A LEVEL

Examiners' report

ANCIENT HISTORY

H407
For first teaching in 2017

H407/23 Summer 2019 series
Version 1

Contents

DOC

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this pdf as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Save As Other . . .** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select *Save as . . .* to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for *pdf to word* converter).

We value your feedback

We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the icon above you will help us to ensure that our resources work for you.

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates. The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report. A full copy of the question paper can be downloaded from OCR.

Paper 23 series overview

This is a new specification for Ancient History and new criteria for assessment. This required candidates to assess themes in the Period section (A) and to explore specific issues in more depth in the Depth study. In addition, Section A included a new element of assessing the view of a modern author on specific debate. In the Depth study the candidates had to analyse and evaluate a specific passage from prescribed sources on a well-defined topic. In general candidates rose to the challenge and in a number of cases excellently, with few clearly having difficulties. The specification highlights the use of ancient sources as a key component for assessment and responses showed candidates meeting this criterion, for the most part, in a reasonable manner; some responses indeed exhibited a set of skills which was very good, even excellent. This was especially true in the newer style questions (Q3 and Q4).

The examination questions proved accessible to all levels where candidates had engaged with the subject during their period of study. The great majority had clearly studied the prescribed sources and had appreciated the nature and differences between them in terms of genre and content. There was a consistent engagement with the sources which was especially pleasing to examiners.

For successful responses candidates need to display a secure knowledge of the ancient sources and the historical periods studied, displayed in precise and accurate examples; in addition to perform well their judgements needed to be well-developed from the evidence, rather than asserted sentences; the prescribed sources needed to be carefully evaluated in the context showing how the context, genre and preconceptions of the author impacted on the reliability of the evidence.

The majority of good responses displayed secure knowledge and understanding at least part of the period and the depth study, although clearly in the context of an examination of limited time, errors were made and misconceptions arose, more numerous only in the less successful responses. There were many good responses which displayed a pleasing and an equally secure knowledge and understanding of both the Period and Depth study.

The majority of good responses formed most of their judgements on the evidence, literary and material, which provided convincing, and at times thorough, explanations although not always consistently meeting these criteria. The vast majority of responses offered good or very good explanations at some point in the text, but again not consistently. This showed they had engaged with the material in the specification and had understood the issues in both the period and depth study. Less successful responses were characterised by limited sources, generalised factual knowledge, inaccurate chronology, general source references ('Suetonius tells us', 'According to Tacitus' or simply Dio in brackets after the information), confusion between emperors and simple inaccuracies.

The analysis and evaluation of sources and the way the portrayal of events affects the content was very variable. Candidates who were less successful offered a paragraph on the author or genre (sometimes), or the background and supposed bias. For example, 'Tacitus was a senator and was biased towards emperors' with little attempt to relate the evaluation to the evidence being used. Sometimes the paragraph which followed concluded that we could not trust the author but the candidate did not seem to see that this negated the argument just presented in the response. On the other hand, many made attempts to deal with specific evidence, notably with material examples such as coins as propaganda. The Depth study contains a good number of inscriptions and coins. Candidates clearly engaged with these and analysed their usefulness very well when used.

There were, of course, some less successful responses, much of the time due to a failure to produce ancient sources; occasionally this amounted to none at all. This, in terms of the assessment criteria, damages the response even where it displayed detailed knowledge and understanding of the issue and context in the question.

Timing appeared not to be an issue with candidates- very few indicated an unfinished question. Only occasionally was a question not answered at all. The candidates appeared to find the questions accessible at all levels in some form.

Section A overview

Question 1 was more popular than Question 2 which required a detailed knowledge of a specific ancient source. Most responses for Q1 displayed a knowledge of the period and an understanding of the historical features in A01; there was a good variety of sources including material evidence for A03; the candidates in this component also showed a good knowledge of the genre and agenda of the relevant authors, some of whom they use in their Depth study; explanations and judgements varied from one sentence to clearly expressed and logically reasoned judgements substantiated with developed explanations based on the evidence (A02).

