



# Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (9HI0/1A)

Paper 1A: Breadth study with interpretations

Option 1A: The Crusades, c1095-1204

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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).

## **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)

Autumn 2020

Publications Code 9HI0\_1A\_2010\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors: Sections A and B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li></ul>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section C

**Target:** AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.</li></ul>
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li><li>• A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.</li></ul>
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand on, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.</li></ul>
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them.</li><li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.</li><li>• Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li></ul>
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li><li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li><li>• Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that papal political ambition was the most significant reason for calling the First and Second Crusades.</p> <p>The extent to which papal political ambition was the most significant reason for calling the First and Second Crusades should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pope Urban II envisaged a papal monarchy with the power to depose monarchs and a victorious crusade would help to meet this ambition</li><li>• Urban's ambition was to gain influence at least, and control if possible, over the Greek Church of Byzantium, and answering the appeal from Alexius I was therefore a significant opportunity</li><li>• The political ambition of Eugenius III in calling the Second Crusade was to regain the significant papal prestige Urban had got from the First Crusade, e.g. the fall of Edessa was a significant slight to papal political power</li><li>• Eugenius had the ambition to assert greater political authority over European kings whom he targeted through his preachers for the Second Crusade.</li></ul> <p>The significance of other reasons for calling the First and Second Crusades and/or that the significance of papal ambition was limited should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Urban was greatly troubled by the violent conflicts between the nobility in Europe, which revealed a significant lack of church authority and this could be addressed by exporting the problem to the Holy Land</li><li>• The appeal of Alexius I was not answered in a completely cynical way, because solidarity between Christian rulers was important and this limits the significance of Urban's political ambition</li><li>• The difficulties facing Christian pilgrims travelling to Jerusalem had to be addressed for purely religious reasons and this was a significant factor motivating Urban to call a crusade</li><li>• Eugenius correctly understood that the fall of Edessa was a real threat to Jerusalem and his religious duty to defend it, which therefore limits the significance of his political ambition</li><li>• In purely practical terms there were not the military resources available in Outremer to meet the growing Muslim threat and calling a crusade was therefore a significant necessity.</li></ul>

	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---



Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far they agree that Muslim victories in the years 1146-87 happened because divisions between Muslims were largely overcome.</p> <p>The extent to which Muslim victories in the years 1146-87 happened because divisions between Muslims were largely overcome should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nur ad-Din's treaty with the Sultan of Rum led to victory at Inab in 1149 and enhanced his reputation as war-leader</li> <li>• By overcoming the independence of Damascus, Nur prevented the Damascenes forming treaties with the Franks and a united Syria became a secure base for further attacks on crusader territory</li> <li>• By acting as the leader of jihad, Nur was able to increase the number of soldiers for the Muslim cause</li> <li>• By overcoming divisions between Fatimids and Seljuks, Saladin was able to harness Egyptian wealth and resources for his campaigns against the Franks</li> <li>• By uniting Muslims in a jihad, Saladin was able to deploy vast and decisive troop numbers in his attack on Tiberias in 1187, which led to the fall of Jerusalem.</li> </ul> <p>Other reasons for Muslim victories in the years 1146-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The unwillingness of European kings to respond to appeals for help left the crusader forces under-manned, e.g. Henry II preferred to send funds to the Templars rather than take the cross himself</li> <li>• Conflict within government gave the Muslim leaders opportunities to make gains, e.g. Raymond III's truce with Saladin was taken as a sign of weakness and encouraged Muslim advance on Tiberius</li> <li>• After the fall of Edessa the Crusader states were increasingly difficult to defend from attacks in the north east, which was compounded by the inability to secure Egypt in the south west</li> <li>• Both Nur and Saladin were talented military leaders with sharp tactical brains and a better understanding of how to campaign in intense heat.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the accession of Baldwin IV in 1174 was a turning point in the government of the crusader states.</p> <p>The extent to which the accession of Baldwin IV in 1174 was a turning point in the government of the Crusader states should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Governments in the years 1100-74 carried out vigorous campaigns to conquer and consolidate territory, e.g. in the reigns of Baldwin I and Baldwin II, unlike government generally in the years 1174-87</li><li>• Factional disputes over succession were more easily resolved in the years 1100-74 than in the years 1174-87, e.g. the accession of Baldwin II's daughter Melisende was little contested</li><li>• Jerusalem, in the years 1100-74, faced less military threat from Muslim power than in the years 1174-87, e.g. the attacks on Banyas in 1174 and the destruction of Jacob's Ford in 1179 by Nur ad-Din and Saladin</li><li>• The deterioration of relations with Byzantium after the accession of Andronicus I to the Byzantine throne in 1182 left government more vulnerable than at any time in the years 1100-74</li><li>• Baldwin's leprosy provided government with problems of kingship that were different from anything in the years 1100-74, e.g. Baldwin's inability to take the field or provide an heir.</li></ul> <p>The extent to which the accession of Baldwin IV in 1174 was not a turning point in the government of the Crusader states should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Disputes over succession were a continuous feature of the government of Outremer, e.g. Baldwin II's succession was as disputed as was succession after the death of Baldwin IV</li><li>• Reliance on Europe for extra manpower and martial assistance was a continuous requirement of government in Outremer, e.g. the calling of the Second and Third Crusades</li><li>• The defeat of Saladin by Baldwin IV at Montgisard in 1177 was as significant a victory for crusader forces as any in the period 1100-74</li><li>• The Primacy of Jerusalem as the main seat of government was a continuous necessity and defending Jerusalem was always the priority of government</li><li>• The Crusader states were never at any time truly integrated and this required each Crusader state to have a defensive and economic rationale</li></ul>

