearly understood how to use Egypt as the launch pad for his power grab after Nur al-Din's death. Beyond Saladin's base in Egypt candidates tended to look at his careful acquisition of Damascus and other cities that gave him supremacy over Syria, as well as his role as leader of jihad. A few candidates ventured to explore Saladin's shrewd diplomacy and subtle political skills as well as his obvious military prowess.

A number of candidates showed good knowledge of Saladin and Egypt but were unable to weigh his control of Egypt against other sources of his power, and tended to assert, for example, that Saladin's control of Egypt led to his victory at Hattin, or his takeover of Syria.

Less successful candidates tended to describe particular aspects of Saladin's life and character.

It is largely true that Saladin's power 1169-87 came mainly from his ~~control~~ control of Egypt, Saladin's consolidation of power in Egypt gave him the sufficient resources of wealth to carry out his subjugation of Syria and ideologically unite the Muslim world. With this being said it is also important to consider how Saladin's power grew from other factors such as the power of Nur-al-Din, his own political and military skill and the internal weaknesses of ~~the~~ Ayyubids and his rivals.

It is largely true to say that Saladin's power grew from his control of Egypt. Saladin's uncle Shirkuh was ordered to ~~subjugate~~ subjugate Syria on behalf of his overlord Nur al-Din, in his bid for power in Egypt with Almaric. Shirkuh took control of Egypt in 1169 and had expelled the vizier Shawar. If Nur al-Din had not obligated Shirkuh to go to Egypt with Saladin, it is possible that Saladin would never have had the opportunity to develop his power. When Shirkuh died, Saladin successfully consolidated his control ~~to~~ over Egypt, being in full control by 1174. Saladin

successfully crushed a palace coup and placed his family in positions of power to ensure a loyal power base. Most importantly Saladin replaced the Fatimid caliphate and put the Sunni Caliph's name in the Friday Prayers. This decision, shows Saladin's excellent political skill in uniting the Muslim world ideologically by extending Sunni Muslim control, Saladin thus established the foundations of his Sunni Ayubbid Dynasty in Egypt, this was key to his success and power 1169-87 since ~~Egypt~~ firstly without Egypt's vast resources of wealth it is unlikely he would have been able to subjugate Syria under his control so successfully. Secondly consolidation of power in Egypt was fundamental to Saladin's power as it established the Sunni Primacy in uniting the Muslim world, which was a key factor to his later success in consolidating power in Syria and without which Sunni - Fatimid Muslim divisions would likely have lessened his power. In this way control over Egypt can be seen as the crucial reason for Saladin's power from 1169-74, it gave him the foundations on which he could extend his power ideologically and geographically in Syria.

On the other hand it can also be argued that Saladin's ~~own~~ predecessor Nur-al-Din set the foundations from which Saladin built his power 1169-87. Nur al-Din united the Muslim world both geographically and ideologically under the

(Section A continued)

banner of jihad, ~~Nur al-Din~~ <sup>establishing</sup> established control of Aleppo and Damascus for the first time under one Muslim ruler. It can be argued that without these foundations that Nur al-Din built Saladin would never have had the extent of power he had as his power in both Egypt and Syria stemmed from him, building the ideological framework of jihad and sending him to Egypt where he was able to establish control. However, while this is true, Saladin's defiance of Nur al-Din refusing to give him aid or send the required annual payment from Egypt shows that Saladin's power predominantly stemmed from Egypt. Saladin's refusal risked civil war, avoided only by Nur al-Din's death and his ability to do this came from the magnitude of power he established in Egypt which was not due to Nur al-Din, in Syria, thus limiting the influence of Nur al-Din ~~of~~ on Saladin's power.

~~This~~ Saladin's <sup>political aptitude and</sup> consolidation of Muslim Syria both geographically and ideologically is another fundamental reason for his power 1169-87. Saladin's political skill ensured by 1187 he controlled Aleppo, Mosul, Damascus and ~~Egypt~~ Egypt. Firstly Saladin married Nur al-Din's widow and swiftly took up Nur al-Din's mantle following the death of his son al-Salih showing his political foresight to take initiative to legitimise his power. ~~Saladin went a~~

Secondly Saladin built upon the ideological framework of jihad cultivating himself as the 'Defender of Sunni Orthodoxy and Islam'. By uniting the Muslim world ideologically and through political aptitude Saladin took control of Damascus and Aleppo without spilling Muslim blood. Damascus was key to establishing power as an intellectual centre for propaganda to develop jihad. Saladin took control of ~~Aleppo~~ Mosul through negotiation with the city's ruler, showing political skill. Saladin not only ~~conquered~~ established conquest of Muslim Syria to establish power but also consolidated his power, showing his political excellence. For example he was known for his generous nature and built schools hospitals and madrassas making him popular with his people ensuring consolidation of power. In this way Saladin's excellent political skill established his power ~~at~~ over Muslim Syria both ideologically and geographically. Yet ~~it~~ without the economic resources of Egypt Saladin would have likely been less successful and his ~~top~~ replacement of the Sunni caliph in Egypt was crucial to uniting the Muslim world ideologically to thus extend ideological control of Egypt.

