

**GCSE (9–1)**  
*Candidate Style Answers*

# **HISTORY B**

## **(SCHOOLS HISTORY PROJECT)**

J411  
For first teaching in 2016

### **J411 – The First Crusade c.1070-1100**

Version 1



# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	3
<b>Question 6</b>	
High level response	4
Commentary	4
Medium level response	5
Commentary	5
<b>Question 7</b>	
High level response	6
Commentary	7
Medium level response	7
Commentary	7
<b>Question 8</b>	
High level response	8
Commentary	8
Medium level response	9
Commentary	9
<b>Question 9</b>	
High level response	10
Commentary	10
Medium level response	11
Commentary	11

# Introduction

This resource has been produced by a senior member of the GCSE History examining team to offer teachers an insight into how the assessment objectives are applied. It illustrates how the sample assessment questions might be answered and provides some commentary on what factors contribute to overall levels.

As these responses have not been through full moderation, they have not been graded and are instead, banded to give an indication of the level of each response.

Please note that this resource is provided for advice and guidance only and does not in any way constitute an indication of grade boundaries or endorsed answers.

## Question 6

What can Source A tell us about the Battle of Dorylaeum? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.

[7]

### High level response

Source A can give a lot of detail about the battle. One thing that it tells us is how badly prepared the Crusaders were for an ambush. The author describes the Turks attacking from all sides. Bohemond's force of 10,000 had split from the main Crusader army to make travelling easier and they had not been expecting to fight. This is also shown by how surprised the writer sounds at how many enemy soldiers there were and how many places they had come from.

Another detail is that it mentions a woman helping the soldiers. This shows that at the battle, not all of the people involved were soldiers. The Crusader armies were full of non-combatants, who were there to make money or for religious reasons. At the battle of Dorylaeum, lots of these became involved because they were being killed by arrows from the Turks. Normally they would be behind the army in a battle but the ambush had caught everyone by surprise.

A third detail is that it shows how the Crusaders were motivated by religious beliefs but also by money and greed. In the last line, it says that they stood and fought in the 'faith of Christ' but it also says that 'all riches shall be given to you.' Bohemond motivated his soldiers by promising them plunder when they defeated the Turks. Once the reinforcements arrived and the Turks were defeated, the Crusaders raided the baggage of their enemy and lots of soldiers got rich from what they took.

## Examiner commentary

Top Level 3

The answer has identified three points, so it has identified a 'wide range' of features. It has used these with relevant contextual knowledge which confirms the accuracy of the source details in order to draw clear conclusions about the battle. Note that, as per the comments in the mark scheme guidance, the answer does not include limitations of the source which are not a required feature of this answer.

### Medium level response

The source shows that the battle started badly for the Crusaders. The writer describes the Turks attacking them from a distance. The author also says that the soldiers in the Crusader army were amazed at how many enemies there were and how many places they came from.

The source also shows that there were women involved. It describes the work of one woman taking water to the soldiers which shows that the battle went on for a while because they were thirsty enough to need water taking. So it was not just soldiers who were involved in the battle.

This was not the first battle of the Crusade. The Crusaders had already captured a city off the Turks which had been quite a surprise to the Turks. The Crusaders had shown how brutal they were by throwing heads into the city to terrorise people.

## Examiner commentary

Top Level 2

This answer shows two details from the source. Although verging on describing, the candidate has identified things that the source informs about the battle. It lacks the developed knowledge of the context to develop further into a L3 comment, however. Also note that the last paragraph, whilst ostensibly contextual knowledge, is not actually related to the focus of the question and therefore cannot improve the mark of this answer.

## Question 7

How useful are Source B and Interpretations C and D for a historian studying how the Crusaders survived the siege of Antioch in June 1098? In your answer, refer to the source and the two interpretations as well as your own knowledge. [15]

### High level response

Source B and interpretations C and D are all useful to a degree in showing how the Crusaders survived the siege of Antioch in 1098.

