

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE History 9HI0 1A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit <https://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus>. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_1A_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was once again pleasing to see candidates of all abilities engage effectively with this year's A Level paper 1A, which deals with the Crusades, c1095-1204.

The time frames, topics and conceptual focuses of this year's paper were dealt with well by candidates. Candidates were well prepared for the examined areas. Most answers were broadly in line with the indicative content in the mark scheme, but some candidates offered information and analysis beyond that which we anticipated. In section C the extracts offered no apparent difficulties for the majority of candidates and provided an accessible interpretative framework.

The advice offered to centres and candidates remains similar to last year.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity/difference and significance with a time frame of not less than ten years. Section B offers a further choice of essays using an extended time frame of not less than one third of that offered by the specification as a whole. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of the questions in sections A and B. Thus, where section A questions targeted a shorter time period candidates deployed a greater depth of knowledge, in comparison to the more careful selection generally required for section B questions which cover a broader time frame.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In section C, the stronger answers were able to demonstrate a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. These responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the credibility of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence offered by both the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a

drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to consider whether the First and Second Crusades were called mainly to serve the political interests of the papacy. This was the more popular question in Section A with candidates finding it both accessible and straightforward.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on causation. At the top end causation was exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Reasons addressing political ambitions were exemplified well through papal aims to reassert authority over western Christendom and gain influence in the east. These were often analysed against other causal reasons such as the spiritual call to crusade and the need to protect pilgrims. The best answers discussed the changing priorities as the calling of the Second Crusade relied less on papal interests and more as a reaction to events in the east.

At level 3 there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but the criteria by which to make a judgement was less secure. In many cases candidates provided a range of reasons but did not develop their chosen reasons into an analysis centred on causation.

Less successful candidates offered narrative approaches to the First and Second Crusades without much focus on the second order concept of causation.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

The first and the second crusades have been argued to be called due to multiple factors. One of these factors were to serve political interests of the papacy as evident during the 1st and 2nd crusade. However, other factors like the aim to free Jerusalem was a more important reason to call the 1st and 2nd crusades. Lastly, the most important reason for the call of the first and 2nd crusade was to serve personal ^{motivations} ~~ambitions~~ of the leaders instead. Therefore, it will be argued that it extremely ~~more~~ inaccurate to say the first and second crusade were called mainly to serve political interests of the papacy.

On the one hand ~~me~~ it is right to argue that the first and second crusades were indeed called to ~~fulfilled~~ political interests of the papacy as it is evident throughout. ~~During the Urban II experience~~ when pope Urban II first came to power, he experienced hardship due to his investiture controversy with Henry IV. This is because Henry IV had appointed an antipope, Clement III who threatened to take down Urban II from his position. ~~and~~ This made Urban II want to look for opportunities that would ~~proat~~ help him increase

(Section A continued) his political powerbase. This was evident when Henry IV's wife accused him of sexual depravity. As a result, Urban II excommunicated Henry IV, while allowing his wife to divorce him. To Urban II the first crusade was another opportunity that Urban II could ~~these~~ use to dominate not only in the west but also in the eastern Christendom, increasing the status of papacy. This is also evident in Second crusade when Eugenius tried to extend his power & beyond west to serve his political interests. These originated when in 1140s Armenian men came to receive judgements and advice on issues that had occurred in the East. This pleased ~~the~~ the pope, ~~making him think he~~ resulting him to believe he was ~~not~~ not only well respected in the east but he could also gain more ~~to~~ dominance by taking back control of Edessa and other crusader states. This demonstrates how the papacy want to increase their political power, as one could ~~infer~~ infer that they were trying to go beyond being spiritual and be better than their predecessors. Therefore, First and 2nd crusades were indeed called to serve political interests of papacy.

Despite this, other factors remain more significant in the call of the crusades. This is because it was the ~~aim~~ aim to serve their duty of freeing Jerusalem.

(Section A continued) Jerusalem was the ultimate destination of pilgrimage for Christians. This is because it had 2 major place that were linked to christ; Cavalry & Hill where Jesus was crucified) and the holy Sepulchre (had cave tomb where Jesus resurrected). This means that Jerusalem held a spiritual meaning in their heart and any threat posing to Jerusalem would be a threat to Jerusalem. At ~~Clermond~~^{council} of Clermond in 1095, before the start of the crusade, Urban II explained to Christians the importance Jerusalem held and how it was under major threat especially after the siege of ~~Nicaea~~ Nicaea in 1078. This catalysed rage in Christians as, hint of increasing muslim power means a going to pilgrimages would become harder. This would be disastrous as in 1060s around 7000 German pilgrims went to Jerusalem. If this was reduced they would inevitably end up in hell for not protecting what christ left for them. Although, during the second crusade the main aim wasn't Jerusalem, it was still used to encourage individuals to go to crusade. This is because in 1144 ~~Antioch~~ Turks sieged Edessa, killing 15,000 ~~Edessa~~ people. This was mentioned in Quantum Praedecessores - a papal bull, indicating that the siege of Edessa demonstrated the rise in muslim unity and power, which can further