Furthermore Saladin's own personal ambition can be said to have driven the establishment of his power 1169-87. His lack of focus on jihad ~~to~~ ~~leads to~~ means that his seldom attacks on Frankish territory in the early 1180s before his illness in 1185 being described as aly

opportunistic frays designed to inflict damage and minimum risk and cost to justify his ongoing attacks in Muslim Syria. This is certainly true and Saladin did not launch his first major attack on the Franks till 1177, making his own personal ambition ~~and~~ for power ~~at~~ over ~~the~~ Muslim Syria and lack of focus on jihad key to establishing his control.

Finally the internal weakness of <sup>Outremer and</sup> the kingdom of Jerusalem can also be said as key to Saladin's power from 1169-82. The ~~internal~~ weakening of royal authority in this period ~~is~~ and internal divisions and factions in Jerusalem with the accession of the 'leper' king Baldwin IV <sup>thus</sup> weakened Outremer's defence and allowed Saladin to consolidate his power in Syria and Egypt. ~~the~~ The weakness of the 'leper' king Baldwin IV developed factions and ~~stability~~ rivalry in Jerusalem which directed resources internally rather than externally to defence, allowing Saladin to consolidate Syria and take crusader territory. For example his destruction of the aggressive Jacobs Fort in 1179. Raymond of Tripoli's coup in 1180 diverted resources internally and ~~the~~ Guy Lusignan's removal and defiance of Baldwin IV in going to Ascalon when Saladin attacked ~~the~~ Kerak castle in 1183 not only weakened Frankish defences ~~and~~ allowing Saladin to consolidate.

power but also almost risked ~~the~~ civil war. ~~But~~ Guy's own defensive policy allowed Saladin's power to grow and he was heavily criticised of missing the golden opportunity to destroy Saladin in the early 1180s. ~~when he was weak.~~ Finally Outremer was fundamentally weakened by a lack of western aid for defence allowing Saladin's power to grow. The chronic lack of manpower with only 700 knights in Jerusalem was weakened by decreasing western aid. For example Patriarch Heraclius. Heraclius had failed to ~~go~~ gain aid from Richard I and Philip II in 1183 instead offending them by and deterring them by his opulent dress. Therefore allowing Saladin to gain power in Syria by the weakness of opposition in the Franks.

In conclusion it is largely true that Saladin's power came from Egypt 1169-82. Saladin's consolidation of Egypt gave him the economic might to subjugate control over Muslim Syria and his removal of the Fatimid caliph gave ideological unity to the Muslim world which was crucial for his later power in Syria. While the framework of jihad built by Nur al-Din, ~~and~~ his own political skill in uniting Muslim Syria geographically ~~and ideologically~~ was also ~~and~~ ideologically, his personal ambition and weakness of the Franks in Outremer was significant to his power, without the economic might and quick

consolidation of power in Egypt it is unlikely Saladin would have gone on to later consolidate power so successfully. With the <sup>crucial</sup> economic might of Egypt, manpower of the Turkish heartlands and ~~strong~~ intellectual might of Damascus Saladin ~~stop~~ consolidated power and his Ayubbid Sunni Dynasty by 1187 from ~~then~~ <sup>which</sup> he went on to defeat the Franks at Hattin and conquer Jerusalem.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There were some excellent responses to this question, and this is a good example of a top level 5 answer.

The candidate offers a sophisticated analysis of the potential pitfalls Saladin avoided by uniting the Muslims under a Sunni leadership. The candidate shows exactly why Egypt was crucial to Saladin's power and keeps returning to it throughout the essay. A good range of explanations for Saladin's power are discussed with detailed evidence and analysis. The question is answered in full, and with an impressive grasp of the issues.

This response was awarded level 5, 20 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Maintaining focus on the demands of the question is essential. When planning an answer, it is useful to think how each section of evidence relates to the focus of the question. This candidate has a relentless focus on the question, and this leads to a good discussion and evaluation of key points. Try to remember the three buzz words that make a good answer possible: evidence, discussion, judgement.

It cannot be argued that at the peak of his political and military career, Saladin held significant power. What can be debated however was the primary source of this power; was it because of his base in Egypt, his ability to unite the Muslim world, his political savvy or simply the death of Nur ad-Din that allowed for him to grow his power. In this essay we will look over these points and analyse their significance in Saladin's power base.

Firstly, Saladin's control of Egypt was extremely important to his rise in power. After he gained Egypt under Nur ad-Din he was able to take quick control of the region, after the death of the local Caliph he installed a relative into power and replaced much of the governing body with family members. Saladin also benefited from taxes, for example when Nur ad-Din asked for support to fight the Franks, Saladin sent lavish gifts.

instead of paying an annual tribute to help maintain rapport with the locals. This allowed for him to gain the support of the locals and use Egypt's vast wealth for himself to increase his powerbase for example setting up his own military unit loyal solely to him. Saladin also used Egypt's distance from Nur ad-Din's other interests to his advantage, he would constantly avoid Nur ad-Din for fear that he would order him to return to Syria. This meant that Saladin could hold onto his Egyptian powerbase while Nur ad-Din was distracted elsewhere. Saladin could also use Egypt's wealth and manpower later on in his career when fighting the Franks, his control of Egypt provided the Muslims with a significant numbers advantage as can be seen at the battle of Hattin where Saladin's Knights numbered 12,000 to the Franks 1,200.

