



# A Level History

7042/1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071-1204

**Report on the examination**

Published: August 2024

# Contents

The below table is interactive. You can press the control button click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Contents	Page
<a href="#">General guidance about question types</a>	3
<a href="#">Individual questions and exemplification</a>	5
<a href="#">Further support</a>	15

# General guidance on question types

## Question 1: The 'Extract' Question

- Identify, understand and evaluate arguments in each extract in relation to the focus of the question.
- Deploy contextual knowledge selectively and relevantly to assess how convincing the arguments are.

## Qualities seen in more successful responses

- Evidence of careful reading of each extract before committing pen to paper.
- Identification of key arguments in each extract in relation to the question set.
- Contextual knowledge deployed appropriately to challenge or corroborate the arguments in relation to the question.
- Balanced assessment with focus on the extent to which arguments are convincing in relation to the question.
- Focus on omissions/ what is not in the extract is very limited - or is avoided altogether – and is only referred to if directly relevant to an argument identified in the extract.

## Qualities seen in less successful responses

- Limited understanding of the arguments expressed in each extract, often showing little evidence that the whole extract has been read fully before beginning the answer.
- Tend to either paraphrase the extract with limited evaluation, or to focus on random sentences or phrases.
- Where it is offered, evaluation of arguments may not be focused fully on the question.
- Contextual knowledge sometimes deployed without focus on the question, or without linkage to arguments in the extracts.
- May contain inappropriate and irrelevant references to author provenance and tone.

## Questions 2-4: Essay questions

- Demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the question and its demands.
- Provide a balanced, analytical response which reviews the issues raised by the question.
- Provide appropriate and full coverage of the breadth of the question, with appropriate supporting evidence.
- Substantiate judgements on the issues, throughout the answer and/ or in an extended conclusion.

## Qualities seen in more successful responses

- Evidence of careful planning seen in the structure and organisation of the answer.
- An analytical approach which avoids lengthy narrative passages.
- Appropriate range, both in relation to chronological coverage and of issues to be considered.
- Balance of treatment, used to advance an argument and with appropriate judgement of the issues.

- Use well selected supporting information.
- Provide an effective introduction which sets out the argument to be advanced and an effective conclusion demonstrating overall judgement.

## Qualities seen in less successful responses

- Limited evidence of effective planning and structuring.
- Tendency towards partial responses to the question asked, either in terms of chronology or range of issues to be considered.
- Inclusion of descriptive passages not clearly linked to the question.
- Over-lengthy introductions which do little more than provide contextual information.
- Inclusion of conclusions which repeat points already made
- Issues with, or an absence of, sustained analysis and judgement.
- Occasional use of inappropriate language, such as over use of first person etc.

# Individual questions

## Report on Question 1

This question asked students to evaluate the historical interpretations of three historians in relation to the condition of Outremer in the years 1098 to 1118. This is a popular time period, which students clearly know well and are usually able to deploy plenty of relevant contextual own knowledge in their answers. Stronger students were able to keep a close focus on what the extracts had to say about the particular issue in the question, rather than becoming bogged down in discussions of other issues. Students were rewarded for using their own knowledge to both corroborate and to challenge what the historians were arguing. However, it was not expected that students would necessarily laboriously try to find a point of challenge for all three extracts. It is entirely possible that students will find one of the extracts very convincing and will thus provide plenty of own knowledge to support that judgement. The answers to the three extracts are considered holistically and the quality of evaluation is far more important than trying to provide an overly formulaic response. When dealing with each extract, students should be encouraged to think about the extract as a whole, rather than becoming overly focused upon a single line. Equally, the very good answers considered the whole period in the question, rather than just giving examples from the first few early years of Outremer's existence.

**Extract A** argued that the situation in Jerusalem was not secure, despite the successes of the First Crusade, but that Baldwin I improved the position of the Kingdom by capturing the key ports. However, there were still problems, namely the failure to capture Ascalon and the reliance upon the Italian City States. Generally, students were able to analyse these arguments using a wide variety of own knowledge, although some become overly focused on discussing Crusader motives which was not of direct relevance. Use of examples, such as the ports captured by Baldwin and the ways in which the Italians were of use, and also a hindrance, was very good. The most effective counter argument deployed by students tended to be to consider how much of a threat the Fatimids really posed after 1105 or an evaluation of whether the help offered by the Italians outweighed the economic negatives.

