



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY

9769/52

Paper 5 The Crusades, 1095–1192

May/June 2023

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 2023 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

Level	Level description	Mark
3	<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
2	<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
1	<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
0	No creditable response	0

Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2

Level	Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks	Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks
5	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.
4	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.
3	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.
2	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.
1	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.

0	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response
----------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Question	Answer	Mark
1	<p>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B about the reasons for the weakness of the Crusader States in the years 1149–1187. You should analyse the content and provenance of both documents.</p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both documents cite the greater threat posed by the unification of the Muslim world as the most significant problem. • Both suggest that there is an element of blame attributable to the Christian leaders themselves. • Both indicate, to different extents, that this may be caused by the moral failings of the Crusader States. <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggests that a lack of help from the west has contributed to the problem. • A gives more detail about the threat which is posed by the Muslims. • B sets events in a longer-term historical context. • B puts greater emphasis than A on the immorality of the present generation in contrast to previous generations. <p>Provenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A, as a letter written out of desperation, might be exaggerating the threat faced by the Crusader States – although his account of the Muslim campaigns is factually correct. • B’s portrayal of events as being the result of the moral failings of the crusaders may be the result of his falling out with the kingdom’s leadership, particularly Guy of Lusignan. 	10

Question	Answer	Mark								
2	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the poor crusading leadership caused the failure of the Third Crusade to achieve its aims? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in this set (C–F).</p> <p>Main issue:</p> <p>The main issue is over whether it was the weaknesses of the crusading leaders (Richard I, Philip Augustus and Frederick Barbarossa), or other factors, which caused the failure of the Third Crusade to achieve its aims.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 618 1326 1989"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 618 815 719">Analysis of interpretation in the documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="815 618 1326 719">Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 719 815 1252">Document C suggests that it is the betrayal of the German army by the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II which caused initial problems for the crusading army, delaying Frederick's journey.</td> <td data-bbox="815 719 1326 1252">The letter is likely to be influenced by the rivalry between the two emperors – claims of betrayal by the Byzantine emperors is a common trope of the crusading period. It could also be argued that, given that Frederick's crusade collapsed the following year after his death, these events had very little effect on the outcome of the crusade itself. It was his death, rather than these events, which denied the crusade a significant number of troops who could have made a difference to the outcome.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1252 815 1552">Document D suggests that Philip Augustus's departure after the siege of Acre on the grounds that he was ill was a betrayal and left Richard in a dangerous position. It does however accept that Philip had given significant help to the crusade up to that point.</td> <td data-bbox="815 1252 1326 1552">As an English source, it is not surprising that it is critical of Philip, especially given the fact that Philip waged war on Richard's lands in France on his return home. It is perhaps surprising, then, that he has anything positive to say about Philip at all.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1552 815 1989">Document E is a description of the truce made between Richard and Saladin in 1192. It suggests that Richard was driven to this by ill-health, and that he gained significant concessions from Saladin. It indicates that the truce was strategically sensible in the circumstances. It also suggests that it was to last three years, the implication being that the campaign could resume at a later date.</td> <td data-bbox="815 1552 1326 1989">It might be pointed out that this English author is not surprisingly less sceptical about Richard's claims of ill-health in this document than Philip's in D. Rather than a capitulation, the truce is presented as a reasonable outcome in difficult circumstances.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in the documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	Document C suggests that it is the betrayal of the German army by the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II which caused initial problems for the crusading army, delaying Frederick's journey.	The letter is likely to be influenced by the rivalry between the two emperors – claims of betrayal by the Byzantine emperors is a common trope of the crusading period. It could also be argued that, given that Frederick's crusade collapsed the following year after his death, these events had very little effect on the outcome of the crusade itself. It was his death, rather than these events, which denied the crusade a significant number of troops who could have made a difference to the outcome.	Document D suggests that Philip Augustus's departure after the siege of Acre on the grounds that he was ill was a betrayal and left Richard in a dangerous position. It does however accept that Philip had given significant help to the crusade up to that point.	As an English source, it is not surprising that it is critical of Philip, especially given the fact that Philip waged war on Richard's lands in France on his return home. It is perhaps surprising, then, that he has anything positive to say about Philip at all.	Document E is a description of the truce made between Richard and Saladin in 1192. It suggests that Richard was driven to this by ill-health, and that he gained significant concessions from Saladin. It indicates that the truce was strategically sensible in the circumstances. It also suggests that it was to last three years, the implication being that the campaign could resume at a later date.	It might be pointed out that this English author is not surprisingly less sceptical about Richard's claims of ill-health in this document than Philip's in D. Rather than a capitulation, the truce is presented as a reasonable outcome in difficult circumstances.	30
Analysis of interpretation in the documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)									
Document C suggests that it is the betrayal of the German army by the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II which caused initial problems for the crusading army, delaying Frederick's journey.	The letter is likely to be influenced by the rivalry between the two emperors – claims of betrayal by the Byzantine emperors is a common trope of the crusading period. It could also be argued that, given that Frederick's crusade collapsed the following year after his death, these events had very little effect on the outcome of the crusade itself. It was his death, rather than these events, which denied the crusade a significant number of troops who could have made a difference to the outcome.									
Document D suggests that Philip Augustus's departure after the siege of Acre on the grounds that he was ill was a betrayal and left Richard in a dangerous position. It does however accept that Philip had given significant help to the crusade up to that point.	As an English source, it is not surprising that it is critical of Philip, especially given the fact that Philip waged war on Richard's lands in France on his return home. It is perhaps surprising, then, that he has anything positive to say about Philip at all.									
Document E is a description of the truce made between Richard and Saladin in 1192. It suggests that Richard was driven to this by ill-health, and that he gained significant concessions from Saladin. It indicates that the truce was strategically sensible in the circumstances. It also suggests that it was to last three years, the implication being that the campaign could resume at a later date.	It might be pointed out that this English author is not surprisingly less sceptical about Richard's claims of ill-health in this document than Philip's in D. Rather than a capitulation, the truce is presented as a reasonable outcome in difficult circumstances.									

Question	Answer		Mark
2	Analysis of interpretation in the documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	
	Document F suggests that the campaign had damaged Saladin more than Richard realised and that had Richard pursued his campaign further he might have been more successful. This could indicate a misjudgement by Richard, or poor intelligence, or it could suggest that his illness was a genuine reason for his willingness to seek peace.	The author, as a courtier of Saladin, would have known of the events at his court but might also be seeking to justify them.	
	<p>Possible judgements (AO2):</p> <p>Several of these sources suggest poor leadership. C suggests that Frederick was outwitted by and fell prey to old rivalries with the Byzantine Emperor. D condemns Philip's departure after the siege of Acre and questions whether his illness was genuine; we can infer from F that Richard misjudged Saladin's position in 1192. F also suggests that the truce would give Saladin time to recover and consolidate his position. Taken together it could be said that the documents demonstrate that there was little or no co-operation between the crusading leaders.</p> <p>On the other hand, C suggests that it is the betrayal of Frederick's army by the Byzantine Emperor that caused a significant problem – though it is arguable that this was ultimately insignificant. Both D and E suggest that the ill-health of Philip and Richard were contributory factors, though the author of D is clearly sceptical about this. E suggests that the truce is not an example of poor leadership, but a wise decision in the circumstances, although this could be challenged by discussion of provenance.</p>		