Another massive source of power for Saladin was his ability to unite the Muslim world. Saladin did this by taking up the role as leader of Jihad (the Muslim version

of a crusade, translated directly as 'struggle'. This new title as the leader of Jihad meant that he would gain support and respect and loyalty. This is also what played into Saladin's ability to ~~control~~ wield far greater numbers than the Franks which led to his victory at Hattin in 1087 and the fall of Jerusalem later that year.

Another source of power for Saladin was his political savviness. This can be seen when he placed many of his family members into positions of power in Egypt which is ultimately what gave him control over the region allowing for him to utilise its resources. Saladin also showed his political ability elsewhere with his peaceful subjugation of Aleppo through negotiations with its ruler and his securing of control of Damascus through the marriage of Nur ad-Din's widow.

It can also be argued that the majority of Saladin's power comes from the death of Nur ad-Din in the <sup>early</sup> 1170s. This is because

it was Saladin's ability to quickly act on the power vacuum created by the death of Nur ad-Din. If Nur ad-Din had not died when he did, he could have potentially removed him from power in Egypt and Saladin would never been able to take the role of the leader of Jihad, as Nur ad-Din held it.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a clip from a good level 4 response. There is clarity, some good detail, a bit of discussion and it is well organised. This candidate has planned and executed a very good answer and was awarded level 4, 16.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

When a question asks you to consider which cause is the most important, in this case it is what caused Saladin's power, it is important to plan your response. Deal with the given factor first, and in this case, it is Egypt, and then look at other factors that gave Saladin power. This is key to getting a mark at level 4 because it means there is a basis to weigh the importance of a number of factors and make a clear judgement.

### Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates how accurate it is to say that the main duty of knights, in the years 1095-1192, continued to be the protection of pilgrims. This proved to be the more challenging question in section B, however, this is generally the case with change and continuity questions.

Successful candidates were able to frame their answers within the continuing importance of Jerusalem as the destination of pilgrims and understood that popes had included the need to protect pilgrims as part of their crusading mission to take and defend the city. At this level candidates drew on a continuity from pope Urban's speech at Clermont, through the development of the military orders to the Treaty of Jaffa in 1192. The feudal duty of knights to serve their lords in battle was another thread used to exemplify continuity. Change was exemplified with reference to chivalric values widening the feudal duty of knights to include more spiritual goals, and the development of the military orders as warrior monks, and their role in manning castles and protecting trade routes.

Less successful candidates struggled with change and continuity and the word 'duty' in the question. This led to candidates losing sight of the time frame as a whole and providing evidence from different periods. Typically, this might mean looking at the First Crusade, the rise of Muslim power, and possibly the Third Crusade. The focus of the question was often shifted from change and continuity to looking for similarities and differences. Less successful candidates also took duty to mean what motivated knights to go on crusade. This led to the description of evidence marginally relevant to the focus of the question, such as indulgences and the acquisition of wealth.

It could be argued that the main duty of knights in the years 1095 to 1192 was to ensure the protection of pilgrims. However other factors such as the upkeep of chivalric values and the increased reliance on the military orders could be seen as other reasons. I believe the factor that has the most importance will be the one that showed the most importance to knights over a long period of time.

The factor of somewhat significant to knightly duties between 1095 and

1192 as the protection of Pilgrims. In the First Crusade, Jerusalem was characterized as the backdrop to the death and resurrection of Christ, as well as the place of significant holy sites such as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It had been the chosen destination for pilgrims since the tradition was begun by ~~Augusta~~ ~~mother~~ in the 6th century, once had grown in popularity, seen by the 7,000 German pilgrims that went on Crusade in the 1070's. However by the 1090's, loss of control of Asia Minor by the Byzantines, increased Muslim attacks on pilgrims as well as increased taxes for them had led to had resulted in them being included in the reasons for the Crusade. This was highlighted by both the Templars and the Hospitallers having specific aims of protection and care towards the pilgrims, therefore showing their

importance to knightly duties. This was developed by the Second Crusade in 1149, as Bernard of Clairvaux, an influential preacher, stated in a letter the importance of protection of Jerusalem despite the aim of the Crusade being the capture/recapture of Antioch. This could highlight already the worry that the recapture of Antioch or Antioch could impact on Jerusalem and the access pilgrims were granted to it, and therefore shows its importance in knightly duties as preachers were often trusted influential members of society. The Third Crusade also emphasised knightly duties to pilgrims. The 1187 capture of Jerusalem by Saladin meant the expulsion of the Franks from the city and heavily impacted on those who lived there for spiritual enlightenment as well as limited the number of preachers/pilgrims who could enter, which greatly

Stated the duty of a knight towards the protection of pilgrims, which therefore shows this factor to have ~~some~~<sup>lesser</sup> significance, as despite it being a long term issue, it declined in importance from being a specific reason for crusading to a non-causal factor.