(Section A continued) pose threats to accessibility of Jerusalem to Christians. Therefore, we can argue that ~~the~~ ~~the~~ 1st and 2nd crusade was called mainly to serve Christ which ~~meant to free~~ translated into free Jerusalem, instead of fulfilling political interests of papacy. Thus, making a ~~question~~ statement inaccurate.

lastly, The most significant reason for calling 1st and 2nd crusade was to serve personal ~~and~~ motivations of leaders of both crusade. ~~for example~~ ^{for 1st crusade}, we can ~~see~~ ^{see} that not all princes went to crusade to free Jerusalem and serve the papacy's political interest. for example Baldwin of ~~Cologne~~ ~~Bologna~~ ^{Bologna} ~~stopped~~ ~~because~~ it was ~~not~~ diverted to a different route rather than ~~go~~ ~~reaching~~ reaching Jerusalem. He went towards Edessa, taking control over areas like savanda. During this, he so impressed the ruler of Edessa that he made Baldwin ~~the~~ his heir. When Torto was assassinated, Baldwin established himself as the prince, instead of returning to join the crusade. Therefore, showcasing that ~~some~~ ^{some} leaders went to crusade to fulfill their own aims of gaining more land and power, which they would obtain as easily in the west. This theme of going to crusade can also be ~~seen~~ ^{seen} to have continued during the second crusade. This is because Conrad III went to crusade to gain more respect and

(Section A continued) power. This is because he was very unpopular amongst his nobles and barons, which he thought were trying to overthrow him. As a result, he considered going to crusading, hoping it would divert the nobles and bolster his reputation in front of them. Therefore, we can clearly see that these leaders would not have joined either crusades if they were not going to join anything from it, even if it meant ignoring ~~pope~~ political interests of papacy and serving the Christ by freeing Jerusalem. Thus, ~~not~~ ~~the~~ demonstrably the statement is inaccurate.

To Conclude, the first and Second Crusades were ~~not~~ not mainly called to serve the political interests of the papacy. This is because freeing Jerusalem ~~had a more significant use~~ to serve Christ was more significant for people to go to crusade, without the use of Jerusalem by popes, they wouldn't be able to convince individuals to join crusading during both crusades, especially evident when Eugenius used Jerusalem even though it was Edessa under more threat ~~there~~. Despite, pope having hands in calling crusades to serve their own political interests, the personal ~~at~~ motivations were most significant ~~for~~ for calling the 1st and 2nd Crusade. Without the leaders crusades would be weaker as they are

(Section A continued) the one, that bring troops with them.
Therefore, it is significantly inaccurate to say 1st and 2nd Crusade were called mainly to serve political interests of the papacy.



This is an example of a response in level 4. The answer explores a range of reasons that cover both crusades. Alternatives relating to Jerusalem and personal motives are also covered for both crusades. The conceptual focus is mostly understood and a secure response is offered. Whilst the overall judgement is supported, relative significance is not evaluated. The answer was awarded level 4, 16 marks.



Causation questions are best tackled with a range of reasons. Candidates should aim to comparatively assess these reasons in order to weigh up their relative significance.

Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider how accurate it is to say that Nur ad-Din made the most significant contribution to the growth of Muslim power in the years 1144-69. Whilst this was considerably the less popular question in Section A, it elicited some of the best answers.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on the conceptual focus of significance. At the top end significance was exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Nur ad-Din's contributions were exemplified well through the uniting of Syria and increasing power and control at Antioch and Edessa. These were often analysed against other individuals such as Zengi, Shirkuh and Saladin as well as arguments that weighed up the weaknesses of the Crusader states and how this led to opportunities for the growth of Muslim power. The best answers were evaluative of the factors they offered.

At level 3 there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but the criteria by which to make a judgement was less secure. In many cases candidates provided a range of factors but did not develop their chosen factors into an analysis centred on significance.

Less successful candidates drifted out of the upper time scale posed by the question and offered information on Saladin and crusader weaknesses post 1169.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Between the years 1144 and 1169, the quality and strength of the Muslim force grew significantly, overcoming theological divisions that resulted in an ineffective response to the First Crusade. Nur ad-Din's unification of the Muslim world was certainly significant to this strengthening, however, it was the context of fractionalism within Outremer and the weakness of the leadership in the Second Crusade that allowed Nur ad-Din's exploitation of the Christian force.

Indeed Nur ad-Din's contribution to the growth of Muslim power was seen primarily in his unification of Syria, Aleppo and Damascus. By 1155, Nur ad-Din had united Muslim Syria with Aleppo and Damascus, allowing him to provide the force of three regions at the Battle of Inab in 1149 against Raymond of Antioch. This unification helped grow Muslim strength, especially since the Muslim world had been previously divided in the theological divide between the Sunni Seljuk Turks and the Shia Fatimids in Egypt. This division meant that they were unable to provide an effective force against the First Crusade. For instance, at Nicaea in 1096, Kilij Arslan was unable to defeat the Crusaders as he arrived too late after fighting the Danishmend Turks. By contrast, the force that Nur ad-Din provided at Inab showed the strength of

(Section A continued) the new force, fighting under the belief of jihad. In fact, contemporary poems praise Nur ad-Din's religious enthusiasm as he was known to support the Mosques and Madras. The recognition of the Crusading objective through his belief in jihad, meant that Nur ad-Din was able to effectively take Turbessel in 1151, undermining the Crusader state of Edessa who heavily relied on the fortification at Turbessel. Therefore, Nur ad-Din made a significant contribution to the growth of Muslim power through his unification, religious enthusiasm and strategy.

However, Muslim victories and growth in the years 1146 and 1169 would not have been possible without the context of factionalism within Outremer. In 1131, Baldwin II died, leaving Melisende, her husband Fulk of Anjou, and Baldwin III as co-regents. Since Baldwin III was too young to rule, Melisende stepped in as Queen. The factionalism occurred when in 1152, Melisende refused to allow Baldwin III to rule, despite his coming of age. Meanwhile, Fulk of Anjou was implicated in the murder of Melisende's relative, Hugh of Jaffa. Through using the system of the palatinates that Baldwin I set up in 1100, Melisende continued to rule through a near civil war. In 1152, Baldwin III imposed himself against Melisende with force, exacerbating the factionalism. This ~~helped~~ contributed to the growth of Muslim power because the rulers of Jerusalem were unable to fulfill their

(Section A continued) duty, given the primacy of Jerusalem, and help to defend the other crusader states as they had done in the past. Between 1100 and 1137, the kings of Jerusalem travelled North 15 times to help defend Outremer. By contrast, factionalism meant that Nur ad-Din could take Turbessel in 1151 and ~~be~~ be victorious at Hattin in 1149 against Christian forces with limited help from Jerusalem.

Moreover, the growth of Muslim power between 1144 and 1169 was also caused by the failure of the Second Crusade at Damascus in 1148, and the lack of Western aid that it caused. In July 1148, the Crusade leaders, Conrad III and Louis VII, led the Second Crusade to its failure due to poor decisions. Throughout the Crusade, the leaders had failed to listen to local leaders, keeping Edessa as their war aim until 1143, when it had been razed in 1146; and they were undermined by the treaty between Manuel I and the Turks at Konya in 1120, which ~~exposed their~~ meant that their position was exposed when going to markets provided by Manuel I. However, their worst decision came at Damascus when they turned from sieging the city from the west, with the supplies of an orchard and a river, to turning to the East. As a consequence, three days later, Conrad III abandoned the Crusade due to the starvation of his troops. It was these poor decisions that made it easier for the Muslim force to

(Section A continued) strengthen, as they were presented with a relatively weaker enemy.

Furthermore, the failure at Damascus in 1148, punctured the image of Crusading in Western Europe. Therefore, the Muslims were presented with no fresh European threat, and the Christians within Outremer suffered from a lack of Western support. Indeed between 1154 and 1187, 7 crusade letters were sent to Europe, but none crusade was initiated. Perhaps this was due to the Angevin-Capetian conflict between 1159 and 1259, which undermined the English and French forces; or because there seemed to be no clear threat to Jerusalem. The First, Second, and Third Crusades were called after a clear threat was made to Jerusalem. In the 1090s, Suleiman was growing the Seljuk Turks in Asia Minor; the capture of Edessa in 1144 provoked Eugenius III to call for the second crusade because of its proximity to Jerusalem; and the Third Crusade was called due to the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 after Hattin. Between 1148 and 1169, there was no additional threat to Jerusalem, and this combined with the punctured image of the crusades, meant that there was a lack of Western aid. This helped Nur ad-Din grow his force because he wasn't being ~~cont~~ attacked by a strong Christian force.

To conclude, Nur ad-Din certainly made a significant

(Section A continued) contribution to the growth of Muslim power in the years 1144-69, through his unification of Muslim Syria, Aleppo and Damascus; overcoming a previously fractured religious context; and recognising the Crusader reliance on fortifications such as Turbessel in Edessa. However, his contributions were not the most significant factor, as the strengthening wouldn't have been possible if ~~much~~ the Muslims were against a united Christian force in Outremer, and if there had been support from the west. The factionalism between Melisende and Baldwin III prevented an effective Christian response to attacks, ~~not that~~ for example at Hama in 1149, and therefore was the most significant factor.



There were some excellent responses to this question, and this is an example of an answer operating at the top of level 5. A clear direction is given at the start. The candidate maintains this throughout offering a range of factors that each have strong knowledge to substantiate the points made. There is real consideration throughout and factors are evaluated against each other. This responds fully to all demands of the question. The answer was awarded level 5, 20 marks.



Candidates are encouraged to spend a few minutes planning the direction of their answer and thinking about how their chosen factors have relative significance against the stated factor and other factors employed in their response. This will help to maintain a focus on the conceptual focus.

Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates to consider how far you agree that, in the years 1100-92, the reigns of Baldwin I and Baldwin II were very different from the reigns of those rulers who came after them. This was the more popular question in Section B; responses however were mixed.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on the conceptual focus of similarity/difference. At the top end differences were exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Candidates mainly focused on differences in conquest and consolidation, military campaigns and dynastic security. These were often analysed against similarities such as castle building, the deployment of military orders and the continuation of military successes, albeit more defensively in comparison to earlier offensives. The best answers offered evaluative judgements relating to both sides of the argument.

At level 3 there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but the criteria by which to make a judgement was less secure. In many cases candidates were descriptive and some spent a long time considering similarities between Baldwin I and Baldwin II rather than focusing their comparison on the reigns of the rulers who came after them.

Less successful candidates were almost wholly narrative. There were some common errors noted in the application of evidence in less successful answers too: castle building with examples such as Krak de Chevaliers and Kerak were attributed only to Baldwin I and Baldwin II, and the role of the military orders was all but discounted in the later years despite their prominence then.

100

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

~~It was~~ Baldwin I and II had ~~a~~ and were both similar leaders of Jerusalem. It can be argued that ~~yes~~ they were very different leaders than the one that came before because they ran successful schemes, or because they were both very individual and active rulers. It could also be argued that they were similar to one that came after because they had similar difficulties in acquiring and maintaining their position as king of Jerusalem.

Baldwin I and II both ran successful schemes ^{to consolidate their power} as rulers, unlike those that came after them. Baldwin I during his rule was a good leader with good control. He ~~was~~ took the position after Godfrey, and expanded his territories effectively. He started a castle building scheme which was very significant, ^{as well as military campaigns.} ~~especially when Montfieri~~ Baldwin II continued ~~this~~ ^{his castle-building scheme} by building another 7 castles, including Montefiore, an important castle for defence of Jerusalem, in 1136. The rulers that followed them were less successful because they struggled in personal matters.

(Section B continued) rather than strengthening the position of the kingdom of Jerusalem. This evidence proves that both Baldwin I and II were successful rulers who expanded Jerusalem's territories effectively. The ruler Baldwin II, his brother Amalric who left the kingdom heavily divided by factionalism, and Baldwin IV, who was more conflicted with personal matters, didn't continue this effective consolidation of territories.*

The reign of Baldwin I and II was also different from the ones that came after because they took a more active leadership, whereas Baldwin III and IV had the kingdom divided.

Baldwin II initially ran a joint rule with his parents Melisende and Fulk of Anjou. With this, there was conflict between them, coming from the different families of Angevins and Montlherys.

Fulk, an angevin, had disputes over appointing Angevins. After his death, Baldwin III asked Melisende to divide the kingdom between them; she refused, and Baldwin drove her out with a series of invasions.

Baldwin IV's case was similar as he was only 14 when he became king, Raymond, of Tripoli acted as regent, and ended up having a truce with Saladin, an enemy to the

(Section B continued) overlords. This proves that both Baldwin III and IV's reign was divided, and they didn't have complete control over the kingdom as individuals, unlike Baldwin I and II, who didn't have these problems. Therefore the rule of the later kings was different because they were less active leaders, and split the leadership.

It could ~~also~~ be said that the ^{rule} leadership of the kings is similar because they had similar issues with succession. Baldwin I acquired his ~~own~~ reign by proving himself in a military campaign, in which he impressed Toros and became ruler of Edessa. Baldwin II had only had daughters, so entrusted the throne to his daughter Melisende, which is the reason for the split kingdom with her and Baldwin III. He had a similar succession crisis with the division of the kingdom. Furthermore, Baldwin IV had leprosy, so was unable to have children. Instead, he prioritised his sister, Sibyll's marriage, and wanted her son to rule. All these kings had similar issues with the succession of the kingdom, ~~and~~ whether that was acquiring it; Baldwin I, and II besting a succession rival Eustace of Boulogne, or ^{whether that was} entrusting it to an heir. Although these problems were not

(Section B continued) completely similar, they were continuous throughout each of their reigns, an evidence of their rule not being so different.

~~In conclusion~~

* Therefore, the earlier kings had similar consolidation of their power, unlike the later kings.

In conclusion, it is true to say that the rule of kings Baldwin I and II were different from the later ones to a large extent. This is proven by the earlier kings success in their consolidation of territory and castle building scheme, which the later kings were not as effective at due to personal issues. This is further proven by Baldwin I and II being individual leaders, whereas Baldwin III had to split his kingdom and Baldwin IV had Raymond as his regent when he had leprosy. It could however be argued that the kings had somewhat similar issues of succession, whether that was acquiring Jerusalem or entrusting it to an heir, however this judgement doesn't prove anything, as the problems were not directly linked, for example Baldwin IV's leprosy wasn't inherited from the previous kings. Therefore the rule of Baldwin I and II ^{was} significantly

(Section B continued) *different from the later rule.*



This is an example of a level 5 response. Whilst the introduction lacks full direction, the remainder of the response is sustained and exploratory responding fully to the second order concept. There is ample analysis of consolidation, leadership and control and succession. The time frame and the conceptual focus are kept at the heart of this answer. The focus is on similarities and differences throughout. Criteria are established and used to formulate judgements; however relative significance is not evaluated. This answer was awarded level 5, 19 marks.



Essays in section B cover a longer time frame than section A. Plan to cover the time frame before you start writing

Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider how far the failure of the Second Crusade was the main turning point in the fortunes of the crusader states in the years 1100-92. Candidates found the question accessible.

Successful candidates maintained a focus on the conceptual focus of change. At the top end change was exemplified as in the indicative content of the mark scheme. Discussions centred around the weakened defences of the crusader states after failing to recapture Edessa and take Damascus as well as the limited amount of aid from Europe after the failure of the Second Crusade. Alternative turning points were commonly addressed through the founding of the military orders and factional disputes that followed the death of Baldwin II. The best answers were evaluative and utilised the whole time frame of the question.

At level 3 there was often plenty of rewardable, relevant material offered, but the criteria by which to make a judgement was less secure. In some cases, candidates provided a range of turning points but did not focus on change or wholly centred their discussion on the Second Crusade without consideration of alternatives.

Less successful candidates did not utilise the time frame posed by the question, meaning that their responses fell short of the demands of the question posed this year.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

I would not say that the failure of the Second Crusade was the main turning point in the fortune of the Crusader states as there is not a serious decline until the death of Baldwin IV which was a more primary turning point given that prior to his death ~~the crusader states were~~ in 1185 the Crusader states were much more stable and fortunate. The Second Crusade's failure certainly puts the ~~ineptitude~~ ineptitude of the Crusader states on full display however it is not the main turning point in their fortune.

The failure of the Second Crusade was certainly a turning point for the fortunes as before, the Crusader states were more fortunate in terms of ~~both~~ both military and socioeconomic success. During the reign of Baldwin I of Jerusalem the Crusader states were successfully able to outcompete the Muslim threats by way of military force, five times between 1109-1115, Baldwin I was able to repel attacks from the Shi'ah Fatimids in Egypt, showing his military strength

(Section B continued)

in the face of adversity, furthermore the Crusader states were also able to ~~more~~ successfully rely on trade not only through seaports making connections in the west but also ~~to~~ trade with Muslim cities like Damascus, ~~the~~ both militarily and economically before the Second Crusade the Crusader states were fortunate however the failure of the Second Crusade began to shift these fortunes.

The Second Crusade was a turning point in both military and economic fortune however it was not the main turning point as it is only a prerequisite to the later metamorphosis of crusader fortunes. Of course ~~now~~ before the Second Crusade, the Crusader state of Edessa was destroyed by the Muslim leader of Mosul and Aleppo, Zengi, in 1146 which greatly weakened the defence of the states as there was no natural boundaries to protect them in the east and the fall of Edessa and the massacre of 15,000 Franks there was certainly demoralising for the Crusader states. More military defeat was to follow, as the failure to siege Damascus resulted in the

(Section B continued)

disbanding of the Second Crusade and the loss of an important trading partnership with Damascus left the Crusader states in despair however following the Second Crusade, the Crusader ~~fortunes~~ States fortunes did improve showing that despite the immense failure, showing their glaring weaknesses, the Second Crusade was not the main turning point.

(Section B continued)

Gusard shows that the Crusader states military fortunes have increased. ~~But~~ The death of Baldwin IV was the main turning point for the fortunes of the Crusader states as he died in 1185 and soon Saladin had massacred the Crusader ~~the~~ army at the Battle of Hattin capturing the new King of Jerusalem Guy in 1187 and soon capturing Jerusalem in 1187. This sudden and land slide shift in Crusader states fortune shows the main turning point to be the death of Baldwin IV in 1185 not the failure of the Second Crusade in 1148. Although the Crusader states saw small success in the third Crusade under Richard Lionheart at the Battle of Arsuf in 1189 and the capture of Acre also in 1189, the Crusader states never again were able to hold Jerusalem.

Overall, although the failure of the Second Crusade was a turning point in the Crusader states fortune seeing a short but drastic decrease in Crusader states fortunes in all military, social and economic areas, it was not a permanent change and the Crusader states managed to rebuild and succeed.

(Section B continued)

militarily and politically under Baldwin IV, furthermore following his death in 1185 the fortunes of the Crusader states underwent a metamorphosis, losing military campaigns and the Holy City of Jerusalem which was never reclaimed.



This is part of an answer operating in level 4. The candidate shows awareness of the position the crusader states were in prior to the Second Crusade and then addresses why the Second Crusade was and was not a turning point. The answer includes sufficient knowledge. A strength of this response is its clarity on 'change'. The answer was awarded level 4, 15 marks.



Turning point questions are addressing change as a conceptual focus. Successful candidates will show an understanding of what the situation was like both before and after the turning point to be able to assess its role. When addressing 'main' turning points, it is advisable to discuss alternatives and evaluate these against the turning point given in the question.

Question 5

Question 5 asked candidates to consider whether the failure of the Fourth Crusade was due to the lack of effective organisation. The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of the extracts in terms of the lack of effective organisation (extract 1) versus the role of events outside Innocent III's control (extract 2).

Candidates at the top end could develop the interpretations in both extracts through the addition of their own evidence and argument. The majority of successful candidates knew about the Treaty of Venice as well as external circumstances relating to leaders. The lack of effective leadership appears to have been well understood. The counter argument concerning effective financial and spiritual preparations was exemplified well as was the recruitment of effective new leaders. Many successfully brought in knowledge of Venetian interests and Alexius' intervention.

Candidates at level 3 tended to spend too long explaining the content of the extracts rather than engaging with the interpretations that they offered. This meant they were judging the quality of the extract rather than the interpretations in them. It is worth noting that some candidates made incorrect assumptions about extract 1, believing that it was arguing for an anti-Byzantine conspiracy when it was actually doing the opposite.

Less successful candidates tended to select points in isolation and judge whether this was accurate by applying own knowledge. There were some examples of heavy description that veered away from the extracts and the debate under discussion. Candidates are reminded to keep the interpretations at the core of their responses for AO3 answers.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the failure of the Fourth Crusade was due to 'the lack of effective organisation' [Extract 1, line 10]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

It could be argued that the failure of the Fourth Crusade was due to 'the lack of effective organisation' as the crusade suffered diversions due to perhaps avoidable outcomes. However it could also be argued that the Fourth Crusade was organised and other factors contributed to the failure. To determine which interpretation is most convincing, accuracy will be considered.

Thomas Asbridge argues that the most significant cause for the failure of the Fourth Crusade was 'the lack of effective organisation'. While acknowledging the 'hatred' within leadership, Asbridge argues that 'it makes more sense' to blame the 'crusaders' inability to meet the terms of the Treaty of Venice in 1201. The crusaders had a lack of kingship leadership during the Fourth Crusade due to the ineffective organisation of papal legate Peter of Capua in being able to recruit a king to the cause. This meant that the Fourth crusade had to struggle in terms

of recruitment, only being able to supply 12,000 of the initial 34,000 men at Lido in 1201. This illustrates that ineffective organisation of Pope Innocent III and his legates led to poor recruitment, which consequently meant that the crusaders only supplied ~~3~~ 54,000 marks in comparison to the 81,000 marks required in the terms of the treaty. This meant that the crusaders were at the discretion of Venetian Doge Enrico Dandolo in order to recover their debt, leading to the campaign in Zara in 1202 rather than Outremer. This shows that the interpretation is convincing as due to ~~poor~~ ^{ineffective} organisation in recruit, the crusade was diverted, leading to its failure.

// Furthermore, Kbridge also argues that there was ineffective organisation in terms of ~~the~~ Innocent III's control over the crusaders, illustrated by 'events' showing that Rome 'could not impose its will on the crusade'. The campaign to Zara in 1202 was against the wishes of Pope Innocent III who condemned crusaders from taking part with the Venetians, as ~~the~~ Zara too was a Christian territory.

Due to ~~not~~ ineffective organisation in terms of papal leadership, Innocent's message was not proclaimed to the crusaders which meant that the crusaders who attacked Zara were excommunicated. This meant that the crusaders were required to take

a vow to not attack fellow Christians ~~is~~ in return for ~~their~~ salvation, thus highlighting ~~the~~ the poor organisation due to Innocent's inability to have control over the fourth crusade. This shows that poor organisation led to distractions, such as the campaign to Zara and the threat of excommunication, preventing the Fourth Crusade from being efficient and successful, thus highlighting the reason for its failure. This suggests that the interpretation is ~~more~~ convincing as both ~~poor~~ a ~~leader~~ organisation 'lack of effective organisation' in recruitment as well as papal influence and leadership illustrate the causes of the failure of the Fourth Crusade.

On the other hand, Phillips argues that there was organisation in the preparations for the Fourth Crusade, illustrated by Pope Innocent⁴'s attempts 'ask churchmen to provide both money and men for the crusade' as well as 'promise' those who didn't attend but 'paid' for the crusade would 'receive remission of sins to'. ~~By~~ This interpretation is somewhat convincing as Innocent did publish a church-wide crusade tax which suggests attempts were made to account for a lack of ~~King~~ Kingship on the Fourth Crusade, ~~in~~ terms of accumulating financial means. These attempts to gain financial

support are further illustrated through the papal indulgence 'port miserabile' which was also available to those who ~~were~~ did not wish to participate on the Fourth Crusade, but were able to contribute through financial contributions. This shows the attempts Innocent made to appeal to those who were physical (by means of age or illness) usually able to contribute to the crusade. This shows that ~~financial~~ organisation in terms of financial support was somewhat successful due to the attempts made by Pope Urban.

// However, while Kibridge considers the eventuality that the crusaders were unable to meet the terms of the Treaty of Venice 1201, Philip merely focuses on Innocent's attempts rather than the outcome. The eventuality of the ~~crusaders~~ crusaders only fulfilling 54,000 of the 81,000 marks required illustrates that Innocent's attempts at financial organisation were indeed not effective enough. Furthermore, Philip suggests that it was 'problems relating to timing' which led to a lack of highship, ~~the~~ illustrating a lack of regard ~~for~~ for Peter of Capua's alienation of both Richard I and ~~Philip~~ ^{Philip} II in his attempts for Richard to release the Bishop of Beauvais and Philip to reinstate his lawsuit with Rainer. Kibridge regards these as 'marriage-related difficulties' without

regard on for Peter of Capua's largely ~~was~~ unsuccessful role. This suggests that the interpretation is less valid ~~at~~ while it considers Innocent's attempts for successful organization is recruitment, it fails to regard the eventual failures of this as well as the ~~was~~ unsuccessful ~~role~~ of role of Peter of Capua in attempting organization through the ambition for king's support.

In conclusion, Asbridge's interpretation is somewhat convincing as it considers the attempts made by ~~again~~ Innocent to organise recruitment through terms of papal ~~indulgence~~ ^{indulgence}. However, ~~its failure~~ to regard Asbridge, it fails to regard the ~~fact~~ the ~~reality~~ outcome of Innocent's financial attempts and the debt ~~has~~ ~~left~~ ~~the~~ this ~~caused~~ caused to the crusaders, illustrating many attempts of to travel to Outremer were diverted to Zara. Furthermore Asbridge also suggests ineffective organization ~~was~~ is illustrated through the lack of papal control over the Fourth Crusade, demonstrated by the campaign to Zara in spite of Innocent's wishes. Therefore this shows that Asbridge's interpretation is accurate and ~~has~~ the most convincing. This shows that the failure of the Fourth Crusade can indeed be attributed to 'the lack of effective organisation'.



This is an example of an answer operating at the top of level 5. The focus of this response is on the interpretations throughout. There is a clear, confident and discriminatory approach from the opening. A plentiful range of issues about control, recruitment, agreements, preparations and leadership are raised from the interpretations which are then evaluated to test the interpretations of both authors. The candidate has 'convincing' at the heart of the response with comparisons throughout. This is a sustained and evaluative argument that understands and assesses the views in both extracts and tests the historical debate. The answer was awarded level 5, 20 marks.

4 paras!!!

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the failure of the Fourth Crusade was due to 'the lack of effective organisation' [Extract 1, line 10]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

It is ~~very~~ ^{quite} convincing that the failure of the fourth crusade was due to ineffective organisation as both interpretations highlight Pope Innocent's mistakes ~~which~~ ^{in being overzealous}, however the ~~concrete~~ both extracts also reference that some of the events were out of the Pope's control which can limit the view as it suggests that the crusade failed in spite of his preparation, not because of it.

The argument for ineffective planning made in ~~extract~~ extract 1 maintains that the crusade was poorly planned as events showed "Innocent in Rome could not impose his will on the crusade". This is shown in the events of the fourth crusade as at several instances, the pope's will was ignored, for example during the attack on 1202, Pope Innocent issued an encyclical (letter) stating that he condemned unprovoked attacks on Christian cities on behalf of the crusade and this letter was suppressed by leaders. Furthermore, when he condemned the plan to sack Constantinople (a Christian city) and clarified who would be excommunicated, his letter was once again suppressed. Even the end of the crusade happened against his suggestion as in 1205, his papal legate acted autonomously and absolved ~~the crusaders~~ ^{the crusading} wars. This suggests the view in the extract that notes that a series of 'unplanned' but necessary decisions had to be made in response to the crusaders' inability to pay off their debt to the Venetians. This reflects ineffective organisation as it shows that Pope Innocent's overzealousness of the

participation of the crusade led to a debt owed to the Venetians which indirectly ~~can~~ caused divisions that the Pope ^{eventually} then lost control over. Therefore, this can be used to suggest his role in the poor organisation is what led to the failure of the First. However, the First extract also does make the point that the events unfolded

On the other hand, Extract 2 suggests that Innocent did prepare well for the fourth crusade as he set out 'practical measures' and ensured there would be provision for the crusaders. For example, he encouraged funding for the crusade by asking clergy for money, attempting to impose churchwide ^{taxes} ~~to help fund the~~ to help fund the crusade, even requesting 1/40th of church income. Additionally, he appropriated ^{successful} methods that he of previous popes by incentivising participation through indulgences; he offered remission of sins for crusaders but also offered partial indulgences for those willing to sponsor a crusader's campaign. This highlights ^{his} ~~his~~ ^{effective} ~~effective~~ ^{organisation} organised the crusade and supported provision etc which may suggest that the fourth crusade's failure was not caused by ineffective organisation.

However, extract 2 also notes Innocent's ambition and suggests that factors outside of his control were the reason for the failure of the crusade. For example, the extract mentions 'problems related to the timing of the crusade's launch' being outside Innocent's control. For example, he was 'denied' the leadership of two secular leaders in Philip II and Richard I because of Richard dying in battle and John's eventual promise to crusade being made too late. Furthermore, Philip II had been excommunicated and France had been placed on interdict by the pope legate because of his unlawful marriage. However, as noted in the extract, Innocent still ensured to recruit prominent nobles in Thibault of Champagne and Louis of Blois reflecting that although he had failed to secure European kings, he had still ensured high recruitment by ^{enlisting} ~~enlisting~~ powerful nobles. This therefore indicates that the crusade was not poorly organised and Innocent had made alternative arrangements to account for his losses.

In conclusion, the view that the crusade was ineffective is quite convincing because of its poor timing, poor provision and too insufficient participation; however, the extracts note that this was not necessarily due to organisation and these factors were out of his control and he at several instances tried to rectify these mistakes/losses and was ignored.



This is an example of a response at level 4. The answer sees a range of points and offers a discussion of the evidence, however, whilst the interpretations are understood, there is a lack of comparison. Issues from the extracts are clearly integrated with own knowledge to discuss the views with poor planning, financial and spiritual preparations and leadership all addressed. This is balanced, addressing most of the relevant aspects. The answer was awarded level 4, 15 marks.



Comparison of common issues within the extracts is advised.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (eg main factor) as well as some other factors
- Explaining their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – eg a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Paying little attention to the precise demands of the question, eg writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (eg looking at other significant issues/consequences with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of alternatives
- Assertion of change, causation, significance or consequence, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this fitted the issue within the question
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong

focus on these as views on the question

- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, eg clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the extracts, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times this meant selection over sheer volume of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between interpretations, eg consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, eg extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these in relation to the arguments in the extracts
- Statements or evidence from the extracts being used in a manner contrary to that given in the extracts, eg through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought as to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

