



## Cambridge Pre-U

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/52**

Paper 5 The Crusades, 1095–1192

**May/June 2022**

**MARK SCHEME**

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2022 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.

## Introduction

This assessment is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material.

## Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.

If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range.

If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

## Assessment Objectives

### AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

### AO2

Showing understanding of appropriate concepts, investigate and respond to historical questions clearly and persuasively using an appropriate coherent structure to reach a substantiated and sustained judgement.

### AO3

Analyse, interpret and evaluate source material and/or interpretations of the historical events studied.

## Levels-based mark schemes

The levels-based mark schemes address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 2 and 3, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content for each question in the mark scheme.

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 1**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Level description</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>3</b>	<p>Analyses both similarities and differences. Compares and contrasts the documents, integrating comments on both documents by content, theme or issue.</p> <p>Makes clear and well-supported comparisons of the content of the documents, and explores their themes and issues.</p> <p>Focuses consistently on the matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Analyses the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, and explains why with reference to their provenance.</p> <p>Demonstrates supported critical evaluation of both documents as historical evidence.</p>	8–10
<b>2</b>	<p>Describes the main similarities or the main differences and includes some reference to the alternative viewpoint.</p> <p>There may be some imbalance between comparison and contrast. At the lower end of the level, may treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes clear and supported comparisons of content, themes and issues.</p> <p>Deals largely with the matter under discussion, but use of the documents in relation to the question may be uneven.</p> <p>Some analysis of how far the documents agree or disagree. At the higher end of the level, there may be some explanation of why they might agree or differ, though the consideration of provenance will not be well developed.</p> <p>At the higher end of the level, demonstrates some critical evaluation of the documents as historical evidence.</p>	4–7
<b>1</b>	<p>Refers to some differences or similarities. May be uneven, for example, differences may be covered but not similarities or vice versa.</p> <p>Makes some comparison or contrast of content, themes or issues, but may be largely description or paraphrase. Likely to treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes reference to the wider topic but with limited focus on the specific matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Limited analysis of the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, though this may be implicit or asserted. Limited reference to provenance of the documents.</p> <p>At the lower end of the level, there may be simply description or paraphrase of the documents.</p>	1–3
<b>0</b>	No creditable response	0

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks</b>	<b>Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	9–10 marks Full analysis of all the documents as a set, interpreting them in relation to the question.	17–20 marks Well-sustained critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is well explained and supported throughout. Has a precise focus on the question. Coherent and developed judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on clear and persuasive evidence from the documents in their historical context.
<b>4</b>	7–8 marks Analyses all the documents, interpreting them in relation to the question, but some unevenness in depth or coverage of the documents.	13–16 marks Generally sustains a critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is mostly well explained and supported throughout. Has a broad focus on the question. Coherent judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on evidence from the documents in their historical context which is mostly clear and persuasive, but unevenly developed.
<b>3</b>	5–6 marks Some analysis of all the documents, with some interpretation of them in relation to the question. Uneven in depth of coverage of the documents with some omissions, description or irrelevance.	9–12 marks Some critical evaluation of evidence from the documents, but unevenly supported and explained. Generally coherent and contains some argument applicable to the question. Undeveloped judgement based predominantly on evidence from the documents which is occasionally clear and persuasive.
<b>2</b>	3–4 marks Limited analysis of the documents, with little interpretation of them in relation to the question. The depth of coverage of the documents will be very uneven, with significant omissions or evidence of misinterpretation of some documents, and with much description or irrelevance.	5–8 marks Limited critical evaluation of the evidence from the documents. Generalised critical comments with limited support and uneven explanations. Generally coherent and introduces argument which is mostly relevant to the topic. Attempts a judgement but offers limited supporting evidence from the documents.
<b>1</b>	1–2 marks Describes or paraphrases the documents. Little or no analysis and there may be major omissions of documents and very limited reference to the question. Answers reveal serious misinterpretation of the documents.	1–4 marks Little critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Has some coherence. Few parts of the response are relevant. It responds to some of the issues raised by the topic. No judgement beyond simple and unsupported assertions or relies on description of the documents.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks</b>	<b>Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks</b>
<b>0</b>	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B about Richard’s response to the difficulties he faced in 1192. You should analyse the content and provenance of both documents.</b></p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both documents show that Richard was in a weak position. In B, he needs to make a truce because of his illness, and because of ‘scanty’ support. In A, the weakness is caused by divisions between the English and French contingents in his army over strategy.</li> <li>• Both show Richard as pessimistic about his position: In B, he ‘despaired of recovering his health’, whilst in A he points out the weakness of his army’s position caused by lack of numbers: if he splits his army so that half can resupply themselves with water, the Muslims will be able to attack the half of the army which remains at the siege.</li> <li>• Both show that his position was caused, or exacerbated, by the small number of troops he had remaining.</li> <li>• Both suggest discord or disagreement within his army. A says so explicitly, whilst it is hinted at by the final sentence of B.</li> </ul> <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst A shows the dilemma which Richard faced outside Jerusalem, B shows how he was proposing to resolve the problem, with a truce.</li> <li>• In B, Richard shows himself as prepared to negotiate with the Muslim army, whereas in A he still sees them as a threat.</li> </ul> <p>Provenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document A is written by a courtier of Saladin’s who might seek to exaggerate the weaknesses within Richard’s army and downplay the divisions which existed within the Muslim army in order to defend Saladin’s reputation.</li> <li>• Document B is an English chronicle which is seeking to defend Richard’s decision to leave the Holy Land and make a truce, despite this clearly being contentious, even at the time of writing, as is hinted at in the final sentence.</li> </ul>	10