Another main duty of knights, between 1095 and 1492, was the adherence to ~~the~~ chivalric values, which could be seen as a ~~some~~<sup>knights</sup> significant factor. Chivalric values dramatically changed the duty knights had in the east between the first and third crusades. The first chivalric values focused on winning wars, a focus on personal strength and a show of bravery. This shows them to be of some significance to knightly duties, but only held prominence when in the

battleground and ~~could have~~ painters  
~~the~~ knightly duty and service as  
a temporary venture. However Chivalric  
Values were developed in both  
what and how they were promoted.  
By 1187, they had more focus  
on manners and courtesy, commit-  
ment to their house and their own  
development of personal strength.  
These ~~the~~ values were often  
preached through poetry sung  
by troubadours. An example from  
1146 shows Chivalric Values as  
becoming much more important to  
knightly duty as they not only  
preached the ideals, obligations and  
expectations of a knight, but  
encouraged them to use their  
knightly ability as it was a  
skill acquired from God. The importance  
of knightly duty was shown  
when Richard I and his men  
went on Crusade together, display-  
ing how knightly duty had turned  
from a temporary to permanent venture.

Showing their impact ~~on~~ on knightly duty between 1043 and 1192 to be of great significance. Unlike protection by pilgrims, they were relevant throughout the period as well as having a long term impact.

A final factor of some historical importance to knightly duty between 1045 and 1192 was the militarisation of the Templars and Hospitallers. ~~The~~ The Hospitallers and Templars, created 1070's and 1120's, were militarised at some point in the 1130's, and their militarisation had a huge impact on knightly duty. Instead of a more religious focus, seen especially in the Templars with the Brother Knights who took monastic vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, their duty had switched to aiding the leaders of Outremer, who looked to them

due to lack of Supplies, for help. This is especially seen after the Second Crusade, with the templars giving 800 knights and 2,000 soldiers, many of whom paid mercenaries, to defend Antioch against Nur ad din, as well as being given control of ramparts such as Acre and the city of Tarsus in 1182. In a similar way, the hospitalars were given castles at Calusee in 1128, being given in 1136, and the entire city of Sicily in 1160's. As well as this, they provided 800 soldiers and 800 mules to a campaign in 1167, which almost bankrupted them, as well as aiding in decreasing the muslim threat between 1170 and 1187. This shows the change in knightly duty between as a result of the changing nature of the military orders between 1095 and 1192, as they went from helping seigniorial military campaigns to helping secure Outremer on

or local level. However, it is only a somewhat significant point due to the ~~increased~~ decreased role the military orders had to play. They began to lose control of their combined 42 castles by the 1180's, reduced to just Beaufort and Crak de Chevalier, as well as being to lose a lot more men. 230 templars died at the battle of Hattin <sup>in 1187</sup> compared to 60 at the battle of Ascarin in 1164. This shows the negative impact the military orders had on knightly duties, leading to them becoming strained and unable to defend themselves, making them somewhat significant



This is a clip from a successful, level 4, response to this question. In this passage the candidate deals with the continued need to protect pilgrims as part of the crusading mission to take and defend Jerusalem. The response covers the time frame and offers generally accurate detail organised around change and continuity, although the focus is not entirely secure.

There is good detail on the importance of pilgrimage to Christians and why this was central to the crusading mission. Chivalric duties and the role of the military orders are also considered.

If this response had a better evaluation of change and continuity this would have pushed the mark to level 5. This answer was awarded level 4, 16 marks.



Selecting the right question for you is the key to exam success. Some candidates chose this question because they had good knowledge about knights and their reasons for going on crusade, but they never checked that they understood the full demands of the question. These candidates had the knowledge but lacked how to deploy it successfully.

A change and continuity question asks candidates to consider what changed and how far it changed, compared to what stayed the same. Therefore, the judgement that has to be made at the end is about whether there was more change, or more continuity.

## Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider whether Richard I provided the most significant example of effective crusader leadership in the years 1095–1192. This was the more popular question in section B and provided a range of responses. Most candidates agreed with the lead in the question and were able to offer good evidence about the effectiveness of Richard's leadership. Candidates generally knew about Richard's extensive preparations for crusade, his astute military tactics and his diplomacy, as well as some of the negatives such as his relationship with Philip II, and his failure to retake Jerusalem. Candidates' main rival to Richard I was Godfrey of Bouillon whose role in the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 compared well to the outcome of the Third Crusade.

At the top end candidates showed a breadth of knowledge and a real commitment to Richard's historical legacy, both positive and negative. These responses were interesting to read and showed how much candidates have enjoyed studying this topic. The best answers covered the period and took in evidence from the three crusades. The focus on significance was well maintained overall.

Less successful candidates tended to focus on Richard alone and made, at best, simplistic references to the First and Second Crusades.

