

## **GCSE (9-1)**

### **History B (Schools History Project)**

**J411/31: Viking Expansion, c.750-c.1050 with The First Crusade, c.1070-1100**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

### **Mark Scheme for June 2023**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2023

**PREPARATION FOR MARKING****RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor assessor Online Training; OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **number of required** standardisation responses.

**MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.

5. **Crossed Out Responses**

Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

**Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions**

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (*The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.*)

**Contradictory Responses**

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

**Short Answer Questions** (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (*The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.*)

**Short Answer Questions** (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

**Longer Answer Questions** (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. Award No Response (NR) if:
  - there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.

9. *Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.*

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

## 11. Annotations

<i>Stamp</i>	<i>RefNo.</i>	<i>Annotation Name</i>	<i>Description</i>
 1	1191	Tick 1	Level 1
 2	1201	Tick 2	Level 2
 3	1211	Tick 3	Level 3
 4	1221	Tick 4	Level 4
 5	1231	Tick 5	Level 5
 6	1241	Tick 6	Level 6
 SEEN	811	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
 NAQ	501	NAQ	Not answered question
	1371	H Wavy Line	Incorrect/ muddled/ unclear
 BP	1681	BP	Blank page
	151	Highlight	Part of response which is rewardable (at one of the levels on the MS)

	11	Tick	Tick
---	----	------	------

## 12. Subject Specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader/PE.

### INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.

3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

**Mark Scheme****Section A: Viking Expansion, c.750–c.1050**

<b>Question 1 – 3 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Identify one important trading town within the Viking homelands in c.750.</li> <li>b) Identify one Anglo-Saxon kingdom that became part of the Danelaw.</li> <li>c) Give one reason for Svein Forkbeard's attacks on England.</li> </ul>	
<b>Guidance</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>
1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(a), likely valid responses include: Ribe, Hedeby, Birka and Kaupang.</i>
1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(b), likely valid responses include: Mercia, Northumbria, East Anglia or Essex.</i> <b><i>Do not accept Wessex, Sussex or Kent.</i></b>
1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(c) likely valid responses include: Previous Viking successes in attacking England; England was richer than Denmark, England had weak/ divided government at the time; supply of silver from the far east had dried up, the massacre of St. Brice's Day; Danegeld/ extortion</i>  <b><i>Do not accept: overly generalised comments which could apply to any Viking raids, any time, any place, e.g. 'For gold'. Do not accept 'Ethelred was only 12/ inexperienced (he had been on the thrones since 978 and 36 at the time of the first raids).</i></b>  Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.

<b>Question 2 – 9 marks</b> <b>Write a clear and organised summary that analyses the role of gods in Viking society.</b> <b>Support your summary with examples.</b>		<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 3 marks</b>	<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates a well-selected range of valid knowledge of characteristic features that are fully relevant to the question, in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows sustained logical coherence, demonstrating clear use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows some logical coherence, demonstrating use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).		<i>Answers could consider aspects of one or more of the following: impact of beliefs in gods on practices (causation/ consequence); change in Viking gods over time, e.g. from worship of pagan gods to the Christian god (change); the importance of gods in Viking society, (significance).</i> <i>Answers may show understanding of second order concepts such as significance; cause and consequences; and change and continuity.</i>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1). The summary shows a very basic logical coherence, demonstrating limited use of at least one second order concept in attempting to find connections and to provide a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).		<i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise their answer, but the concepts do need to be apparent from the connections and chains of reasoning in the summary in order to meet the AO2 descriptors (see levels descriptors).</i>
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>

<b>Question 2–9 marks</b> <b>Write a clear and organised summary that analyses the role of gods in Viking society. Support your summary with examples.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b>	<p>Summary based on second order concept(s) with two or more valid supporting examples, e.g.</p> <p><b>[Consequence]</b>  <i>The Vikings honoured a range of gods and goddesses. This affected what happened in Vikings society at significant times. For example, they made offerings to the gods and called on them for help at important times, such as the birth of a baby.</i></p> <p><i>Vikings also believed the world would end with the final battle of Ragnarok ('doom of the gods') where everything would be destroyed. This belief may explain why they placed such value on fighting and living adventurously – because humankind was doomed anyway. [8]</i></p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Answers must cover at least two different roles in society for this level.</p>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b>	<p>Summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example, e.g.</p> <p><b>[Significance]</b>  <i>Viking gods played an important role in their society. For example, Vikings held gatherings in special places known as 'groves', led by a jarl. They built open-air altars and large statues of their gods. Sometimes these ceremonies lasted for several days and nights and included sacrifices. These were also places where important court cases or markets were held, showing how central to Viking society the gods were. [6]</i></p> <p><b>[Change]</b>  <i>In c.750, Vikings in Scandinavia were pagans who honoured gods like Odin and Thor. They made offerings to these gods on piles of stones called a horgr. However, this changed under Harald Bluetooth who was baptised as a Christian in 965. This led to Christianity becoming the official Danish religion and by the early 11<sup>th</sup> century Vikings were worshipping the Christian god – we can see this through the number of churches being built. [6]</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: Change involves saying from what to what.</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>	<p>Lists/descriptions of Viking gods/ role of gods in society with no organising concept, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In the early Viking age, most Vikings were pagans. There were three main Viking gods – Odin, Thor and Frey. There is evidence of the Vikings carrying out animal sacrifices to the gods. [3]</i></li> <li>• <i>Harald Bluetooth built a church in Jelling, which tells us that he worshipped the Christian god. [2]</i></li> <li>• <i>They believed that three worlds made up the universe – Asgard, Midgard and Hel. [1]</i></li> </ul>

	<p><i>OR</i></p> <p><b>Statement based on second order concept with no development or no valid specific examples, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>At the start of this period the Vikings worshipped pagan gods but by the end they worshipped the Christian god. [1]</i></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 3 – 10 marks</b> <b>What impact did the settlement of Volga Vikings have in eastern Europe? Explain your answer with examples.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 5 (9–10 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well-supported explanation (AO2).	<i>Explanations could consider: establishment of Staraya Ladoga as an important meeting point for trade; trade of goods from Scandinavia (e.g. honey, furs, ivory) and also from Constantinople and the Arab world (e.g. spices, silk, silver) with Vikings returning to Scandinavia via the settlements in eastern Europe; enslavement of Slav population to take to the Arab world and Byzantine Empire; control of the towns and river routes; establishment of defences; establishment of Novgorod and Kiev as major trading centres; Vladimir's rule and religious conversion brought Orthodox Christianity to Rus territory (along with the Greek alphabet, Byzantine law, education, culture, etc.).</i>
<b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).	<i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

<b>Question 3–10 marks</b> <b>What impact did the settlement of Volga Vikings have in eastern Europe? Explain your answer with examples.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 5 (9-10 marks)</b>	<p><b>Two or more impacts of Viking settlement in eastern Europe identified and fully explained e.g.</b></p> <p><i>One impact was the <b>establishment of important trading stations and towns</b> in eastern Europe, such as Staraya Lodata, Novgorod and Kiev. Lots of trade took place in these settlements, including trade of goods from Scandinavia (e.g. honey, furs and ivory) and also from Constantinople and the Arab world (e.g. spices, silk and silver) with Vikings returning to Scandinavia via the settlements in eastern Europe. <b>So Viking settlement increased prosperity and trade in the area.</b></i></p> <p><i>Another impact was on <b>religion and culture</b> in eastern Europe. Vladimir was the Rus ruler of Kiev from 987 to 1015. He had links with the Byzantine Empire and had converted to Christianity. <b>His influence meant that</b> Viking settlement had a big cultural impact, spreading Orthodox Christianity throughout the region, along with the Greek alphabet, Byzantine law, education and aspects of Byzantine music and literature. [10]</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</b>	<p><b>One impact of Viking settlement in eastern Europe identified and fully explained e.g.</b></p> <p><i>One <b>impact was the capture of slaves</b>. There was a trade in slaves to the Arab world and the Byzantine empire, and the Vikings were very effective in this business. They raided villages in eastern Europe and captured people to sell in the Byzantine and Islamic markets. So the Viking settlement in eastern Europe <b>had a negative impact on some local people, who were displaced from their homes.</b> [7]</i></p>
<b>Level-3 (5-6 marks)</b>	<p><b>Identifies an impact/ action of the Volga Vikings in EE and uses this to address question (but does not provide precise evidence), e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Vikings enslaved local people. This meant that Viking settlement in eastern Europe had a negative impact on people who were displaced from their homes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Under Vladimir, the Vikings spread Christianity. This brought a whole new religion to these parts of eastern Europe.</i></li> <li>• <i>Riurik established the 'New Fortress' at Novgorod. This helped to secure Viking control over Slav lands in this area.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Volga Vikings intermarried with the Slav population. This meant that over time, the Vikings became more like their Slav subjects.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Identifies an action of the Volga Vikings in EE and gives precise evidence (but does not explain the change or impact), e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Vikings brought new goods to the area. For example, they brought honey, furs and ivory from Scandinavia.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Vikings established new towns in eastern Europe, such as Novgorod and Kiev. Oleg became ruler of Kiev in 882 and his brother Vladimir</i></li> </ul>

	<p><i>followed him.</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: 5 marks for one action/impact identified; 6 marks for two or more</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b>	<p>Describes settlements, journeys or relevant events without identifying impact on eastern Europe, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Volga Vikings from Sweden travelled from Staraya Lodata down the Volkhov and Dnieper Rivers.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Scandinavians were a minority in Slav lands. They were known as the Rus.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> Identifies one or more impacts/actions of the Volga Vikings in Eastern Europe but with <b><u>neither</u></b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support from precise evidence</li> <li>• explaining why it was a change, e.g.</li> <li>• <i>They increased trade in the area.</i></li> <li>• <i>Riurik built a major fortified centre at Novgorod.</i></li> <li>• <i>They enslaved local people.</i></li> <li>• <i>They developed the area by establishing big towns such as Kiev.</i></li> <li>• <i>They brought Christianity to the area.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>	<p>Valid but general assertions, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>They developed the area.</i></li> </ul>

	<p><b><i>OR Simply identifies Viking settlements (without description), e.g.</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>The Vikings had an impact on Kiev.</i></li></ul>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 4* – 18 marks</b> <b>'The Vikings were successful in attacking western Europe between 793 and 879 because of the quality of their ships.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description BUT to achieve the highest two levels answers must consider both reasons to support and reasons to challenge the statement.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Grounds for agreeing include: speed of ships under oar and sail meant Viking raiders could attack targets with an element of surprise and make a quick getaway; design of the longships meant they did not need a jetty, so could be pulled up onto a beach and easily pushed out again, escaping pursuers; shallow-draughted boats gave them the ability to go inland up navigable rivers and muddy estuaries; size of the ships – large enough to carry a crew of over 50.</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: weakness of western Europe (e.g. local chieftans in Ireland; small kingdoms in England; weakness of Frankish empire following Charlemagne's and Louis the Pious' death) meant there was a lack of united opposition to the attacks; choice of targets for hit-and-run raids (e.g. isolated monasteries on the coast); use of winter camps meant raiding could begin early spring; use of holding monks to ransom; high-quality weapons (e.g. double-edged swords, axes, spears); tactics in battle (e.g. role of berserkers, brutality towards monks, use of the shield wall).</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance, and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 4* – 18 marks 'The Vikings were successful in attacking western Europe between 793 and 879 because of the quality of their ships.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer. Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p>Balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other (2-2 or 3-1). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree with this statement to a large extent. Advances in ship building were crucial for successful Viking attacks on western Europe. Firstly, the longships were light and slim and could therefore reach great speeds – 5 knots using the oars and up to 20 knots under the sail in strong winds. This meant that Viking attacks in western Europe were successful because they could arrive with an element of surprise and also allow the warriors to make a quick getaway with their plunder.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the shallow draught of the longships meant that they could float in quite shallow water and didn't need a jetty to land – they could simply be pulled up on a beach. This gave the Vikings the ability to go far inland up navigable rivers and muddy estuaries. This meant that they could successfully attack trading towns as well as just coastal monasteries, as they did in England and the Frankish Empire from the mid 800s, when they burned the town of Rouen.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the success of the Viking attacks wasn't all down to their ships. Areas of western Europe were quite weak at this time, making them vulnerable to Viking attack. For example, England was divided into small kingdoms – East Anglia, Mercia, Wessex and Northumbria. The lack of united opposition was one reason for the successful invasion of England by the Great Heathen Army, because they could deal separately with each kingdom.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, Viking attacks were successful because of their military culture. The Vikings were fierce warriors. A key example would be their lack of respect for monks or their religion, and how they did not hesitate to use violence and murder in their raids on monasteries. For example, at Lindisfarne in 793, one Anglo-Saxon writer describes how the Vikings seized younger members of the community and led them off into captivity. So the Vikings were successful because they were ruthless in acquiring their plunder if there was any resistance.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I do agree with the statement because although the Vikings did pick weaker targets and use brutal tactics, it was the superior design of their ships which allowed them to take advantage of these targets – without the ability to travel at speed and get away fast, their enemies may have been able to resist their tactics more successfully. [18]</i></p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) (2-1) e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree with this statement to a large extent. Advances in ship building were crucial for successful Viking attacks on western Europe. Firstly, the longships were light and slim and could therefore reach great speeds – 5 knots using the oars and up to 20 knots under the sail in strong winds. This meant that Viking attacks in western Europe were successful because they could arrive with an element of surprise and also allow the warriors to make a quick getaway with their plunder.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the shallow draught of the longships meant that they could float in quite shallow water and didn't need a jetty to land – they could simply be pulled up on a beach. This gave the Vikings the ability to go far inland up navigable rivers and muddy estuaries. This meant that they could successfully attack trading towns as well as just coastal monasteries, as they did in England and the Frankish Empire from the mid 800s, when they burned the town of Rouen.</i></p>

	<p><i>On the other hand, the success of the Viking attacks wasn't all down to their ships. Areas of western Europe were quite weak at this time, making them vulnerable to Viking attack. For example, England was divided into small kingdoms – East Anglia, Mercia, Wessex and Northumbria. The lack of united opposition was one reason for the successful invasion of England by the Great Heathen Army, because they could deal separately with each kingdom.</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument, two explained points of support (2-0), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I agree with this statement. Advances in ship building were crucial for successful Viking attacks on western Europe. Firstly, the longships were light and slim and could therefore reach great speeds – 5 knots using the oars and up to 20 knots under the sail in strong winds. This meant that Viking attacks in western Europe were successful because they could arrive with an element of surprise and also allow the warriors to make a quick getaway with their plunder.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the shallow draught of the longships meant that they could float in quite shallow water and didn't need a jetty to land – they could simply be pulled up on a beach. This gave the Vikings the ability to go far inland up navigable rivers and muddy estuaries. This meant that they could successfully attack trading towns as well as just coastal monasteries, as they did in England and the Frankish Empire from the mid 800s, when they burned the town of Rouen.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1-1), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I agree with this statement to a large extent. Advances in ship building were crucial for successful Viking attacks on western Europe. Firstly, the longships were light and slim and could therefore reach great speeds – 5 knots using the oars and up to 20 knots under the sail in strong winds. This meant that Viking attacks in western Europe were successful because they could arrive with an element of surprise and also allow the warriors to make a quick getaway with their plunder.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the success of the Viking attacks wasn't all down to their ships. Areas of western Europe were quite weak at this time, making them vulnerable to Viking attack. For example, England was divided into small kingdoms – East Anglia, Mercia, Wessex and Northumbria. The lack of united opposition was one reason for the successful invasion of England by the Great Heathen Army, because they could deal separately with each kingdom.</i></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument; one explained point of support (1-0), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I agree with this statement. Advances in ship building were crucial for successful Viking attacks on western Europe. Firstly, the longships were light and slim and could therefore reach great speeds – 5 knots using the oars and up to 20 knots under the sail in strong winds. This meant that Viking attacks in western Europe were successful because they could arrive with an element of surprise and also allow the warriors to make a quick getaway with their plunder.</i></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p><b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No, I disagree because I also think their battle tactics like the use of the shield wall and the berserkers made them successful.</i></li> <li>• <i>Yes, I agree because their longships were fast and allowed them to get away quickly after a raid.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively, description of Viking ships/ warfare/ raiding/ invasions/ relevant events without using this to address the question of reasons for success, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In 793 the Vikings were carrying out small hit-and-run raids in England but by 865 a large army launched a full invasion.</i></li> <li>• <i>Vikings used longships which had a shallow draught meaning they didn't need deep water. They had holes for oars, positioned low down the sides of the ships, and square sails.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>1 identifications/ description = 4-5 marks</b>  <b>2 identifications/ descriptions = 5-6 marks</b></p>

	<b>3 identifications/ descriptions = 6 marks</b>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes, I agree because their ships were fast.</i></li><li>• <i>No, they were successful because of things like good battle tactics.</i></li></ul>

<b>Question 5* – 18 marks</b> <b>How far do you agree that Viking settlers transformed the places they settled in western Europe? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT, to achieve the two highest levels, answers must consider some of the grounds for arguing the opposite point of view to the one that they finally support.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and significance, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Grounds for agreeing include:</i>  <b>Scotland and the islands:</b> Political changes, e.g. by 1000, the kings of Norway had set up an Earldom of the Orkneys, and a Kingdom of the Isles that included the Hebrides and the Isle of Man; some historians argue that the Picts were wiped out; the Shetlands and the Orkneys were dominated by the Vikings who brought wives and families from Norway; until the 18th century, some people on the islands spoke their own language, Norn, which was similar to Norwegian; all the place names on the islands are of Norse origin; high level of people on Shetland/Orkneys have male Scandinavian ancestors.
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	<b>England:</b> Political changes, e.g. Vikings held the Danelaw securely 878–927 (jarls, burhs, etc.); long-lasting influence of Viking customs, legal system, etc. in Danelaw and beyond; peasants given greater freedom in the Danelaw than elsewhere; impact of language and place names; development of Jorvik as a major Viking city and port (with extensive trading links) with a population of around 10,000.
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance, and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	<b>Ireland:</b> establishment of Dublin as a major trading base; enslavement and transportation of local
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

	<p><i>population.</i></p> <p><b>France:</b> significant Viking settlement in Normandy under Rollo; impact seen in Scandinavian place names along coast and larger rivers.</p> <p><b>Iceland:</b> first people to settle the land on a large scale; majority of modern Icelandic residents descended from first Viking settlers; the Vikings recreated Norwegian society in Iceland.</p> <p><b>Greenland:</b> Vikings established two settlements there and lives there between c.983 and 1400s.</p> <p>Grounds for disagreeing include:</p> <p><b>Scotland and the islands:</b> Some archaeological evidence points to Vikings being eager to adopt local customs (e.g. choice of burial site special to the Picts); some historians think the Vikings settled and lived alongside the Picts;</p> <p><b>England:</b> absorption into local population and adoption of established Anglo-Saxon customs (e.g. use of sculptured tombstones) and adoption of its language(s); Pagan worship alongside Christianity but on balance the Christianisation of Vikings (e.g. churches built by Vikings in Jorvik); housing remains in Jorvik show that, at least until the mid-tenth century, Anglo-Saxon structures remained predominant; areas of Britain were less affected or unaffected by Viking settlement.</p> <p><b>Ireland:</b> few Vikings moving to /conquering the interior; loss of Viking identity, e.g. conversion to Christianity, intermarriage and becoming Gaelic-speakers.</p> <p><b>France:</b> Relatively little colonisation of Normandy further inland; Vikings in Normandy quickly took on a French identity, e.g. conversion to Christianity, marriage into French families and adoption of French language and customs (e.g. fighting on horseback).</p> <p><b>Greenland:</b> only two very small settlements; lack of integration with local Inuit population; disappearance by 1400s.</p>
--	---

<b>Question 5* – 18 marks</b> <b>How far do you agree that Viking settlers transformed the places they settled in western Europe? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b> <b>NOTE: Candidates might approach this thematically (e.g. language, culture, religion, politics, etc.) or by looking at different areas of settlement. Either approach is acceptable.</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p>Balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <b>OR</b> three on one side and one on the other <b>(2-2 or 3-1)</b>. Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. In England, Viking law and culture was well established in the Danelaw between 878 and 927, and had a lasting impact beyond that time. For example, they brought their use of 'things' to the system of law (from which the jury system derives). They also transformed Eoforwic into Jorvik and developed it into a major port city in northern Europe, with extensive trading links. So the Vikings left a distinctive mark in England in many ways.</i></p> <p><i>As well as this, it can be argued that the Vikings transformed many of the Scottish islands. By 1000, the kings of Norway had set up an Earldom of the Orkneys, and a Kingdom of the Isles that included the Hebrides and the Isle of Man. The Shetlands and the Orkneys were dominated by the Vikings who brought wives and families from Norway and right up until the 18th century, some people on the islands spoke their own language, Norn, which was similar to Norwegian. So the Scottish islands were transformed both politically and culturally.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also an argument that the Vikings did not completely 'transform' England because in many ways the Vikings were absorbed into the local population and adapted many of the established Anglo-Saxon customs. For example, the Vikings converted quite quickly to Christianity soon after moving to England, and several churches in Jorvik were built by the Vikings. So it could be said that although the Vikings controlled England in the Danelaw, they did not completely 'transform' it.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, there are areas in western Europe where the Vikings themselves were highly influenced in the areas they settled. For instance, in Normandy, the Vikings quickly took on a French identity through conversion to Christianity, marriage into French families and adoption of French language and customs such fighting on horseback. This shows that far from 'transforming' Normandy, the Vikings shed a lot of their previous identity and took on a new one.</i></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the Vikings a large and lasting impact, but more so in some areas (such as the Scottish islands) than others (such as Normandy). Even in areas where their influence was very strong, such as England, one reason for their success was their adaptation of local customs and traditions, so it would be going too far to say they completely 'transformed' the places they settled.</i></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) <b>(2-1)</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. In England, Viking law and culture was well established in the Danelaw between 878 and 927, and had a lasting impact beyond that time. For example, they brought their use of 'things' to the system of law (from which the jury system derives). They also transformed Eoforwic into Jorvik and developed it into a major port city in northern Europe, with extensive trading links. So the Vikings left a distinctive mark in England in many ways.</i></p> <p><i>As well as this, it can be argued that the Vikings transformed many of the Scottish islands. By 1000, the kings of Norway had set up an Earldom of the Orkneys, and a Kingdom of the Isles that included the Hebrides and the Isle of Man. The Shetlands and the Orkneys were dominated by the Vikings who brought wives and families from Norway and right up until the 18th century, some people on the islands spoke their own language, Norn, which was similar to Norwegian. So the Scottish islands were transformed both politically and culturally.</i></p>

	<p>However, there is also an argument that the Vikings did not completely 'transform' England because in many ways the Vikings were absorbed into the local population and adapted many of the established Anglo-Saxon customs. For example, the Vikings converted quite quickly to Christianity soon after moving to England, and several churches in Jorvik were built by the Vikings. So it could be said that although the Vikings controlled England it in the Danelaw, they did not completely 'transform' it.</p>
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p><b>One sided argument, two explained points of support (2-0), e.g.</b>  <i>I agree. In England, Viking law and culture was well established in the Danelaw between 878 and 927, and had a lasting impact beyond that time. For example, they brought their use of 'things' to the system of law (from which the jury system derives). They also transformed Eoforwic into Jorvik and developed it into a major port city in northern Europe, with extensive trading links. So the Vikings left a distinctive mark in England in many ways.</i></p> <p><i>As well as this, in the Vikings transformed many of the Scottish islands. By 1000, the kings of Norway had set up an Earldom of the Orkneys, and a Kingdom of the Isles that included the Hebrides and the Isle of Man. The Shetlands and the Orkneys were dominated by the Vikings who brought wives and families from Norway and right up until the 18th century, some people on the islands spoke their own language, Norn, which was similar to Norwegian. So the Scottish islands were transformed politically and culturally.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1-1), e.g.</b>  <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. In England, Viking law and culture was well established in the Danelaw between 878 and 927, and had a lasting impact beyond that time. For example, they brought their use of 'things' to the system of law (from which the jury system derives). They also transformed Eoforwic into Jorvik and developed it into a major port city in northern Europe, with extensive trading links. So the Vikings left a distinctive mark in England in many ways.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also an argument that the Vikings did not completely 'transform' England because in many ways the Vikings were absorbed into the local population and adapted many of the established Anglo-Saxon customs. For example, the Vikings converted quite quickly to Christianity soon after moving to England, and several churches in Jorvik were built by the Vikings. So it could be said that although the Vikings controlled England it in the Danelaw, they did not completely 'transform' it..</i></p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p><b>One sided argument; one explained point of support (1-0), e.g.</b>  <i>I agree. In England, Viking law and culture was well established in the Danelaw between 878 and 927, and had a lasting impact beyond that time. For example, they brought their use of 'things' to the system of law (from which the jury system derives). They also transformed Eoforwic into Jorvik and developed it into a major port city in northern Europe, with extensive trading links. So the Vikings left a distinctive mark in England in many ways.</i></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p><b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, I agree because there are lots of Scandinavian place names in England, such as Whitby and Lowestoft.</li> <li>• Yes, they transformed Ireland by taking local people as slaves.</li> <li>• No, they had to abandon Greenland because the climate became too difficult.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively, description of Viking settlements/ relevant events without using this to address the question of change/ transformation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Vikings settled in various places in Britain, such as the Shetland and Orkney islands. On the Isle of Man, Viking graves have been found marked by the Christian cross as well as figures from Norse mythology.</li> <li>• In York, archaeologists have found many Viking items such cooking pots, brooches and shoes from the time of the Danelaw.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 identifications/ description = 4-5 marks</b></p>

	2 identifications/ descriptions = 5–6 marks 3 identifications/ descriptions = 6 marks
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<b>Valid but general assertion(s), or naming areas of settlement, e.g.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No, they often fitted in with the local population.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Vikings settled in the Danelaw in England.</i></li> </ul>

## Section B: The First Crusade, c.1070-1100

<b>Question 6 – 7 marks</b> <b>What can Source A tell us about the power of the papacy? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 2 marks</b> AO3 Analyse sources (contemporary to the period). <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO3 are equal in levels 1, AO3 carries greater weight in level 2 and greater weight again in level 3.	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 3 (6–7 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows strong awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify a wide range of features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	<i>Valid features that answers could identify include:</i> <b>Surface features</b> (L1) – Tells us the church was founded by God; Popes could depose/reinstate bishops etc  <i>Inferences from the source's content</i> (L2) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Useful as evidence about Papacy's control of Church, e.g. doctrinal texts, control of bishops</li> <li>• Useful as evidence about the power of the Papacy over secular authorities e.g. deposing, kissing feet</li> </ul> <i>Inferences from the source's purpose</i> (L3) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fact that pope is trying to assert authority is useful as evidence about relations between the Papacy and the rest of the church AND/OR rulers of Christian Europe, i.e. evidence of challenge to papal authority.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2 (3–5 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows some awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify some features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	<i>There is no requirement to mention any possible limitations of the source.</i> <i>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations of the source unless this is explicitly used to help to say what the source "can tell us" in relation to the focus of the question.</i> <i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). Analyses the source to identify at least one feature that relates to the focus of the question; this may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

<b>Question 6 – 7 marks</b> <b>What can Source A tell us about the power of the papacy? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.</b> <b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 3 (6-7 marks)</b>	<p><b>Explains how the source reveals that there have been challenges to papal authority by making a valid inference from its purpose, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>Source A is useful as evidence about the relationship between the papacy and the rulers of Christian Europe. The source gives the impression that the Pope has authority. For example, it states that princes should kiss the feet of the Pope and even claims that a Pope might have the right to depose an emperor. However, <b>this reveals that there are challenges to his authority</b> because if he really had the authority set out in the document he would not have needed to issue it.</i>  <i>[It is likely that candidates will refer to Gregory VII's disputes with Emperor Henry IV to support claims but this is not essential for L3]</i></p> <p><b>NOTE 1:</b> Valid inference with valid source support = 7 marks, no valid source support = 6 marks  <b>NOTE 2:</b> Stating the purpose, etc. is not the same as making an inference from the purpose.</p>
<b>Level 2 (3-5 marks)</b>	<p><b>Explains what source tells us the power of the papacy by using a valid inference from content of source, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source A is useful as evidence about the power of Papacy in Latin Christendom. It shows us that the papacy had control of all of the important aspects of the Church. For example, it controlled the approval of books. (4 marks)</i></li> <li>• <i>Source A is useful as evidence about the power of papacy in Latin Christendom. It shows us that the papacy had power over Christian rulers. The source says they were to kiss the feet of the Pope. It says that the Pope could possibly depose the emperor. (5 marks)</i></li> <li>• <i>Source A shows that the papacy was really powerful. (3 marks)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE 1:</b> Valid inference(s) with no relevant support from the source = 3 marks.  <b>NOTE 2:</b> 1 supported inference + 2<sup>nd</sup> inference (supported or unsupported) = 5 marks</p>
<b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>	<p><b>Lifts surface detail from source or general comments on provenance to address question (2 marks), e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source A tells us that only the papacy can depose or reinstate bishops.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source informs us that the papacy was sending out instructions to rulers.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively, makes valid but general assertion(s) OR</b>  <b>Answers which make comments on source without addressing the question of what it can tell us about the power of the papacy (1 mark), e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The source says/informs us about what was happening in the Holy Land in the 1070s.</i></li> </ul>
<b>0 marks</b>	<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.

<b>Question 7 – 15 marks</b> <b>How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying the Battle of Dorylaeum (July 1097)? In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO3</b> Analyse, evaluate and use sources (contemporary to the period) to make substantiated judgements, in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO3 and AO4 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources and interpretations may be combined in responses.</b>	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Surface features</b> of source / interpretations (L2) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing: the Turks attacked the crusaders from all sides; that they used arrows; that the Crusaders stood their ground; Bohemond was in command. C is useful because it shows us that the Turks surrounded the crusaders on all sides; and that the crusaders prayed to God for help. D is useful for showing us that the Turks had mounted archers; and that Raymond of Toulouse provided reinforcement.</i></li> <li>• <b>Inferences from the source / interpretations</b> (L3–L5) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing us how unprepared the crusaders felt for fighting the Muslims – the shock expressed in the source reveals they were not used to this type of warfare; it also provides reasons for the Turks' defeat, e.g. leadership of Bohemond; C is useful for revealing how the Crusaders explained the battle in relation to their religion, i.e. difficulty in battle as a result of sinful behaviour; D is also useful for highlighting the importance/ significance of the battle in the story of the First Crusade, i.e. its outcome allowed the Crusaders to progress to Antioch unimpeded by Arslan; D also highlights the differences in military techniques/ traditions between the two armies.</i></li> <li>• <b>Understanding of appropriate characteristic features</b> could include: <i>nature of Turkish warfare; Crusader forces being scattered under different leaders; difficulty faced by Crusaders in getting supplies; close combat fighting in the battle; skillful leadership by Bohemond; impact of the battle on Crusader tactics; attributing victory to favour of God.</i></li> <li>• <b>Less well-developed comments will probably include –</b></li> <li>• <b>(L3) Comments which support or challenge the evidence presented in sources with candidates' own knowledge,</b></li> </ul>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Surface features</b> of source / interpretations (L2) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing: the Turks attacked the crusaders from all sides; that they used arrows; that the Crusaders stood their ground; Bohemond was in command. C is useful because it shows us that the Turks surrounded the crusaders on all sides; and that the crusaders prayed to God for help. D is useful for showing us that the Turks had mounted archers; and that Raymond of Toulouse provided reinforcement.</i></li> <li>• <b>Inferences from the source / interpretations</b> (L3–L5) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing us how unprepared the crusaders felt for fighting the Muslims – the shock expressed in the source reveals they were not used to this type of warfare; it also provides reasons for the Turks' defeat, e.g. leadership of Bohemond; C is useful for revealing how the Crusaders explained the battle in relation to their religion, i.e. difficulty in battle as a result of sinful behaviour; D is also useful for highlighting the importance/ significance of the battle in the story of the First Crusade, i.e. its outcome allowed the Crusaders to progress to Antioch unimpeded by Arslan; D also highlights the differences in military techniques/ traditions between the two armies.</i></li> <li>• <b>Understanding of appropriate characteristic features</b> could include: <i>nature of Turkish warfare; Crusader forces being scattered under different leaders; difficulty faced by Crusaders in getting supplies; close combat fighting in the battle; skillful leadership by Bohemond; impact of the battle on Crusader tactics; attributing victory to favour of God.</i></li> <li>• <b>Less well-developed comments will probably include –</b></li> <li>• <b>(L3) Comments which support or challenge the evidence presented in sources with candidates' own knowledge,</b></li> </ul>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).	
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Surface features</b> of source / interpretations (L2) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing: the Turks attacked the crusaders from all sides; that they used arrows; that the Crusaders stood their ground; Bohemond was in command. C is useful because it shows us that the Turks surrounded the crusaders on all sides; and that the crusaders prayed to God for help. D is useful for showing us that the Turks had mounted archers; and that Raymond of Toulouse provided reinforcement.</i></li> <li>• <b>Inferences from the source / interpretations</b> (L3–L5) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing us how unprepared the crusaders felt for fighting the Muslims – the shock expressed in the source reveals they were not used to this type of warfare; it also provides reasons for the Turks' defeat, e.g. leadership of Bohemond; C is useful for revealing how the Crusaders explained the battle in relation to their religion, i.e. difficulty in battle as a result of sinful behaviour; D is also useful for highlighting the importance/ significance of the battle in the story of the First Crusade, i.e. its outcome allowed the Crusaders to progress to Antioch unimpeded by Arslan; D also highlights the differences in military techniques/ traditions between the two armies.</i></li> <li>• <b>Understanding of appropriate characteristic features</b> could include: <i>nature of Turkish warfare; Crusader forces being scattered under different leaders; difficulty faced by Crusaders in getting supplies; close combat fighting in the battle; skillful leadership by Bohemond; impact of the battle on Crusader tactics; attributing victory to favour of God.</i></li> <li>• <b>Less well-developed comments will probably include –</b></li> <li>• <b>(L3) Comments which support or challenge the evidence presented in sources with candidates' own knowledge,</b></li> </ul>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b>	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Surface features</b> of source / interpretations (L2) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing: the Turks attacked the crusaders from all sides; that they used arrows; that the Crusaders stood their ground; Bohemond was in command. C is useful because it shows us that the Turks surrounded the crusaders on all sides; and that the crusaders prayed to God for help. D is useful for showing us that the Turks had mounted archers; and that Raymond of Toulouse provided reinforcement.</i></li> <li>• <b>Inferences from the source / interpretations</b> (L3–L5) – e.g., <i>B is useful for showing us how unprepared the crusaders felt for fighting the Muslims – the shock expressed in the source reveals they were not used to this type of warfare; it also provides reasons for the Turks' defeat, e.g. leadership of Bohemond; C is useful for revealing how the Crusaders explained the battle in relation to their religion, i.e. difficulty in battle as a result of sinful behaviour; D is also useful for highlighting the importance/ significance of the battle in the story of the First Crusade, i.e. its outcome allowed the Crusaders to progress to Antioch unimpeded by Arslan; D also highlights the differences in military techniques/ traditions between the two armies.</i></li> <li>• <b>Understanding of appropriate characteristic features</b> could include: <i>nature of Turkish warfare; Crusader forces being scattered under different leaders; difficulty faced by Crusaders in getting supplies; close combat fighting in the battle; skillful leadership by Bohemond; impact of the battle on Crusader tactics; attributing victory to favour of God.</i></li> <li>• <b>Less well-developed comments will probably include –</b></li> <li>• <b>(L3) Comments which support or challenge the evidence presented in sources with candidates' own knowledge,</b></li> </ul>

<p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).            Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3).            Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<p><i>rendering sources more or less useful in terms of typicality or reliability. Candidates may show how the sources/interpretation agree and/or disagree with each other.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (L2) <i>Undeveloped comments on how provenance of sources make them unreliable and therefore not useful, e.g. B and C were both written by Crusaders and therefore only show the Crusader perspective; all are written a long time after the battle and therefore not useful.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Candidates should not be rewarded above Level 1 for simply saying what is 'missing' from the sources e.g. 'Not useful because it has no information about ...'</i></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>            Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).            Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO3)            Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO4)            There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about usefulness of the interpretation(s) and the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question, or there is an assertion but this lacks any support or historical validity</p>	<p><i>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations unless this is explicitly used to help to say how it affects usefulness for the context given. Evaluation of usefulness may also involve making valid substantiated suggestions of other lines of enquiry for which the collection may be useful, but the focus given in the question must also be addressed.</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>            No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<b>Question 7 – 15 marks</b> <b>How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying the Battle of Dorylaeum (July 1097)? In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Supported inferences (<b>support from sources</b>) from <u>content of two</u> of B, C or D to explain why they are <b>useful</b> as evidence about the Battle of Dorylaeum (i.e. 2 x L4), e.g.</p> <p><i>Source B is useful for showing the reasons that the Crusaders emerged victorious from the battle. For example, the leadership of Bohemond was important – the author calls him 'wise' and describes how he 'commanded all the rest of Christ's soldiers' to march quickly to battle.</i></p> <p><i>Source C is also useful for showing how the Crusaders explained what happened in Dorylaeum in religious terms. Fulcher says, 'it was clear to us that this had happened because of sinful behaviour', showing how he put the difficulties they faced in battle down to divine punishment for corruption and greed.</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Supported inference(s) (<b>support from source</b>) from <u>content of one</u> of B, C or D to explain why it is <b>useful</b> as evidence about the Battle of Dorylaeum, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Source B is useful for showing the reasons that the Crusaders emerged victorious from the battle. For example, the leadership of Bohemond was important – the author calls him 'wise' and describes how he 'commanded all the rest of Christ's soldiers' to march quickly to battle.</i></li> <li><i>Source C is useful for showing how the Crusaders explained what happened in Dorylaeum in religious terms. Fulcher says, 'it was clear to us that this had happened because of sinful behaviour', showing how he put the difficulties they faced in battle down to divine punishment for corruption and greed.</i></li> <li><i>Interpretation D is useful because it highlights how significant the Battle of Dorylaeum was in the success of the First Crusade. Jones says that it was 'the moment the First Crusade truly sprang to life', and the defeat of the Turks allowed the Crusaders to progress to Antioch unimpeded by Arslan.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Valid but <b>unsupported inference(s)</b> from content to explain why one or more of B, C, D are <b>useful</b> as evidence about the Battle of Dorylaeum, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Source B is useful because it gives us some reasons why the Turks were defeated at Dorylaeum.</i></li> <li><i>Source C is useful for showing how the Crusaders were not used to the Turks' style of warfare.</i></li> <li><i>Interpretation D is useful because we can see how important winning the battle was to the progress of the Crusaders.</i></li> <li><i>Interpretation D reveals how different the military strategies of the Crusaders and the Turks were.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, <b>uses specific contextual knowledge (or purpose of B)</b> to argue that one or more of B, C or D are <b>useful or not useful</b> because they are <b>(un)reliable</b>, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Source B is trying to glorify the Crusader victory at Dorylaeum, so I don't think it's that useful because it exaggerates how much danger the Crusaders were in, in order to make their victory seem even more spectacular.</i></li> <li><i>D talks about the Turks' tactics of 'lightning raids' and 'hails of arrows' and I think this is useful because it's reliable. It's true that the Turks had a style of ambushing their enemies on horseback, with their archers able to fire arrows over sixty metres.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE: 1 source = 7-8 marks; 2 or more sources = 8-9 marks</b></p>

Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Uses <b>surface features or extracts</b> to argue source(s) are <b>useful</b> about the Battle of Dorylaeum, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>C is useful because it tells us that the crusaders prayed to God for help.</i> (4)</li> <li>• <i>Source B is useful for showing how the Turks attacked the crusaders from all sides. It also tells us how Bohemond got the Crusaders to hurry to the battlefield.</i> (5)</li> <li>• <i>B is useful because we learn that the Crusaders stood their ground even when they were caught by surprise by the Turks' attack. D is useful for showing us that the Turks had mounted archers and that Raymond of Toulouse provided the Crusader army with reinforcement.</i> (6)</li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, argues <b>useful or not useful</b> on the basis of <b>undeveloped provenance</b>, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>B and C were both written by Crusaders and therefore only show the Crusader perspective, so they are not useful because they are unreliable.</i> (4 marks)</li> <li>• <i>D is not useful as it was written a long time after the events of the battle in question.</i> (4 marks)</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE: undeveloped provenance – limit to 4 marks</b></p>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Valid but general assertion(s) and/or comments on the sources which <u>don't answer the question</u> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B is useful because it tells us about what it was really like to be in the middle of the battle.</i></li> <li>• <i>Interpretation D says that the Crusaders had a tactic of butchery at close quarters.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, argues <b>not useful</b> because of <b>what information the source(s) do not contain</b>, e.g.</p> <p><i>Source C is not very useful. It doesn't tell us about the lack of unity in the Crusader forces, which was a key reason for them struggling at Dorylaeum.</i></p>
0 marks	

<b>Question 8* – 18 marks</b> <b>‘The reason for the Crusaders’ success between October 1097 and July 1100 was their effective military tactics.’ How far do you agree with this view?</b>		<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b>		
<b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering the role of military tactics and alternative factors.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (reasons for successes) and consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	<i>Grounds for agreeing may include: The building of the ‘Malregard’ fort on the road to the north of Antioch, which protected the crusader camp from Turkish raids from the garrison; it also helped to control the road to the north and allowed crusaders access to food supplies; at Antioch, the building of a siege tower at Bridge Gate prevented ambushes by Turks from the city; the Crusaders established outposts in regions around Antioch and by April 1098 they had almost encircled the city and secured the surrounding area; Bohemund’s plan at the Battle of Antioch to attack the thin line of Muslim troops (keeping troops in reserve) worked and Kerbogha did not act quickly enough to crush the Crusaders; tunnelling under walls/ building siege engine led to the fall of Marrat in December 1098; organisation of troops around Jerusalem; successful use of siege engines, battering rams and scaling ladders at Jerusalem; surprise tactics at Ascalon.</i>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	<i>Grounds for disagreeing may include: Divisions in Muslim world, e.g. Seljuk governor of Antioch had no help as a power struggle was taking place in Seljuk lands; arrival of English fleet in spring 1098 ended the winter supply crisis at the siege of Antioch and brought skilled carpenters; it was Bohemond’s deal with Firuz</i>

	<p><i>which allowed the Crusaders to finally break through into Antioch; the discovery of the Holy Lance gave the Crusaders the conviction to fight against Kerbogha after being trapped in Antioch; it was more Muslim division, panic and chaos which lost them the battle of Antioch; use of vinegar to put out Greek fire on siege towers at Jerusalem; help from local Christians and Genoese sailors at Jerusalem; lack of unified Muslim response following sack of Jerusalem.</i></p>
--	---

Question 8* – 18 marks 'The reason for the Crusaders' success between October 1097 and July 1100 was their effective military tactics.' How far do you agree with this view? Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p><b>Balanced argument, two valid explained points on each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</b></p> <p><i>In relation to the Crusaders' success in capturing Antioch in June 1098, I disagree because it was more to do with other factors. The crusaders' siege was not very effective and it was actually Bohemond's agreement with the armour-maker, Firuz, which allowed them to sneak into the city. Firuz controlled one of the towers on the city's walls and allowed Bohemond and a small group to scale the walls of the tower. So Bohemond's cunning and negotiation led to their success in this case.</i></p> <p><i>Secondly, the Crusaders succeeded in defeating Kerbogha's forces partly as a result of the discovery of the Holy Lance in the Church of St. Peter. The unearthing of the lance provided the Crusaders with the conviction and morale they needed to take on Kerbogha's huge army after they had become trapped and surrounded in Antioch. They united behind Bohemond and went on to defeat Kerbogha.</i></p> <p><i>However, military tactics were important in helping the Crusaders take Jerusalem in 1099. They used local woods and Genoese ships to build two siege towers, each one three storeys high, and protected from fire and arrows by animal skins. On 15 July, Godfrey of Bouillon cut a section from one of the towers and used it to make a bridge to the wall. Crusaders rushed over the bridge and this allowed the Crusaders to gain a foothold on the walls, and the city's defences started to collapse.</i></p> <p><i>I also agree that effective military tactics were vital in helping the Crusaders defeat the Fatimids at the Battle of Ascalon. An army of 10,000 Fatimids had arrived at the port in August 1099. At dawn on 12 August, Godfrey of Bouillon launched a surprise attack on the Fatimid camp whilst the troops were still asleep. This gave the Fatimids no time to organise their cavalry. It was a savage battle and many Fatimids fled or hid. When theirs left, the remaining Fatimid fighters surrendered.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, while effective military tactics was not the only reason the Crusaders were successful in this period, I do think it was the most important reason, because without good tactics, they would not have been able to take advantage of cunning negotiation or a rise in morale: it was their tactics which allowed them to progress further.</i></p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p><b>Balanced argument supported by three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>In relation to the Crusaders' success in capturing Antioch in June 1098, I disagree because it was more to do with other factors. The crusaders' siege was not very effective and it was actually Bohemond's agreement with the armour-maker, Firuz, which allowed them to sneak into the city. Firuz controlled one of the towers on the city's walls and allowed Bohemond and a small group to scale the walls of the tower. So Bohemond's cunning and negotiation led to their success in this case.</i></p> <p><i>Secondly, the Crusaders succeeded in defeating Kerbogha's forces partly as a result of the discovery of the Holy Lance in the Church of St. Peter. The unearthing of the lance provided the Crusaders with the conviction and morale they needed to take on Kerbogha's huge army after they had become trapped and surrounded in Antioch. They united behind Bohemond and went on to defeat Kerbogha.</i></p> <p><i>However, military tactics were important in helping the Crusaders take Jerusalem in 1099. They used local woods and Genoese ships to build two siege towers, each one three storeys high, and protected from fire and arrows by animal skins. On 15 July, Godfrey of Bouillon cut a section from one of the towers and used it to make a bridge to the wall. Crusaders rushed over the bridge and this allowed the Crusaders to gain a foothold on the walls, and the city's defences started to collapse.</i></p>
Level 4 (10-12	One sided argument, two explained points of support, e.g.

<b>marks)</b>	<p><i>I disagree. In relation to the Crusaders' success in capturing Antioch in June 1098, it was more to do with other factors. The crusaders' siege was not very effective and it was actually Bohemond's agreement with the armour-maker, Firuz, which allowed them to sneak into the city. Firuz controlled one of the towers on the city's walls, and allowed Bohemond and a small group to scale the walls of the tower. So Bohemond's cunning and negotiation led to their success in this case.</i></p> <p><i>Secondly, the Crusaders succeeded in defeating Kerbogha's forces partly as a result of the discovery of the Holy Lance in the Church of St. Peter. The unearthing of the lance provided the Crusaders with the conviction and morale they needed to take on Kerbogha's huge army after they had become trapped and surrounded in Antioch. They united behind Bohemond and went on to defeat Kerbogha.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, a balanced argument, supported by one explained point on each side, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>In relation to the Crusaders' success in capturing Antioch in June 1098, I disagree because it was more to do with other factors. The crusaders' siege was not very effective and it was actually Bohemond's agreement with the armour-maker, Firuz, which allowed them to sneak into the city. Firuz controlled one of the towers on the city's walls and allowed Bohemond and a small group to scale the walls of the tower. So Bohemond's cunning and negotiation led to their success in this case.</i></p> <p><i>However, military tactics were important in helping the Crusaders take Jerusalem in 1099. They used local woods and Genoese ships to build two siege towers, each one three storeys high, and protected from fire and arrows by animal skins. On 15 July, Godfrey of Bouillon cut a section from one of the towers and used it to make a bridge to the wall. Crusaders rushed over the bridge and this allowed the Crusaders to gain a foothold on the walls, and the city's defences started to collapse.</i></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by one explained point, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I disagree because in relation to the Crusaders' success in capturing Antioch in June 1098, it was more to do with other factors. The crusaders' siege was not very effective and it was actually Bohemond's agreement with the armour-maker, Firuz, which allowed them to sneak into the city. Firuz controlled one of the towers on the city's walls and allowed Bohemond and a small group to scale the walls of the tower. So Bohemond's cunning and negotiation led to their success in this case.</i></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p><b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, I agree because it was their use of siege warfare which allowed them to break through the walls of Jerusalem.</li> <li>• No, I think there were more important reasons, such as the fact that there was no united Muslim response.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively, description of tactics/ other relevant events without linking this to the question or without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Jerusalem, the Crusaders used siege towers, tall structure on wheels. They were covered in animal hides to stop arrows and could be wheeled up to the walls.</li> <li>• The Muslims attacked Ascalon in August 1099. The Crusaders launched a surprise attack on their camp and eventually defeated them.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 identification/ description = 4-5 marks</b>  <b>2 identifications/ descriptions = 5-6 marks</b>  <b>3 identifications/ descriptions = 6 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p><b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, they had some very clever tactics like taking their enemies by surprise.</li> <li>• I disagree because they had a lot of luck and help from the people inside the cities.</li> </ul>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 9* – 18 marks</b> <b>‘The People’s Crusade (1096) failed because the Crusaders were not well enough prepared.’ How far do you agree with this view?</b>	
<b>Levels</b> AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b>	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering the role of the crusaders’ failure to make adequate preparations and alternative factors.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (reasons for failure of the People’s Crusade) and consequences of the crusaders’ lack of preparation but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Grounds for agreeing may include: Peter the Hermit’s failure to make the necessary preparations for the journey to Jerusalem. The fact that the participants set off before the harvest which limited the amount of supplies they would have access to. The participants’ view that God would protect them and that they did not need to prepare for the journey to the Holy Land. The fact that the participants did not listen to the advice of Pope Urban II.</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing may include: Lack of ability of all leaders to harness the enthusiasm of participants on the People’s Crusade. The lack of military experience of participants. Lack of coordination of forces. Lack of focus, e.g., attacks on European Jews. Alexios’ order that participants of the People’s Crusade should wait for three months for the next wave of crusaders which led to agitation amongst the ranks. Infighting in the crusader ranks, e.g., at Kibotos. Huge loss of life near Kibotos after crusaders were besieged by Muslim forces (6,000 died). Further loss of life at Kibotos after a counter attack. Issues with supplies in Byzantine lands. Direct conflict between</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2).	

<p><i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><i>Alexios' men and participants of the People's Crusade before they reached Constantinople.</i></p>
--	---

<b>Question 9* – 18 marks</b> <b>‘The People’s Crusade (1096) failed because the Crusaders were not well enough prepared.’ How far do you agree with this view?</b> <b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p><b>Balanced argument, two valid explained points each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is lots of evidence to support the statement. Firstly, leaders like Peter the Hermit ignored Urban’s orders to wait for the harvest to come in and set off at the start of 1096. This limited the amount of supplies they had access to and didn’t give local leaders time to prepare supplies for them. This meant that the People’s Crusade failed because by August, over half of the Crusaders had died. This was mostly in battle with other Christians in Hungary and the Byzantine Empire, as they fought for access to the countryside and supplies.</i></p> <p><i>However, it could be argued that the People’s Crusade failed because of a more general lack of discipline and organisation. For example, there were anti-Semitic pogroms in Germany, Prague and Mainz. When they reached Constantinople, they attacked palaces and stole lead from church roofs. This brought hostility from people in Europe and meant that they received little support from Alexios and the Hungarian king.</i></p> <p><i>It could also be argued that the People’s Crusade failed due to the actions of Alexios. After reaching Constantinople, Alexios ordered that participants of the People’s Crusade should wait at Kibotos for three months for the next wave of crusaders. This led to agitation amongst the ranks, and 6000 were massacred after they left the camp and captured a Muslim castle in their religious fervour.</i></p> <p><i>A different argument is that the Turks outwitted the Crusaders. After the news of the massacre reached the camp at Kibotos, another group rode out to battle the Turks. However, they rode into a trap where the Turks were lying in wait for them. 20,000 were killed as they were lured into a narrow, steep-sided valley. Only 3000 survived. This shows that it was their lack of military skill, and the Turks’ superior skill, which led to the failure of the People’s Crusade.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, the fact that the crusaders did not make adequate preparations definitely contributed to the failure of the People’s Crusade. However, this could have been overcome had they worked with local leaders and been more disciplined. As it was, the lack of solid leadership meant that they lost focus on their journey, and that they were not able to secure the support they needed from Alexios.</i></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p><b>Balanced argument supported by three explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is lots of evidence to support the statement. Firstly, leaders like Peter the Hermit ignored Urban’s orders to wait for the harvest to come in and set off at the start of 1096. This limited the amount of supplies they had access to and didn’t give local leaders time to prepare supplies for them. This meant that the People’s Crusade failed because by August, over half of the Crusaders had died. This was mostly in battle with other Christians in Hungary and the Byzantine Empire, as they fought for access to the countryside and supplies.</i></p> <p><i>However, it could be argued that the People’s Crusade failed because of a more general lack of discipline and organisation. For example, there were anti-Semitic pogroms in Germany, Prague and Mainz. When they reached Constantinople, they attacked palaces and stole lead from church roofs. This brought hostility from people in Europe and meant that they received little support from Alexios and the Hungarian king.</i></p> <p><i>It could also be argued that the People’s Crusade failed due to the actions of Alexios. After reaching Constantinople, Alexios ordered that participants of the People’s Crusade should wait at Kibotos for three months for the next wave of crusaders. This led to agitation amongst the ranks, and 6000 were massacred after they left the camp and captured a Muslim castle in their religious fervour.</i></p>

<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by two explained points, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I disagree. The People's Crusade failed because of a more general lack of discipline and organisation. For example, there were anti-Semitic pogroms in Germany, Prague and Mainz. When they reached Constantinople, they attacked palaces and stole lead from church roofs. This brought hostility from people in Europe and meant that they received little support from Alexios and the Hungarian king.</i></p> <p><i>It could also be argued that the People's Crusade failed due to the actions of Alexios. After reaching Constantinople, Alexios ordered that participants of the People's Crusade should wait at Kibotos for three months for the next wave of crusaders. This led to agitation amongst the ranks, and 6000 were massacred after they left the camp and captured a Muslim castle in their religious fervour.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, a balanced argument, supported by one explained point on each side, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>There is lots of evidence to support the statement. Firstly, leaders like Peter the Hermit ignored Urban's orders to wait for the harvest to come in and set off at the start of 1096. This limited the amount of supplies they had access to and didn't give local leaders time to prepare supplies for them. This meant that the People's Crusade failed because by August, over half of the Crusaders had died. This was mostly in battle with other Christians in Hungary and the Byzantine Empire, as they fought for access to the countryside and supplies.</i></p> <p><i>However, it could be argued that the People's Crusade failed because of a more general lack of discipline and organisation. For example, there were anti-Semitic pogroms in Germany, Prague and Mainz. When they reached Constantinople, they attacked palaces and stole lead from church roofs. This brought hostility from people in Europe and meant that they received little support from Alexios and the Hungarian king.</i></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by one explained point, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>I agree because leaders like Peter the Hermit ignored Urban's orders to wait for the harvest to come in and set off at the start of 1096. This limited the amount of supplies they had access to and didn't give local leaders time to prepare supplies for them. This meant that the People's Crusade failed because by August, over half of the Crusaders had died. This was mostly in battle with other Christians in Hungary and the Byzantine Empire, as they fought for access to the countryside and supplies.</i></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p><b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, they didn't wait for the harvest so didn't have enough supplies.</li> <li>• No, it was more to do with losing men in battle with other Christians.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively, description of relevant events without full explanation, or without linking this to the question of why it failed, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many members of the People's Crusade were killed at Kibotos. Some estimates suggest as many as 20,000 people died there.</li> <li>• There were horrific attacks on Jews by the People's Crusade. In Mainz, the Crusaders slaughtered everyone they could find.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 identification/ description = 4-5 marks</b>  <b>2 identifications/ descriptions = 5-6 marks</b>  <b>3 identifications/ descriptions = 6 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p><b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because they didn't have supplies.</i></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

## Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

### Call us on

**01223 553998**

Alternatively, you can email us on

[support@ocr.org.uk](mailto:support@ocr.org.uk)

For more information visit

-  [ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder](http://ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder)
-  [ocr.org.uk](http://ocr.org.uk)
-  [Twitter/ocrexams](http://Twitter/ocrexams)
-  [/ocrexams](http://ocrexams)
-  [/company/ocr](http://company/ocr)
-  [/ocrexams](http://ocrexams)



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.