



Pearson

Mark scheme

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel
GCE History (8HI0/1A)
Advanced Subsidiary

Paper 1: 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 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 2018

Publications Code 8HI0_1A_1806_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

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	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	5–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it 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	11–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Section C

Target: A03: 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	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 on the view is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues
3	11–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised 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 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.

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 whether increased European settlement in Outremer was the main consequence of the First Crusade in the years 1099-1144.</p> <p>Evidence to support the view that increased European settlement in Outremer was the main consequence of the First Crusade in the years 1099-1144 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The settlement of participants in the First Crusade was urgently needed for defending newly won territory• The First Crusade enabled the settlement of European farmers in Outremer, which was important in establishing a European feudal system there• The settlement of European traders was an important consequence of the First Crusade as this developed markets and revenue, e.g. the roles of Pisan and Genoese merchants• The increase in the number of European villages resulted in church building, which was important in extending Christian influence in Outremer. <p>The importance of other consequences of the First Crusade should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The capture of Jerusalem and its religious and political primacy was important in forging a recognised hierarchy and stable government in Outremer• The increase in the number of pilgrims after the First Crusade was an important consequence because it brought wealth to Outremer and maintained links with Europe• The First Crusade enriched the participants and was an important consequence because noble wealth paid for castle building and facilitated trade• In establishing Outremer, Muslim forces were weakened, which was an extremely important factor in consolidating the crusader states. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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 about whether the degree of Muslim unity was the main reason for the different outcomes of the First and Second Crusades.</p> <p>Evidence that the degree of Muslim unity was the main reason for the different outcomes of the First and Second Crusades should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divisions between Muslims in Turkey and Syria during the First Crusade allowed the crusaders to fight decisive battles in isolation, e.g. the extended siege of Antioch • The Sunni Seljuk Turks did not assist the Shi'a Fatimids in defending Jerusalem, which fell in 1099 • Zengi and Nur ad Din fought to unite Muslims, which, to an extent, stiffened resistance to the Second Crusade • Nur's alliance with the Sultan of Rum proved decisive in securing Aleppo and defending Damascus during the Second Crusade. <p>The importance of other reasons for the different outcomes of the First and Second Crusade should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The motives behind the First Crusade were clearly focused on taking Jerusalem and fulfilling crusader vows whereas the motives of participants in the Second Crusade were highly influenced by greed • The leaders of the First Crusade showed the ability to work together effectively, but this was lacking in the Second Crusade, e.g. Louis VII's rejection of the Antioch plan in 1148 • Edessa was an effective obstacle to Muslim advance after it was captured in 1097, whereas this was removed after its fall in 1144 • The role of Byzantium was more damaging to the Second Crusade than it was to the First Crusade. <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 about how significant the absence of natural boundaries in the east was for the defence of the crusader states in the years 1100-87.</p> <p>The extent to which the absence of natural boundaries in the east was significant for the defence 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">• The lack of natural borders was significant in defending the county of Edessa, which fell in 1144• The defence of Antioch was made difficult by a lack of natural borders and the principality survived only through support from Jerusalem• The lack of natural borders between Damascus and Acre threatened vital seaports, which intensified after the failure of the Second Crusade• The constantly moving frontier of the north-east made Jerusalem more vulnerable to attacks from Egypt and led to defensive and aggressive operations there. <p>The extent to which the significance of the absence of natural boundaries in the east was limited/or other factors in the defence of the crusader states in the years 1100-87 were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only the northeast was unprotected by a lack of natural boundaries and strong natural boundaries benefited Jerusalem, e.g. the Jordan valley• The northeast of Outremer would be difficult to defend in any case because of the vastness of Seljuk territory• The crusaders made a drastic mistake in failing to take Damascus in the Second Crusade as Nur ad Din could use it to consolidate Muslim forces to the east of Antioch• The crusader states relied on native labour to a large degree and thus had a potential opposition close to home that could not easily be persuaded to defend crusader territory• Failure to secure a meaningful alliance in Egypt gifted Shikur and Saladin crucial territory from which to attack Jerusalem. <p>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 lack of European support was the main reason for the decline of the crusader states in the years 1100-87.</p> <p>The extent to which lack of European support was the main reason for the decline 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"> • The papacy were more interested in mobilising Europeans to crusade than in planning and maintaining the crusader states themselves • Many European rulers took the view that the crusader states should protect themselves, having established European style government in Outremer • The nearest European rulers came to recognising the need for a standing army in Outremer was by offering gifts to the Templars, but at maximum this army was only 500 strong and spread across crusader territory • Potential support for the crusader states was restricted by internal political divisions in Europe, e.g. Henry II of England faced threats from within his own family throughout his reign. <p>Other reasons for the decline 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"> • The divisions between the rulers of Outremer over title and estate often occurred at times of danger and gave the Muslims encouragement, e.g. the succession crisis after 1183 assisted Saladin's preparations for war • The growth of Muslim unity and power after 1144 was a significant factor in the decline of the crusader states • The difficulty of securing Outremer from attack due to its undefined and porous borders tended to exhaust crusader power • The weakening of Byzantine power over the period prevented united action against growing Muslim power, and fed into the decline of the crusader states. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
5	<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 view that Innocent III's personal ambition led to the failure of the Fourth Crusade.</p> <p>Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their discussion of various views to reach a reasoned conclusion.</p> <p>In considering the given view, 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">• Innocent's desire for supreme religious and political authority was destructive• Innocent ignored the advice of the Archbishop of Jerusalem when he called the Fourth Crusade• Innocent thought wrongly that he could lead the crusade without kings• Innocent wanted the subordination of the Eastern Church to Rome and this aim did nothing to challenge Muslim power. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The diversion to Constantinople was because of the appeal of Prince Alexius, not Innocent• The diversion to Constantinople was taken after a series of decisions by the crusaders, which had unforeseen consequences and demanded further solutions• The need for unity put the crusaders under pressure to act• The diversion to Constantinople was a result of choices by the crusaders. <p>Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues to address whether Innocent III's personal ambition led to the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Innocent III's eagerness connected the Fourth Crusade to the acquisition of wealth by encouraging crusader debt, e.g. crusaders were allowed to borrow money from Jews• Innocent's determination to launch the crusade led to him making an exaggerated prediction of crusader numbers, which led to the Treaty of Venice and handed power to the Venetians• Innocent condemned the taking of Zara but he failed to take control of the crusade and prevent the further diversion to Constantinople, which may suggest his approval• After Constantinople fell Innocent welcomed the subordination of the Eastern Church to Rome. <p>Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues related to the debate to address other factors that explain the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Relevant</p>

points may include:

- The signatories to the Treaty of Venice shared a collective responsibility for its flaws
- The role of the Venetians in persuading the crusaders to attack Zara and Constantinople, and the economic benefits that accrued to Venice from these diversions
- The role of the crusader leaders in reneging on their vows to crusade in the Holy Land
- The role of crusader leaders in the conquest, pillaging and division of Byzantium suggests their motive was to gain wealth and power.

Other relevant material must be credited.