Richard I was one of the leaders on the 3rd crusade from 1189-1192. He did provide a significant example of effective crusader leadership, as he ensured crusader rule between Tyre and Jaffa lasted for another 100 years, after 1192. Although, unlike Godfrey of Bouillon, one of the princes in the first crusade, he was unable to capture Jerusalem. Thus suggesting that whilst he was significant to re-gaining and ensuring parts of the Holy Land regained, he failed in his goal of re-capturing Jerusalem. Although the context in 1190s was perhaps harsher than that of the first crusade.

Indeed, Richard I, King of England was significant in effective leadership, as despite the increasing threat of Saladin and loss of Jerusalem in 1187, he was able to capture significant territories, and defeat Saladin on more than one occasion. Indeed in 1191, after being

Shipwrecked on Cyprus, he defeated Isaac, Byzantium emperor, and gained control of the kingdom. Additionally he sold Cyprus to the Templars gaining 10,000 bezants. Demonstrating effective military skill as Cyprus remained in crusades control. Furthermore, Richard defeated Saladin at Acre in 1191, using effective cavalry charges and siege methods. He continued to demonstrate effective leadership, at the Battle of Arsuf in 1191, where he divide his troops into 3 divisions, who protected the baggage train by alternating between the attack and the train. This allowed him to defeat Saladin, by maintaining a constant fresh supply of knights. Thus demonstrating how despite the high level of muslim threat, Richard I was able to defeat Saladin twice using his military skills and limited number of troops. Demonstrating how he was an effective leader.

Despite Richard I key examples of military strength, he also failed to re-capture

Jerusalem, which was the aim of the 3rd crusade. Whilst he did have significant military success, he also experienced many failures. Indeed the siege of Acre had been going on for two years by Conrad. Although the presence of Richard I and Philip, King of France impacted the war, it was not Richard alone who defeated Saladin. Furthermore, perhaps it was the weakness of Saladin, not the strength of the crusaders, which caused this win. Additionally, by 1192 he was unable to regain Jerusalem and ended up signing a truce with Saladin, which lasted three years. Saladin gained control of Ascalon and Jerusalem, whilst the crusaders regained control from Tyre to Jaffa in Tripoli. This was a huge loss for Richard I, as after nearly 100 years, the crusaders had lost Jerusalem, although perhaps this was at the fault of Guy not Richard I. Furthermore, unlike Guy, Richard gained pilgrims access to Jerusalem. However, upon returning back to Europe, Richard I left Jaffa defenceless, allowing Saladin to siege the city and claim control. This demonstrates how while

Richard I did clearly provide ~~some~~ some effective leadership, he also experienced a similar number of failures.

Indeed, if you compare the effective crusading leadership to that of Godfrey of Bouillon during the first crusade, Godfrey was perhaps more successful. Indeed at the Battle of Dorylæum in 1097, the first crusader contingent was weakening under Muslim pressure. But upon Godfrey's surprise attack, the crusades gained victory despite being unfamiliar with Muslim tactics. Furthermore, at the siege of Jerusalem in 1099, unlike Richard, Godfrey was able to gain control of the holy city. He breached St. Stephen's gate in one day by building a siege tower in 3 different areas in order to ~~confuse~~ confuse the Fatimids. Additionally he put out the Fatimids' secret weapon of Greek fire using ungear. This clearly demonstrates how Godfrey was perhaps more successful than Richard as despite being in unfamiliar territory he capture

Jerusalem. Although Godfrey did fail to gain control of Ascalon in 1099, suggesting he wasn't all success at once perceived. In addition, Richard I perhaps experienced harsher climates than Godfrey. Indeed during the first crusade, divisions in the Muslim world was present, whereas during the third crusade, Richard I faced the united Muslim threat of jihad. Thus, suggesting how perhaps Richard was more of a successful leader than Godfrey, as he faced a more significant threat and still was mostly successful.



This is a clip from a good level 4 response. The candidate shows good knowledge about Richard's strengths and weaknesses but could have spent more time on weighing Richard's effective leadership against other crusade leaders. Nevertheless, the comparison with Godfrey of Bouillon is well made and this response was awarded level 4, 15 marks.



Essays in section B cover a longer time frame than section A. Plan to cover the time frame before you start writing.

Between the years 1095 and 1192, the levels of effective crusader leadership fluctuated, as well as the ~~with~~ with differing levels of fulfilment of the crusading aims. The leaders differed in their levels of military success, their ability to raise morale and their ability to co-operate well, not only between each other but also with potential allies. Whilst all crusading leaders showed their strengths and weaknesses, it is a fair judgement that Richard I <sup>provided</sup> ~~was~~ the most significant example of effective crusader leadership.

Firstly, the aim of each crusade was to ultimately gain territory in the Near East and strengthen Christian influence in those areas. Richard I, even after his crusading partner Philip II of France had left, undisputedly showed great example of military success. Despite Saladin using his full force at Acre, an important port which he had acquired in 1187, in ~~the~~ 1189 Richard and Philip II lay siege, starving

the Muslims into retreat. Furthermore, after Philip left, Richard had ~~no~~ further ~~many~~ victories in Jaffa and Arsuf, the latter of which he showed his military ability of adaptability, launching a full scale attack after the Hospitallers progressed to early. However, Richard I did fail to create a force strong enough to fulfil the crusading aim of retaking Jerusalem. On the other hand, the treaty finalised in September 1192 secured Christian occupation of the coast and safe pilgrimage ~~to~~ to Jerusalem, which lasted for three years. Conversely, in the second crusade Louis VII of France and Conrad III of the Holy Roman Empire had very little military success. They failed to acquire Edessa, <sup>which had fallen in 1144</sup> the original aim of the Crusade, and then failed after just under a week of sieging at Damascus, losing the strategic base camp on the ~~orchards~~ orchards which had been acquired by Conrad III and moved to the East of the city. It is fair to judge that Louis VII and Conrad III succumbed too easily to the threat Nur ad-Din posed, which caused them to ~~rush~~ rush the siege, their biggest mistake and ultimate failure, showing them to be vastly less effective than Richard I in terms of

leadership. On the other hand, the ~~right~~ leaders/princes of the first crusade not only fulfilled the aim of taking Jerusalem in 1099, but also took Edessa in 1097, Antioch in 1098 and then Tripoli in 1100, establishing Christian control in the form of the crusading States of Outremer. Overall, in terms of military gains, Louis VI and Conrad were by far inferior to Richard I and the leaders of the first Crusade. However with the latter two, it is fair to note that the Princes of the first crusade made more territorial advances than Richard I, though the Muslim threat they faced was weaker.

Furthermore, in terms of ability to raise morale Richard I can be seen as superior to any other leader of a crusade. In ~~1191~~<sup>1099</sup> Richard I and his forces began a 70 mile march down to Jaffa and organised his infantry in an efficient way so that none would get too tired depending from the Turks, alternating who was on the outer flank. Indeed, on the first day of travel there was an attack from the Seljuk Turks in which Richard I put himself in the thick of the fighting. Additionally

Richard's series of military successes were significant in raising morale of his troops. Richard I himself presented the epitome of a chivalric knight, which served as an inspiration to many of his troops. Constantingly, Louis VII and Conrad III did little to motivate their troops, most significantly when Conrad III returned to Constantinople in 1147 as he was sick and left his troops to travel to Acre. As a result, ~~thousands~~ many left the cause. Whilst Richard travelled with his men, both Louis VII and Conrad III, went to Acre directly by ship, showing a lack of care and a lowering of moral for their troops. Additionally in the ~~the~~ ~~the~~ First Crusade, the troops suffered poor conditions ~~and~~ in cold winters, which in turn lowered morale, however significant victories such as at Dorylaeum in 1097, rose spirits. Whilst morale was not perfect under Richard I, it was significantly better compared to the lack of care from Louis VII and Conrad III and the ~~the~~ difficulty of raising morale in the first crusade. It was also helped by the fact that Richard I was the King of England, the most high-profile leader to date.

Finally, when assessing the effectiveness of

leadership, one must also consider the leader's ability to maintain relationships. In terms of this Richard I was not the best considering his ongoing tensions with Philip II of France. Not only was this due to the fact that they were traditional enemies with bordering territory but also because they supported different claimants to the Kingdom of Jerusalem and also Richard had married Berengaria of Navarre <sup>in 1191</sup> instead of Philip II's sister, as had been arranged. This rivalry not only led to a delay in decision making but also meant that Richard I had been refused entry at Tyre in 1191 by Conrad of Montfermat, who was supported by his cousin Philip II. The same cannot be said for Louis III and Conrad III because although they were traditional rivals they worked together well in the siege of Damascus. However the ultimate example of co-operation was between the princes of the first crusade. Although Bohemond and Baldwin did split off and there were tensions between Raymond of Toulouse and Godfrey of Bouillon, the majority of them worked together, including

Raymond and Godfrey to take Jerusalem. They also established the 'Council of Princes' in order to make unified decisions.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of a response at level 5. The main feature of this essay is the thoughtful way the candidate establishes the criteria by which to make a judgement. The candidate weighs the effectiveness of crusader leaders in terms of territory gained, the inspiration they stimulated in their followers, and the extent to which they cooperated with co-leaders.

This is carried out effectively. This response was awarded level 5, 18 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

The strength of this response is the way the time frame is covered and common features of leadership that are used to weigh effectiveness and reach a sustained judgement.

## Question 5

Question 5 asked candidates how convincing they found the view that it is misguided to blame one specific individual for the failure of the Fourth Crusade.

The extracts provided sufficiently contrasting interpretations for candidates to analyse them and deploy their arguments successfully. The vast majority of candidates were able to make the case for and against blaming one specific individual and weighed this argument against the role of specific individuals, and especially that of Innocent III.

At the top end candidates were able to establish an overview of the debate in the extracts and develop and critique the rival interpretations. Opinion was fairly evenly divided on the guilt or otherwise of the individuals referred to. Some of the best answers developed the case against conspiracy theories and brought in solid, decisive evidence from their own knowledge to counter these. A common approach by successful candidates was to look at the changing responsibilities of those involved, with Innocent's flawed preparations leading to the transgressions against Zara and Constantinople by Dandolo and the crusade leaders.

At level three candidates tended to spend a little too long explaining what the extracts were saying, before adding in some own knowledge of their own to expand on the evidence in them. At this level judgement tended to be about the quality of the extract rather than the interpretations in them.

Less successful candidates tended to focus on the veracity of the extracts, picking out points in isolation and judging whether or not this was confirmed by own knowledge. At this level judgement tended to be asserted in favour of one extract over the other.

It is fair to suggest that it is misguided to blame one specific individual for the failure of the fourth Crusade as one could argue that it was a combined fault.

~~The sources reflect~~ Source 1 reflects this idea, as it ~~states~~ somewhat correctly states that "the leaders of the Fourth Crusade" had "pre-existing motives to divert the Crusade to Zara and Constantinople." Source 2, however, contradicts this statement and says that "Innocent III thought that he possessed the ability to plan the vast international enterprise of the Fourth Crusade" <sup>correctly</sup> "contributing the idea that some ~~were~~ were more at fault than others for the failure of the crusade.

The first source puts forward the idea that it is misguided to blame one particular individual, ~~but~~ and suggesting that the leaders of the fourth crusade were as much to blame as any. It says they had "pre-existing motives to divert the crusade to zara and constantinople" and that Boniface ~~is~~ in particular "was angry about the mistreatment of his brothers by previous

Byzantine emperors." Indeed, the arrival of Boniface after the death of Thibault shifted the course of the crusade slightly. He was Italian, whereas most of the other leaders were French, and held ~~the~~ somewhat different motivations than the others, perhaps due to the treatment of his brothers. However, it would be inaccurate to suggest that the leaders had pre-existing motives to divert to Zora and Constantinople. Despite the fact that some of them encouraged the attack on Zora, many decided to leave. Many felt they needed to fulfill their vow, especially those who ~~had~~ accompanied Thibault, and sailed to Acre on their own. The army of Baldwin of Flanders sailed to Acre to aid the fight there. So even though it can be argued that Boniface held ulterior motives, it would be inaccurate to suggest all the leaders had pre-existing motives to divert the crusade.

Another suggestion coming from source one is that the Venetians, particularly the Doge Dandolo, is also to blame as much as anyone else. The source says that "Dandolo held grievances against the city, that he thought of as an obstruction to Venetian interests" and that his bitterness increased over "Byzantium's choice to give

preferential treatment to Venice's ~~and~~ competitors from Genoa and Pisa." Indeed, Dandolo and the Byzantine Empire had ~~some~~ some tension due to previous conflicts in 1171 and 1172, which resulted in the Venetians allying with the enemies of Byzantium, and them releasing Venetian prisoners, and paying to rebuild the damage they caused. Nevertheless, tension remained between the ~~the~~ two, suggesting that revenge could have been a reason why Dandolo diverted the crusade. Additionally, invading Constantinople would not only help him fix the debt left by the crusades, for which he was responsible, but it would limit Byzantine power and improve Venetian trading interests. So it is likely that this was the motive of the Doge. However, with this in mind, Source 1 does a good job of highlighting ~~both of the~~ the fact that both the leaders and the Doge could be to blame for the failure of the Fourth Crusade <sup>both of</sup> for their parts in encouraging the diversion to Zara and Constantinople, therefore, supporting the idea that it is misguided to blame one specific individual for the failure of ~~the~~ the Fourth Crusade.

On the other hand, Source 2 seems to lay the blame primarily on the role of Pope Innocent III

suggesting that his over-emphasis on vengeance led to the failure. The source states that "Innocent proclaimed that the Holy Land had been conquered by the treachery of Mohammed" and ~~that~~ that "the right to vengeance was strengthened by the use of horror stories that in turn gave the crusaders the idea that taking vengeance was both legal and Holy". Indeed, like all the crusades before the Fourth, the pope stressed the violence and atrocities which Muslims were allegedly committing against Christians in the East. ~~These~~ Such stories were touched upon in ~~Admiral's~~ Post Miserable, but also through the use of his preachers, Fulke of ~~the~~ Niverny and the Abbot of Paris. This would have undoubtedly ~~fuelled~~ fuelled the fire of the crusaders' desire. However, it's important to note the fact that after the papal legate, Peter of Capua, returned to Rome in 1202, the pope had effectively lost any control over ~~the~~ the crusade that he had, therefore removing much of the blame for anything that occurred after, like the diversion to Constantinople.

Another thing that Source 2 highlights to place the blame on Innocent III is his overachievable ambition to launch a pope-lead crusade

in a time where desire for Crusading had considerably died out, as it says that "Innocent thought he possessed the ability to plan the vast international enterprise of the Fourth Crusade". Indeed, he wanted this crusade to be lead by the pope, and this is reflected by his failed attempt to recruit Richard I and Philip II as leaders; perhaps if he wasn't so determined to fashion himself as the figurehead of the crusade, he would have had more luck securing secular leadership, as well as the armies and coffers that would have come with it. Additionally, desire for crusading had decreased, since the second Crusade but especially since the third. There was a half-hearted attempt to crusade in 1197 after the truce established between Saladin and Richard I ran out, but overall, Innocent refused to accept that crusading was simply not as popular as it used to be. This, combined with the lack of support from secular leaders,\* severely hindered recruitment, and contradicts the argument that it is misguided to blame one individual

\* and his overstressing of vengeance,



This is an example of a response at level 4. The candidate clearly understands that the extracts offer rival interpretations, and successfully analyses the argument in each by developing the points of interpretation and offering criticism. However, the response could really do with more comparison of the interpretations with each other.