Question	Answer	Marks										
2	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the progress of the First Crusaders to Jerusalem was characterised by religious devotion? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in this set (C–F).</b></p> <p>Main issue:</p> <p>The main issue is over what motivated the First Crusaders during the campaign. Some contend that religious devotion was the most important driving force, whilst others believe that a variety of motives such as a desire to escape poor economic conditions in the west and a desire for booty, drove them on.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 685 1313 2051"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="316 685 815 786">Analysis of interpretation in the documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="815 685 1313 786">Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 786 815 1155">Document C refers to the economic conditions in Europe in the years preceding the crusade. Famine, civil war and illness were all problems. There is also mention of religious dreams and visions which may have driven people, and of ‘prophets’ – possibly like Peter the Hermit.</td> <td data-bbox="815 786 1313 1155">C – The chronicler was writing shortly after the crusade and so was a witness to many of these events – albeit from Germany, not France. These motivating factors are likely to have affected all members of society, although perhaps particularly the poor, who were the main participants in the first wave.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1155 815 1451">Document D tells of the attacks on Jews in the Rhineland, which suggests a certain type of religious fanaticism, albeit misdirected. There is also mention of the kindness of a Christian bishop here, although he received money in return for his help.</td> <td data-bbox="815 1155 1313 1451">D – Although he did not go on the crusade himself, Albert of Aix would have known of these events, either directly or through hearsay in Germany.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1451 815 1753">Document E suggests that the Crusade had ‘God’s favour’, but the author also speaks of the riches he had accrued and the opportunity for personal ambition which the crusade had provided him with.</td> <td data-bbox="815 1451 1313 1753">E – Stephen was one of the leaders of the crusade, but he is clearly exaggerating the crusade’s success here, as they were in desperate straits at this point. His boastfulness is belied by the fact that he left the crusade a few weeks later.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1753 815 2051">Document F records events outside Antioch when the crusaders had visions of saints riding with them as they broke out of the city. There is also mention of the booty that the crusaders gained, although it is said that the goods were necessities rather than loot.</td> <td data-bbox="815 1753 1313 2051">F – The author was a member of Bohemond’s army and so might be trying to indicate heavenly favour on Bohemond’s endeavour to keep hold of Antioch. There is a suggestion in the source that the truth of these events was questioned by some at the time.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in the documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	Document C refers to the economic conditions in Europe in the years preceding the crusade. Famine, civil war and illness were all problems. There is also mention of religious dreams and visions which may have driven people, and of ‘prophets’ – possibly like Peter the Hermit.	C – The chronicler was writing shortly after the crusade and so was a witness to many of these events – albeit from Germany, not France. These motivating factors are likely to have affected all members of society, although perhaps particularly the poor, who were the main participants in the first wave.	Document D tells of the attacks on Jews in the Rhineland, which suggests a certain type of religious fanaticism, albeit misdirected. There is also mention of the kindness of a Christian bishop here, although he received money in return for his help.	D – Although he did not go on the crusade himself, Albert of Aix would have known of these events, either directly or through hearsay in Germany.	Document E suggests that the Crusade had ‘God’s favour’, but the author also speaks of the riches he had accrued and the opportunity for personal ambition which the crusade had provided him with.	E – Stephen was one of the leaders of the crusade, but he is clearly exaggerating the crusade’s success here, as they were in desperate straits at this point. His boastfulness is belied by the fact that he left the crusade a few weeks later.	Document F records events outside Antioch when the crusaders had visions of saints riding with them as they broke out of the city. There is also mention of the booty that the crusaders gained, although it is said that the goods were necessities rather than loot.	F – The author was a member of Bohemond’s army and so might be trying to indicate heavenly favour on Bohemond’s endeavour to keep hold of Antioch. There is a suggestion in the source that the truth of these events was questioned by some at the time.	30
Analysis of interpretation in the documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)											
Document C refers to the economic conditions in Europe in the years preceding the crusade. Famine, civil war and illness were all problems. There is also mention of religious dreams and visions which may have driven people, and of ‘prophets’ – possibly like Peter the Hermit.	C – The chronicler was writing shortly after the crusade and so was a witness to many of these events – albeit from Germany, not France. These motivating factors are likely to have affected all members of society, although perhaps particularly the poor, who were the main participants in the first wave.											
Document D tells of the attacks on Jews in the Rhineland, which suggests a certain type of religious fanaticism, albeit misdirected. There is also mention of the kindness of a Christian bishop here, although he received money in return for his help.	D – Although he did not go on the crusade himself, Albert of Aix would have known of these events, either directly or through hearsay in Germany.											
Document E suggests that the Crusade had ‘God’s favour’, but the author also speaks of the riches he had accrued and the opportunity for personal ambition which the crusade had provided him with.	E – Stephen was one of the leaders of the crusade, but he is clearly exaggerating the crusade’s success here, as they were in desperate straits at this point. His boastfulness is belied by the fact that he left the crusade a few weeks later.											
Document F records events outside Antioch when the crusaders had visions of saints riding with them as they broke out of the city. There is also mention of the booty that the crusaders gained, although it is said that the goods were necessities rather than loot.	F – The author was a member of Bohemond’s army and so might be trying to indicate heavenly favour on Bohemond’s endeavour to keep hold of Antioch. There is a suggestion in the source that the truth of these events was questioned by some at the time.											



Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Possible judgements (AO2):</p> <p>A range of possible motivations is on show here. C clearly indicates that economic and social conditions may have driven the crusaders in its early stages. D, F and E also refer to the loot gained by the crusaders, although F suggests that some of them were necessities – presumably to sustain them on their campaign. Religious devotion is suggested by the visions in C and F, and in a perverted way by the antisemitism in D. F suggests that personal ambition was a factor. Any judgement which is sustained and well-supported should be accepted.</p>	