	<p>of its own, which was unchanged by the accession of Baldwin IV. Other relevant material must be credited.</p>
--	--

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far they agree that trade between Muslims and Christians was the most significant feature of the economy of the Crusader states in the years 1100-87.</p> <p>The extent to which trade between Muslims and Christians was the most significant feature of the economy of the Crusader states in the years 1100-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trade between Muslims and Christians was vital because European agricultural methods on their own would have been insufficient to maintain nutrition</li> <li>• Trade between Muslims and Christians eased tensions because it was to the advantage of both parties and indeed produced greater trading opportunities through an expanded market</li> <li>• Trade between Muslims and Christians developed trade to Europe and Byzantium in cotton cloth and spices, which in turn increased the willingness of states like Venice to provide military and logistical support</li> <li>• Trade between Muslims and Christians was a source of revenue for the crusader nobility and helped maintain the defences of Outremer.</li> </ul> <p>The significance of other features of the economy of the Crusader states and/or limitations of the significance of trade between Muslims and Christians in the years 1100-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seaports were a very important development of the economy of the Crusader states because they acted as a lifeline to Europe, e.g. they were points of entry for crusading armies as in the Second Crusade</li> <li>• The seaports provided the Italian city states of Venice, Pisa and Genoa with their own dock, warehousing and market facilities, which maintained and developed important cities such as Tyre</li> <li>• Pilgrimage provided important revenue for the Crusader states and helped develop the infrastructure of a medieval tourist trade providing hospitality and trading opportunities, e.g. the sale of holy relics</li> <li>• Increased European settlement expanded the markets of the Crusader states and helped to diversify both supply and demand, as well as supplying some skilled workers for agriculture and construction.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>5</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the Fourth Crusade failed due to a 'chain of unfortunate circumstances'.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Although crusaders had been considering taking over Constantinople for some time, in 1204 it happened through circumstance rather than intent</li><li>• Villehardouin's logical explanation of cause and effect has stood the test of time</li><li>• The inability of the crusaders to meet the terms of the Treaty of Venice led directly to other problems and the failure of the crusade</li><li>• Innocent III was blameless apart from agreeing to the terms of the Treaty of Venice.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Innocent III wanted to be a priest-king and be able to rule over the secular powers</li><li>• Innocent wanted the crusade to be completely under the control of the papacy</li><li>• Innocent had a second goal of rebuilding the kingdom of Jerusalem and this would require more financial resources than were available</li><li>• European states were very different in 1204 than they had been in 1099 and crusading had to be reconciled with this fact, which Innocent failed to do.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Fourth Crusade failed due to a 'chain of unfortunate circumstances'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The deaths of Thibaut of Champagne and Richard I deprived the crusade of men and wealth, which created an unfortunate circumstance in terms of meeting the conditions of the Treaty of Venice</li><li>• The arrival of Prince Alexius at a point of crisis in the crusade was unfortunate in that it offered a way out of the continuing debt problems</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>but nonetheless took the crusade away from its destination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nobody knew in advance that Alexius would fail to live up to his promises and so in 1204 the crusaders found themselves still virtually bankrupt with the only means of restitution being to sack Constantinople.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Fourth Crusade failed due to a 'chain of unfortunate circumstances'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innocent III failed to intervene at times of crisis and tended to respond to events after the fact, e.g. his excommunications after the siege of Zara</li> <li>• The failure to meet the terms of the Treaty of Venice was more than unfortunate because Innocent's idea of raising money to pay for the crusade had failed, and he knew this</li> <li>• Dandolo was a proactive war leader throughout the crusade and it is difficult to argue that he was merely responding to events, e.g. as doge he had to put the interests of Venice first.</li> </ul>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom