Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

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

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

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 or 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.

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

Summer 2023
Question Paper Log Number P72258A
Publications Code 9HI0_1A_2306_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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**	• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	**4–7**	• 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. • 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. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	**8–12**	• 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. • 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. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	**13–16**	• 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. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • 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. • 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.
5	**17–20**	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • 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. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

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**	• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
2	**4–7**	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • 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. • A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
3	**8–12**	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
4	**13–16**	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them. • 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. • 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.
5	**17–20**	• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
1	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the leadership of the Second Crusade was very different from the leadership of the First Crusade. The extent to which the leadership of the Second Crusade was very different to the leadership of the First Crusade should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The leadership of the First Crusade consisted of eight princes, which was different to the leadership of two kings in the Second Crusade • The eight princes were more successful in fighting a campaign of conquest, e.g. the conquest of Edessa in the First Crusade, compared to the failure to re-conquer it in the Second Crusade • The leadership of the First Crusade was free to campaign as they saw fit, whereas the leadership in the Second Crusade had to be mindful of the wishes of the rulers of Outremer • The leadership of the First Crusade showed more persistence than did the leaders of the Second Crusade, e.g. the sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem compared to the brief and unsuccessful siege of Damascus • Securing personal fortunes was more important to the leaders of the First Crusade than to the two kings who led the Second Crusade, e.g. Bohemond of Taranto abandoned the Crusade to become Prince of Antioch. The extent to which the leadership of the Second Crusade was similar to the leadership of the First Crusade should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The leaderships were similar in that they were fighting to gain land for Christendom, e.g. the conquest and re-conquest of Edessa • The leadership of both crusades faced the common challenge of leading forces from across Christian Europe, e.g. a mixture of Franks and Germans • The leaderships were similar in the way they sought to engage the enemy, e.g. cavalry charges and siege methods • The leaderships were similar in that they both enjoyed knightly support based on the feudal obligation of fealty. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which encouragement from the papacy provided the main motive for crusading in the years 1095-1192. The extent to which encouragement from the papacy provided the main motive for crusading in the years 1095-1192 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Encouragement from Urban II for the launch of the First Crusade was energetic and resourceful, e.g. his elaboration of crusading as a 'just war' connected to the remission of sins motivated feudal warriors • Urban II encouraged crusading as a political solution to violence and disorder that motivated younger nobles who were land-hungry, e.g. his reference to the Holy Land as 'a land of milk and honey' • Papal encouragement that stressed the need to capture and defend Jerusalem for Christendom was a compelling factor for crusaders throughout the period, e.g. particularly after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin • Papal encouragement through deploying motivational preachers to make the appeal to crusaders popular and heartfelt was very important, e.g. the role of Bernard of Clairvaux in motivating the Second Crusade • In the final analysis, only a pope could call a crusade and therefore papal encouragement was the key factor. The extent to which other motives for crusading in the years 1095-1192 were important should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The acquisition of land and plunder for younger nobles in the First Crusade was a decisive motivating factor that needed little further encouragement • There was a strong motive for European kings and nobles to prove their military strength and courage, or in some cases to do penance, as a defining feature of kingship • The growth of chivalric values motivated many knights to crusade, e.g. particularly in the case of the Third Crusade where the main leader, Richard I, was the embodiment of chivalry • The crusades called by Pope Calixtus II (1119) and Pope Alexander III (1165) were largely ignored by nobles and kings, and limits the argument of papal encouragement being the main motive for crusading • The duty to protect Christian pilgrims was a strong motive for crusading as some crusaders also undertook pilgrimage, e.g. Louis VII's visit to Jerusalem in 1148. Other relevant material must be credited.

Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which lack of support from Byzantium and Europe was the most significant weakness in the defence of the crusader states in the years 1100-92. The extent to which lack of support from Byzantium and Europe was the most significant weakness in the defence of the crusader states in the years 1100-92 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Lack of support from Byzantium because of the disputed ownership of Antioch was significant during the rise of Zengi, e.g. the attack on Antioch by John Comnenus in 1137 • Lack of support, and indeed hostility, from the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus, weakened the defences of the crusader states significantly, e.g. it enabled Saladin to campaign against the Franks with renewed vigour • Louis VII refused to support Reynald of Châtillon's request to defend Antioch in the aftermath of the Second Crusade. This resulted in defeat at Inab, significantly weakening Outremer's defences • The rulers in Outremer saw support from Europe as essential to their survival and dispatched seven crusade letters (1157-84) that were ignored by European nobles and knights • The lack of European support allowed Jerusalem to become more vulnerable to attacks from Egypt and Syria. Ultimately it took the capture of Jerusalem for the Third Crusade to be called. The extent to which other weaknesses in the defence of the crusader states were significant and / or the limited significance of lack of support from Byzantium and Europe in the years 1100-92 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The lack of natural boundaries to the east led to a significantly porous border that Muslim forces could launch attacks into crusader territory from, e.g. the fall of Edessa in 1144 led to the fall of Damascus • Castles were difficult to man because of the limited numbers of troops available in Outremer, and this was a key weakness that made the military orders the main defence force in Outremer • Lack of support from Byzantium and Europe was offset, to some extent, by the donations sent to the military orders from European nobles and kings, e.g. the £20,000 sent by Henry II in 1186 • Egypt became the deciding factor in the defence of the crusader states after Nur ad-Din gained control of Syria, and failure to secure Egypt was thus a significant defensive weakness. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which Muslim power was transformed in the years 1095-1144. The extent to which Muslim power was transformed in the years 1095-1144 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Muslim power was strengthened by Zengi who provided leadership committed to fighting the Franks, and that stood in contrast to the divided Sunni forces that faced the First Crusade • Zengi's call for jihad against the Franks imposed a religious duty on Muslims to take land from the Christians, and this added another significant dimension to Muslim power • Muslim power was massively enhanced vis-a-vis the Franks by the destruction of Edessa in 1144. This reduced Christian territory, justified jihad and reversed a conquest of the First Crusade • Muslim power was transformed in the sense that the Sunni–Shia divide, a decisive factor in the First Crusade, was less of an issue by 1144. Sunni and Shia forces were now attacking by land and sea. The extent to which change in Muslim power was limited in the years 1095-1144 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Muslim power in its wider sense had never been seriously broken but was disrupted at the Sunni-Shia interface in the Levant, so it could be said Muslim power was reasserted rather than transformed • The Sunni-Shia divide that prevented a joined-up Fatimid-Seljuk fight against the Franks in the First Crusade remained in 1144, e.g. with Egyptians and Turks largely following their own interests • Zengi's leadership was significant by the 1130s but by no means universally accepted, e.g. the limits to his power set by the Damascenes and Artuqid Turks around Aleppo and Mosul • Muslim power was limited by Byzantium, e.g. John Comnenus' attack on Shaizar in 1138 came close to success • Many Muslim cities chose to pay tribute to the Franks and to remain independent from the warring parties to preserve trade and their domestic economy. This limited the change in Muslim power. Other relevant material must be credited.

Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
5	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. 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 it is wrong to blame the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • It is wrong to blame Dandolo for trapping the crusaders in the terms of the Treaty of Venice • Dandolo, it is wrongly claimed, knew the crusaders could not meet the terms of the Treaty of Venice • Dandolo, it is wrongly claimed, trapped the crusaders so that he could divert the crusade against Zara and Constantinople • Blaming Dandolo runs contrary to the evidence. It would be too risky for any doge to attempt such an elaborate plan. Extract 2 • The Venetians were more worldly wise than were the crusaders, especially about the changing trading opportunities for themselves • The Venetians wanted to gain advantage over their rivals Pisa and Genoa in their trading relations with Byzantium • The Venetians' agenda in Byzantium was to secure their dominance over Byzantine trade so that they could then move on to developing further markets. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that it is wrong to blame the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Relevant points may include: • Dandolo was a Christian with a history of crusading and assisting the crusader states, and it therefore makes little sense for him to suddenly abandon sincerely held views on an uncertain adventure • Dandolo did not plan the crusade, nor did he stipulate the details of the shipping order given to Venice. The finance and planning of the crusade was laid down by Innocent III • The ships that Venice produced were designed for beach landings in Egypt, not for besieging Constantinople, and this is evidence for a change of plans once the crusade had set off, not a heist by Dandolo • The diversions to Zara, and Constantinople (at the request of Prince Alexius) were to secure the funds to make the crusade viable. The sack of Constantinople happened after Alexius failed to pay up. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that it makes little sense to blame the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Relevant points may include:

Question	Indicative content
	• Venice had good trading relations with Egypt and Dandolo might not want to jeopardise the cloth and spice trade by an invasion • It makes sense to blame Dandolo and the Venetians for the invasion of Zara because they were desperate to secure Dalmatian oak for their shipyards • Dandolo ignored Innocent's rage after the attack on Zara and then attacked another Christian city, which suggests that his and Venice's motives for crusading were not based on religious devotion • Dandolo claimed part of the plunder of Constantinople for Venice. The Venetians did not denounce the rapacity of the crusaders and proudly displayed their own plundered trophies in Venice.

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