**Extract B** focused on the role of Baldwin I and Tancred in the establishment of Outremer in the years after the First Crusade. It also argued that Muslim disunity was vital. The more able students were able to recognise that Asbridge was focusing on Baldwin and Tancred's pragmatism (i.e. their alliances with local Muslim leaders, how they made use of the Indigenous population, strategic use of castles) rather than just their military ability. Some students did become a little over fixated on listing battles won and lost, which was of some relevance, but not the main point. Some students attempted to challenge the argument by giving examples of battles lost by Baldwin (e.g. the Second Battle of Ramla). This approach did lack nuance and was not very convincing: one loss in battle does not mean that Baldwin was a poor king. Stronger points of challenge might include Tancred's behaviour with regards to Edessa and his challenge towards Count Baldwin II. Some students did get their Baldwins muddled up, which is understandable.

**Extract C** took a pessimistic view of the condition of Outremer: arguing that it was isolated, surrounded by enemies and lacking in the coherence and organisation which would be necessary for survival. There was some good knowledge deployed here, both in support and in challenge. One area which many students argued convincingly was the suggestion by Belloc that Outremer was 'continually penetrated,' with some good examples to illustrate just how weak the Muslim leaders were in this time period.

## Question 1 - Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

Assess how convincing the arguments in these extracts are in relation to the condition of Outremer in the years 1098 to 1118

In Extract A, Edgington argues partially convincingly that the Kingdom of Jerusalem was initially precarious, and that the capture of coastal cities was what solidified the Kingdom's survival, although this cost the Crusaders greatly. His argument is limited by his exaggeration of ~~the effects~~ how much this cost the Crusaders.

Extract A's argument that Baldwin I's capture of the coastal cities was crucial to the Kingdom of Jerusalem's survival is convincing, because port cities could bring more resources and more men, which the Franks desperately needed. With the help of the Norwegian Crusade, Baldwin had taken Sidon in the winter of 1110, one example of his focus on capturing port cities. However, Edgington also argues that Italian fleets specifically were crucial in aiding him, but that this cost Baldwin hugely. The Genoese and Pisan fleets had helped Baldwin capture Beirut in 1110, and while they did require a significant fee, ultimately the benefits of having another coastal city under Baldwin's control outweighed this price. This makes Extract A's argument partially limited, especially as help from the Norwegian Crusade proves the Franks were not only reliant on the Italians. However, when the Venetians helped Baldwin I capture Acre, they had

demanding control of 1/3 of the city, a large fee to pay considering Acre's strategic use to Baldwin as a well-placed port city. On the other hand, their shared control did not cause any particular harm to the Franks, and Outremer continued to prosper. Furthermore, the Venetians would continue to help Outremer, such as on their own Crusade from 1122-24, and so in the long run the price of Italian aid did not outweigh the benefits it brought to Outremer, limiting Edgington's argument.

Edgington's argument subsidiary argument that Baldwin's inability to capture Ascalon was a great weakness is also only partially convincing, because while Ascalon was a very well-placed

city, and could have caused great harm, practically the Muslims' control over it had little impact on the Franks. While they did attack the Franks from Ascalon in 1115 and capture Baldwin I, he escaped immediately and no long-term damage was done.

<sup>in relation to the condition of Ascalon from 1099 to 1115</sup> Overall, Extract A's argument is only partially convincing, because while the argument that Baldwin's capture of coastal cities was crucial to Jerusalem's survival is convincing because they brought more manpower, which Outremer lacked, his argument is limited by his overestimation of the cost that capturing these port cities came at.

Extract B's <sup>argues convincingly</sup> ~~argument~~ <sup>significant</sup> that Baldwin I of Jerusalem and Tancred I of Antioch made <sup>great</sup> contributions to the expansion of the Crusader States, and that Islamic disunity gave them the opportunity to do so.

Asbridge's argument that Baldwin and Tancred were successful because they were practical is highly convincing. Both made truces with the Muslims in the area when necessary - for example, Baldwin made a truce with Tughtakin of Damascus for four years in 1108, and then in 1109 signed a treaty with him

to share their land in the Transjordan, an extremely fertile area, a practical decision which benefited both parties. Furthermore, the argument that disunity in the Muslim world was extremely useful to them is also convincing - for example, after Tancred defeated <sup>the Arab</sup> Ridwan of Aleppo in 1105, they allied together against Joscelin of Edessa and <sup>Mardani of Mosul</sup> Pugay of Damascus. This example of Muslims fighting each other, because they did not trust each other and suspected that the other wanted their own lands, as well as the fact that Tancred exploited this to secure his own control, makes Asbridge's argument convincing. ~~Furthermore in 1113 Baldwin even allied with~~ Another example of Islamic disunity benefiting the Franks is that although the ~~barbarians~~ worked. Furthermore, Baldwin I even allied with local Muslims against the Sultan of Baghdad, <sup>when he sent a commander to try to take Jerusalem in 1107</sup> ~~when he tried to expand his territories~~ again exploiting Muslim disunity to keep Outremer strong and the surrounding

Muslim forces weak and fractured.

Asbridge's argument that Baldwin and Tancred were the most useful figures in the early expansion <sup>and stabilisation</sup> of Outremer is ~~convincing~~ <sup>convincing</sup> because through both military expansion and diplomacy is also convincing. Not only did Baldwin capture a great deal of territory, but he also divided up the land among his nobles to keep them happy and loyal. When capturing Tripoli in 1109, the Franks nearly failed because they could not agree who ~~who~~ would keep it, but Baldwin managed to settle this agreement ultimately giving Tripoli to Raymond of Toulouse, demonstrating his skill not only ~~at~~ militarily, but also diplomatically, which was crucial to the survival of Outremer. Tancred's own capture of territories such as Latakia in 1103, and his remarkably forward-thinking encouragement of ~~his men~~ <sup>his men</sup> to marry Muslim women and his tolerance of Muslim communities in Antioch, also make Asbridge's argument convincing.

Overall, Extract B's argument is very convincing <sup>in relation to the consolidation of Outremer from 1098 to 1117</sup> as Baldwin and Tancred were key figures in the consolidation of Outremer's power, using both military and diplomatic skills, and exploiting Islamic ~~linearity~~ <sup>linearity</sup>.

The section of an answer above shows the qualities of a Level 5 response. The student has clearly read and considered the extracts before beginning their answer and they have shown that they grasp both the main interpretations, alongside some of the sub arguments advanced by the historians. Their own knowledge is strong and has been thoughtfully deployed to offer well supported evaluations of what the historians have argued. Throughout, they have kept a tight focus on the issue in the question. For Extract A, the student has considered ways in which the extract is both convincing and also some limitations. However, for Extract B, they have focused on why the extract is convincing only, which is a perfectly acceptable approach, so long as the student can provide evidence to back up their statements. Their comments are well developed, nuanced and a clear and convincing judgement has been reached. This student was awarded 30/30 as their response to Extract C was of a similar high quality.

## Report on Question 2

This was the most popular of the essay questions, being answered by around 80% of students. To score highly on this essay, answers needed to cover the time period in the question. As a minimum, students needed to consider the motives of Pope Urban II (First Crusade) and Pope Eugenius III (Second Crusade), but many students were able to consider the intervening period as well- for example thinking about why the Papacy supported Bohemond's 'crusade' against the Byzantines, or the Papal support shown to the Venetians in the 1120s. Some students struggled to say much that was meaningful about Eugenius and many seemed to know little about the situation surrounding the call for the Second Crusade beyond Bernard of Clairvaux's involvement, which did limit some marks. Answers which scored highly kept a clear focus on Papal motivation throughout, where weaker answers lapsed into discussions of Crusader motives instead. The key factor in the question was 'political power' and examiners did expect students to write about this in some detail to advance beyond Level 3. Some students argued that political power was about the Pope's position in Europe, where others argued that the Pope wanted to increase his

power over the Byzantines or his influence in Outremer. Any of these approaches was valid. The most common balancing factor which students discussed was the religious angle- for example, the Pope's desire to gain/protect the Holy City of Jerusalem. Students knew a lot about Urban and the calling of the First Crusade, but some were not able to explain how the crusade would help the Pope politically, which also limited marks in some instances as the analysis was not clearly developed.

### Report on Question 3

This was the least popular of the essay questions but, where it was answered, it was often done well. Again, breadth coverage of the date range in the question is key to scoring highly in this examination. Most students realised that 1143 to 1180 covered the reign of Emperor Manuel Comnenus and that this question focused upon his relationship with the Latin Christians. The best answers took a nuanced approach, realising that the relationship was not linear and that there was change over time. These answers also considered that Manuel might have strong relations with some Latins (e.g. Conrad, Baldwin III), whilst having poor relations with others (the French, Reynald of Chatillon). Students who did not discuss either the events of the Second Crusade or its aftermath did limit their marks somewhat as this was a critical point in relations. The best answers were thematic in nature, rather than chronological. Approaching essays in chronological fashion often leads to description and narrative, which could prevent students advancing beyond Level 3. In Level 4 it is expected that students will take a predominantly analytical approach. The other approach which can be unhelpful is to write paragraphs which lack consistency, for example finishing one paragraph with 'and so the relationship was always very strong' and then starting the next line with 'in some ways the relationship was weak.' Level 4 and Level 5 students are able to write in a less formulaic style and tend to adopt the 'one point per paragraph' approach, arguing in a logical manner towards their conclusion, rather than 'flip flopping' - 'on the one hand', 'on the other hand', 'however' - within each paragraph.

### Report on Question 4

This question was relatively popular, with around 2/3 of students opting to answer it. The key to achieving good marks here, as always on the breadth study, was to ensure that there was sound coverage of the time period within the question (1177-1204). As a bare minimum, we expected students to be able to discuss the impact and consequences of the Third and Fourth Crusades, but it was very pleasing that many students were confident in discussing wider examples such as the German Crusade or the expedition of Philip of Flanders in the 1170s. Some students ignored the 'Western interventions' part of the question and wasted time discussing interventions by the Byzantines (who were Eastern Christians) or the reign of Baldwin IV. Equally, Reynald de Chatillon was not considered to count as an example of 'Western intervention' given that he arrived in the East during the Second Crusade. Thematic approaches tended to work more effectively than chronological ones, which often lapsed into narrative description, but any organised answer was rewarded using the generic marking levels. Some students spent time discussing what 'might have happened if,' which tended to be assertive as such comments were difficult to support with any evidence or examples.

#### Question 4 - Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

04

Western intervention in the years 1177 to 1204 seemed crucial to the ~~consolidation~~ ~~the~~ strengthening the position of crusader, especially after the Battle of Hattin in 1187, for it provided manpower and funds to allow for the survival of crusader states. ~~But~~ <sup>Whilst</sup> Western intervention often have negative impacts, they are overshadowed by their success overall in the years 1177-1204.

It could be argued that between 1177-1187 western intervention were minimal and did little to strengthen the position of crusader. Certainly, the papal bulls of 1181 and 1185 asking for assistance were largely ignored. Even when help came, they were problematic as seen with Phillip of Flanders in 1177. Phillip refused to commit his troops to Egypt as he wanted the land for himself. His inaction weakened the crusader states and

Byzantine relations were damaged. ~~The~~ The Byzantines sent a fleet of 70 ships even after Myriocephalon to aid with the attack, thus its failure due to actions from Phillip worsened relations, rendering them less likely to help in the future. Likewise, the council of Henry of Castile achieved little in 1183 as the forces were too limited to make an impact. Despite this, Western assistance did achieve ~~to~~ considerable success. King Henry II ~~he~~ sent a sum of 20000 pieces of silver and an annual payment of 2000 pieces to the crusader

States. Whilst this was not the help they asked for in 1181 & 85, it nonetheless allowed Guy of Lusignan to fund mercenaries, raising the largest ever crusader army to face Saladin at Hattin in 1187. Also, the pisans played an important role in allowing the Siege of Beirut by Saladin. Baldwin IV successfully coordinated the Pisan navy to assist in forcing Saladin to retreat. This weakened the political ~~power~~ standing of Saladin and hurt his image as the Mujahid as he had publicly claimed to defeat the Christians at Beirut. As such, this shows that even during periods where western support was considered limited, it still was useful in strengthening the crusader kingdom.

The Third crusade was called in response to the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, which arguably was the reason for the survival of the crusader states for another hundred years. Following Hattin in 1187, the Christians only held on to Tyne, Tripoli and Antioch, ~~which were~~ The Third crusade was crucial in recapturing most of the coastline, taking Jaffa, Beirut, Arsuf and Acre - which they also took their navy. The presence of western support was essential as they brought siege machines which was crucial as illustrated by the failed attempt by Guy to take Acre only using ladders. The coastline allowed the Christians to establish trade routes with the Italians and communications with the west. Richard's conquest

of Cyprus was also critical as it served as a stopping point for future Western aid and acted as the 'breadbasket' for the crusader states. This greatly strengthened the crusader states militarily. Politically, the fractured politics that originally led to the defeat at Hattin was resolved. Richard sent Guy to Cyprus and Conrad had died. Henry of Champagne also became the leader and links to Western nobility and maintained effective rule from 1190-97. ~~Then the rest of the crusader states left in 1187~~ The Treaty of Jaffa signed in 1194 agreed a 9 year truce, which allowed the crusaders to rebuild and consolidate. Thus it showed how the Third Crusade left ~~the~~ the crusader states in a much stronger position than 1187.

crusade, the German Crusade came at a critical time towards the end of the treaty of Jaffa, helping to strengthen the Christian position. The retaking of Latakia strengthened Antioch and the capture of Beroia and Ciblet strengthened Tripoli. Further, the Germans established the Teutonic Knights, which would be critical in the defence of the kingdom as seen with their aid in the attack of Caesarea in 1204. That said the German crusade had multiple failures. First, poor strategy and disunity at Toron led to the failure to capture the city which weakened the Christian position in the North. Further, the disregard for treaties worsened Christian-Muslim

relations, leading to Al-'Adil's attack and recapture of Jaffa. This shows that Western intervention was not always helpful.

The Fourth crusade whilst did not directly come to the East, had various positive impact. Part of the funds from the sack of Constantinople was sent to rebuild crusader states after the earthquake of 1202. Tyre was rebuilt with a more robust wall, and the great chain of Constantinople was sent to Acre to protect its port. Also, the fall of Constantinople arguably scared Al-'Adil to sign a favourable Peace Treaty in 1204, returning Nazareth, Jaffa amongst other land holdings as he was under the impression that the great army was now heading to the East. Thus said, the impact of the Fourth crusade was somewhat limited as many in the East

went to the Holy Land, with estimates up to 300 knights and 10000 men.

In conclusion, it can be seen that whilst Western intervention during the period 1177 to 1204 had limitations, they were nonetheless crucial for the strengthening of the Crusader States. The unprecedented support in the Third, German, Fourth crusade reestablished most of the landholdings, and resolved political conflicts, ~~thus allowing them~~ allowing them to survive for ~~another~~ another hundred years.

In the example answer above, the student has used a wide range of relevant material to provide a balanced and convincing answer to the question. The introduction makes it clear what their essay is going to be arguing and this is matched by a sound conclusion. Each paragraph begins with a clear point of analysis, which is then supported with relevant examples from across the full time period in the question. There is balance and nuanced understanding of, for example, the ways in which the west was able to provide financial aid if not necessarily sending military forces. This answer was awarded 25/25.

# Further guidance

Our reports on the exams are part of a suite of support we offer to enhance your understanding of our assessments and your students' performance.

## Mark ranges and award of grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [results statistics](#) page of our website.

## Enhanced Results Analysis (ERA)

Use our exam results analysis tool to create and customise different reports to help understand your students' performance.

ERA is our free online service for you to gain a detailed insight into your students' results. You can:

- analyse your students' scores for each exam question
- identify topics, skills and types of question where students may need further support
- compare your students' performance with those of other classes and with students in other AQA schools nationally.

For more information on ERA, log in through Centre Services.

## Professional development

Attend one of our [courses](#) where you can review example responses from students and commentaries from our examiners.

# Contact us

Our friendly team will be happy to support you between 8am and 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 0161 958 3861

Email: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

[aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)