A good level 4 answer, this response was awarded 15 marks.



The extracts on offer will both have strengths and weaknesses. This candidate shows this very well and brings their own knowledge to bear on crucial issues. However, the analysis has to lead to a judgment about which side of the argument is strongest. Therefore, it is a good idea to move from one extract to the other when discussing an issue common to both.

Extract 1 argues that the events and failings of the Fourth Crusade were a result of the combined decisions of numerous key figures in the campaign. Breyer makes particular note of the choices and motives of the Crusade leadership (namely Boniface of Montferrat - the commander of the Crusade) and the Venetian Doge Enrico Dandolo. The extract suggests that there were motives before the Crusade began to divert it to Zara and Constantinople, which would <sup>consequently</sup> eventually result in the abandonment of the aim to travel to Outremer. "among key leaders of the Fourth Crusade, there ~~was~~ <sup>were</sup> pre-existing motives to divert the Crusade to Zara and Constantinople." However, the leaders of the Crusade intended to travel by sea, and as a consequence requested a fleet to be produced by the Venetians as <sup>due to</sup> ~~they~~ the absence of a monarch, they did not have access to a national fleet. The significance of this is that the leaders aimed to sail to Alexandria, bypassing Constantinople altogether. It was the leader's overconfidence, rather than a preconceived desire to divert the Crusade, that led them to be unable to afford the transport of 33,500 men in Venetian boats, and consequently,

falling into debt which would force them to travel to Zara and then Constantinople if they wished the Crusade to survive. The extract goes on to <sup>share some of the</sup> "blame" with a specific Crusade leader: Boniface of Montferrat. The extract suggests that "the mistreatment of his brothers by previous Byzantine Emperors... was clearly a guiding factor in Boniface's decision to support the young Prince Alexius." However, while personal relations between the two men may have influenced the degree to which Boniface was receptive to Alexius' request (including the shared ~~own~~ connection they both shared to Philip of Swabia), it was the promises Alexius made that played a more significant role in the decision to attack Constantinople. The contract on the Treaty of Venice had only 6 months remaining on it, and so when Alexius offered a way for the debt to be paid off (200,000 marks) and to increase the Crusade's chance of success (providing many men to bolster its forces) the choice to accept his request seemed justifiable. Neither Boniface nor Dandolo could have predicted that Alexius would not follow through with his promises, and so it could be argued that it was Alexius' overconfidence in his ability to secure his rule quickly enough to gather the money to pay the Crusaders that was to blame for the failure of the Fourth Crusade.

① "the diversion of the Crusade to Zara was because Dose Dandolo held grievances against the city"

Moreover, extract 2 also places part of the blame for the crusade's failure on Dandolo's grievances towards Zara<sup>①</sup>, and consequent desire to divert the crusaders to capture it for Venice. However, Dandolo had taken a great risk in his decision to agree to the Treaty of Venice, and so he had reason to believe that the crusaders would be able to pay the large cost (2x the income of King John) and subsequently travel on to Alexandria. When the crusaders were unable to pay, Dandolo faced multiple issues, namely: he would be held responsible by the Venetian government for the failure of the Treaty of Venice, he had thousands of crusaders on Venice's doorstep whom could attack due to their frustration at having to delay the crusade and pay 51,000 marks (not prepared to give up), and Dandolo himself had taken the crusading vow to reap the Plenary Indulgence promised by Pope Innocent. ~~Consequently~~ Consequently, Dandolo diverted the crusaders to Zara, it could be said that Dandolo, at this point, saved the crusade by providing it with a way to continue and pay off its debt. Rather than undermining the crusaders, Dandolo adapted its course to both financially gain, and allow it to survive - it



This is an example of work at level 5. The candidate carefully sets out the issues affecting the debate about the Fourth Crusade in the introduction. This is useful in contextualising the interpretations in the extracts. This clip includes an excellent exposition of how to analyse and critique one of the extracts. The own knowledge is not just added in to beef up extract 1. The own knowledge is used to test the substance of the arguments in the extracts.



This candidate clearly brought knowledge of how to handle the debate into the exam room. This is the key in getting a good mark on the section C question. Too often candidates think they can simply rely on what is in the extracts, but this is never the case. Preparing knowledge of the debate helps in selecting the important evidence that will test the extracts and deliver a sustained argument and judgement.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (eg main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – eg a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, eg write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (eg looking at other causes/consequences with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

## Section C responses

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, eg clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, eg consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, eg extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, eg through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

## **Grade boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