Source B shows clearly how influential the apparent discovery of the Holy Lance was. It was written from a chronicle by an eye-witness, Raymond d'Aguilers, and only recorded a short time after the event. It describes the 'joy and exultation' that the Crusaders felt when they had been 'discouraged and under severe pressure.' In the First Crusade, where the majority of soldiers were committed Christians, this would have been a great motivation. The fact that the soldiers were given evidence that showed that God was favouring them would have made them commit to the battle. However, this is of limited usefulness. Even though the lance probably made a difference, this account was written by the military leader of the army, who personally led one of the six Crusader groups. The account is one-sided, because it presents the victory as being down to God blessing something that he was leading, and he makes sure he is at the centre of the account by describing how he touched it first. Therefore, the role of the lance is likely exaggerated to have a larger role than in reality. Other leaders of the time wrote accounts where they suggested that they were suspicious of the truth of the lance.

Interpretation C has the advantage of being the work of a professional historian writing in modern times with the benefit of academic research. Since he is an academic and also there is no personal connection, there is no reason to assume that the interpretation has any personal spin. The source is useful in that it supports Source B by showing the role of the rumours of divine intervention and the Holy Lance. The range of reports shows how common the belief of divine support was and this indicates how widely it affected people. However, the account only covers the morale issues, it doesn't mention any of the practical issues in surviving. For example, one way that they survived the siege was by the benefits of the substantial walls and defences around the city of Antioch, or by sallying out in six battle groups led by Norman nobles. Therefore it is of limited use due to the fact that it only covers one area of the reasons the Crusaders survived. It also overlooks the fact that other leaders questioned the truth of the lance which means that not everyone was fighting believing in divine intervention.

Interpretation D gives a visual idea of the battle. It shows the sally of the Crusaders where they routed the Turkish army. It shows the role of the Holy Lance which is in the centre of the page. However, it is of very limited usefulness. For one thing, it has a detail which contradicts Source B, in that it shows Bishop Adhemar carrying the lance not Raymond, even though most sources confirm that it was Raymond. This is partly because it was made about 150 years later than the actual event. But also William of Tyre was an archbishop and his work was copied by monks, so they would have wanted to emphasise the role of the Holy Lance and the clergy who were there to emphasise the importance of the Church.

The three sources together are very useful for showing the combination of the Holy Lance in motivating the soldiers as well as the charge that they made. However, the most useful is Interpretation C because it gives a more rounded summary which is not affected by personal perspective. It gives the widest interpretation of the reasons for the Crusader victory. B and D both emphasise the role of divine intervention to suit their own ends.

## Examiner commentary

Low Level 5

The answer shows that the candidate has a good grasp of both the content of the source as well as the siege of Antioch. For example, it has shown that it understands the significance of the Holy Lance in context of the Christian faith of the Crusaders. It addresses the content and the provenance of the sources in order to judge usefulness. When limitations are mentioned, they are used to indicate how it affects usefulness, rather than simply being identified.

### Medium level response

Source B is a bit useful because it mentions the Holy Lance. I know that the lance was a big motivator for the Crusaders and made a big difference. The writer says that 'the Lord showed us His Lance' so they thought that it was God who gave them the Lance. This was written at the time by someone who was actually there and was a leader of the Crusaders so he probably knew what he was talking about. But he does not actually say anything about the battle which the Crusaders won.

Interpretation C is similar to Source B because it also talks about the way that the Crusaders felt that God was helping them. It says that the Lance was a big motivator when it was carried on the battlefield and made the Crusaders fight harder. It says that many people 'saw the hand of God at work' which shows the way that lots of the soldiers were motivated by the belief that God was helping. This would have been an important reason why the siege was won by the Crusaders. However, there are lots of gaps in the source.

Interpretation D is not very useful. It does show the soldiers fighting, which gives an idea about how the battle was won. But it was made by someone who was not present so they did not necessarily know what they were drawing. They also got some of the details wrong, like they show the wrong person holding the lance.

Overall, the three sources are quite useful. The most useful source was Source B because it was made by someone who was there.

## Examiner commentary

Mid Level 3

The candidate has shown that they understand the core concept of the question. They have identified some relevant pieces of information in the sources. However, some of the points are a little vague and need development. More importantly, the limitations are identified but not used to develop the evaluation of the sources well. To improve the answer, the candidate should develop the evaluation of the comments.

## Question 8

The People's Crusade of 1095-1096 was a catastrophic failure. How far do you agree with this view?

### High level response

In 1096, after Urban II declared the First Crusade, Peter the Hermit led an early group of Crusaders, mainly non-soldier peasants and poor knights, before the main Crusade was ready. In many ways this was a catastrophic disaster.

One way that it was a disaster was that the army was poorly organised and led. The main military leaders and best knights were all forming for the First Crusade, so the People's Crusade was led by Peter the Hermit, who was not a military man, with only a few experienced leaders like Walter the Penniless. Also most were simply peasants, not disciplined soldiers. This meant that they were not well organised and controlled. For example, thousands died in Hungary raiding for food because they were short supplied before they even got to their destination.

Another way that it was a disaster was that it led to a massacre of Jews in Europe. Thousands of Jews were murdered and others were forced to convert to Christianity. This was due to a combination of religious zealotry, where they wanted to kill non-Christians, but also because they wanted their money to prepare for the Crusade.

The most important way that it was a disaster was that the majority of the Crusaders died in battle at Civetot. They fell for rumours that the Turks were vulnerable and marched into a woods where they were ambushed. They were not able to match the bows and arrows of the Turkish army and almost all were killed except for a few thousand who were able to escape. Therefore the Crusade was a disaster where it did not achieve its aims of liberating the Holy Land.

However, there were some aspects that were successful. One is that before they left for the Holy Land, Peter the Hermit and his Crusade was a real encouragement for people to join the First Crusade. As a result of Peter's preaching work, there were more groups that set off to the Holy Land and also more soldiers joined the First Crusade. Therefore it did help the First Crusade and this was a success.

Another way it was not a complete disaster was that Peter and several thousand of the Crusaders survived to join the First Crusade when it arrived. Their numbers were increased again, mainly by Crusaders from the First Crusade who ran out of money. Peter the Hermit was probably there at the siege of Antioch as several sources say he gave inspiring speeches to the men before they charged the Turkish army. So there were at least some parts of the People's Crusade which played a successful role in crusading.

Overall, it is not entirely true that the People's Crusade was a disaster, mainly by acting as an encouragement to other groups. But in the main, because they were wiped out and also caused problems in Europe as well as Hungary, I think that the People's Crusade was mainly a failure.

## Examiner commentary

Low Level 6

This answer shows a sustained line of reasoning which addresses two sides of the question before reaching a reasoned judgement at the end. It demonstrates both elements of the skills required. Firstly it has good, accurate knowledge which shows a clear understanding, and then it applies second order concepts like causation, and evaluating the events against the objective.



### Medium level response

I completely agree with the question because the People's Crusade was a complete disaster. It started when the Pope wanted to have a Crusade but instead of waiting for the proper Crusade to be ready, Peter the Hermit took the People's Crusade across towards the Holy Land. They mainly consisted of peasants and a few knights but most were not proper fighters.

When they set off to the Holy Land, they ran into problems straight away. They did not have much food or supplies, so loads took food by raiding villages in the countries that they went through and lots were killed fighting for food. This was a disaster because they were dying before they even got to the Holy Land.

They also had problems in Constantinople because the emperor did not like having a rabble in his country so he rushed them all in ships before they were fully prepared or before the proper Crusaders could arrive.

The biggest way it was a disaster was because in the end, nearly all of the People's Crusade was wiped out. Peter went to a different place to find food for the Crusade and whilst he was away, one of the knights took them to attack the Turks. The Turks hid in a woods and trapped them and killed nearly all of them.

Because it went so badly and that everyone died without getting what they wanted, it was a complete failure.

## Examiner commentary

Top Level 3

This answer shows a grasp of the issues involved. It has used some knowledge, though a bit narrative and quite generalised, and in a slightly implicit way has linked the knowledge to an evaluation in support of the question.

## Question 9

The Islamic world was hopelessly weak and divided in the years just before the First Crusade. How far do you agree with this view?

### High level response

There is some evidence that the Islamic world was very divided in 1095, but there is also some evidence that they were unified.

The Crusaders called their enemies 'Saracens' but in reality, there were lots of groups and governments, they were not all one group of people. 200 years earlier they had been a scientifically advanced nation but they were not as advanced in 1095. For one thing, many of the separate groups were competing with each other. There were even examples when Muslim military groups supported Christian Crusaders in skirmishes when they were more opposed to the group that the Crusaders were fighting.

The most important division in the Islamic world was between the Seljuk and Fatimid Muslims, because they were different sects of Islam. They opposed each other as much as they opposed the Christians. Early in the First Crusade, the Fatimid rulers sent 15 representatives to discuss a potential alliance with them. This fell through before they made an agreement but it showed how divided the Islamic world was.

The previously most powerful group, the Abbasids who controlled the caliphate religious leadership, had become much weaker. The centre of the Islamic world had moved east towards Baghdad, and the Fatimids had become more important in the Holy Land. This was a further example of the divisions between the Islamic groups.

The proof of the divisions in the Islamic world was that the Crusaders had a number of successes in the First Crusade even though they were not always well led or organised. They were able to set up the Crusader states, like Tripoli and Jerusalem. This showed that the Islamic resistance was not effective.

However, there were some ways that the Islamic world should not be seen as 'hopelessly weak and divided'. One is the scale of the Islamic world. It stretched from the Far East, through the Middle East, across North Africa and into Europe with Spain. This indicates that there was a degree of power and unity to have captured and controlled such a large area.

Also, the Islamic world might have been divided, but not 'hopelessly'. It was not hopeless because there were several points when it was clear that the Crusaders could have lost. Hopeless sounds like it was completely one-sided. For example, the People's Crusade was completely crushed and the main Crusade nearly lost a significant defeat at Antioch in 1098.

Overall, my conclusion is that the Islamic world was definitely weak and divided, which is why the Crusaders did so well, but not hopelessly so. They were not completely divided and they had enough strength to keep fighting.

## Examiner commentary

Low Level 6

The answer has used key knowledge. With this topic, it stands out that the candidate has understood the different dynasties. The question offers a reasonable counterargument to the main argument. They have also broken down the question by picking out the word 'hopelessly' and altering the conclusion by challenging this. The overall conclusion is a clear judgement which is supported by the evidence of the answer.

### Medium level response

I agree with the question. The main reason that the Islamic world was so divided was because they were not really one group. There were several different governments which controlled different parts of the Islamic world and they did not all agree. There was one government called the caliphate which was the religious centre of the Islamic world, but there were other governments. Some were Sunni Muslims and some were Shia Muslims, so as well as political differences, they disagreed over religious beliefs.

There were lots of disagreements between the different Muslim governments. Especially in Syria, there were lots of feuds and disagreements where warlords were more bothered with feuds against each other rather than working together against the invaders with the Crusade.

This all made certain that they did not work as one united empire. However, they were still quite strong. Together, the Muslim countries controlled most of the East as well as parts of Africa and also even a bit of Europe. So they were definitely a powerful force. This is why the Crusaders did not have an easy job. The Crusaders captured lots of key cities and made new Crusader states, but they did not completely defeat the Muslim governments, which was why there were future crusades after the First Crusade.

Overall, I agree in some ways and disagree in other ways. It was quite weak and divided, with lots of different groups that did not work well together, but also they were still a powerful force.

## Examiner commentary

Top Level 3

This answer has some good knowledge that shows a good grasp of the question. It is over generalised, in the sense that whilst it is conceptually correct it does not, for example, offer specific examples of the governments being referred to. It does offer a counter argument which is relevant. There is also an overall judgement which is valid, though not developed.



We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here:

[www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest](http://www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest)

#### **OCR Resources:** *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content:  
Square down and Square up: alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications:  
[resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk](mailto:resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk)

#### **Looking for a resource?**

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

[www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to-find-resources/](http://www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to-find-resources/)

[www.ocr.org.uk/gcsereform](http://www.ocr.org.uk/gcsereform)

OCR Customer Contact Centre

#### **General qualifications**

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

OCR is part of Cambridge 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 2017** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office 1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



Cambridge  
Assessment