Question 3 (the newest element in the specification) revealed how well the candidates had engaged with the material. The responses displayed relevant and well-developed skills in assessing the opinion of the author, both in in agreeing with and challenging it.

Question 1

SECTION A: The Julio-Claudian Emperors, 31 BC–AD 68

1* To what extent and for what reasons did the emperors attempt to improve the lives of the inhabitants of the city of Rome?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer.   [30]

There was a range of responses to this question. The majority of responses dealt with the attempts and reasons well.

Very good responses took the approach of not narrating each emperor. They identified the key ways in which improvement could be made and dealt with what a selection of emperors did in each of these ways - similarly with 'reasons', grouping actions under headings and identifying how the actions of emperors related to these. This is more analytical and less a run through events with a brief added note on a reason.

Responses had a variety of material to show the attempts made by emperors. Good responses included various attempts – food supply, water supply, security and fire prevention, entertainments, creation of peace and stability, provision of work, enhanced status and roles for the upper classes, multiple buildings and money handouts. Many responses assumed inhabitants means poor/ordinary citizens ignoring other groups who live/worked in Rome.

Not all responses made clear connections between actions and improvements: the corn supply, aqueducts, the night-watch, and so on were relatively straightforward and dealt with well; explaining how the building of the Temple of Mars improved lives proved more difficult; The Augustan Forum is explained in Suetonius but appeared very rarely. Most mention 'bread and circuses', some referring to Juvenal correctly but hardly ever explaining the rest of the reference and giving the quote a context.

Better responses had a range of reasons and linked them clearly to the attempts. Reasons covered most often meant 'making happier'; there were rarely multiple reasons. Most frequent were popularity, maintain power and support, rarely to avoid riots, or genuine concern. Sometimes they were specific to emperor such as Claudius' need to gain immediate support given the antipathy of the Senate or only 8 days of grain left and deeded to get on with it.

Good responses displayed a good range of knowledge of the sources, often detailed, with accurate quotes. This was used to support the judgements and explanations in those which performed well. Good evaluation of specific examples produced well-developed judgements.

Less successfully, in some responses, they were treated as fact rather than as support for an explanation. For example, they were selective especially on Gaius (hate me/fear me, only one neck,) and generalised assertions follow. There was much less of the context and how that impacts the conclusion we can take from them. 3 or 4 lines of general 'evaluation' often followed with no explanation as to how the background of the author, for example, impacted on the validity of the reference/quote just used. These many isolated paragraphs add little because they are not integrated into the development of the judgements.

Common mistakes were that The Res Gestae has the quote on brick and marble; Tacitus not Suetonius has Tiberius (literally) thrown into the Tiber. Sources might be named with a general idea of their view (e.g. Pliny the Elder comments on the buildings but no detail of what comment, or Virgil and Horace referenced for religion but again no specific point made).

Responses which chose to narrate through the emperors generally made much of Augustus using Res Gestae, Suetonius and Dio. After Augustus the responses gradually declined in quality, either through lack of information or sources or the candidate had spent too long on Augustus and needed to finish. Claudius and Nero, therefore received less discussion and assessment.

Assertions are made that Tiberius or Gaius did nothing to improve lives even when giving examples of actions they took such as Gaius reduction of the auction tax. Equally it was asserted without any evidence that the emperors did nothing for the senatorial class.

The question did not ask how far lives were improved but the extent to which attempts were made; responses which discuss the improvement of lives often were left to assert an improvement with no evidence, assuming a new temple did improve lives for example. Great play was made of Tiberius' failure to improve lives, or even made them worse with trials, but the issue in the question was: did he make any attempts and why; responses became diverted by his 'brutality' and lost focus.

Most responses had very good or at least good sections but were affected by a variety of misconceptions. A perfectly relevant reference to evidence might be affected by a misattribution leading to an erroneous conclusion or a misunderstanding of the context again leading to an unconvincing analysis. Minor errors of dates or events are to be expected to some extent in a timed examination and do not seriously affect the performance unless they lead to misunderstanding or an unsubstantiated judgement.

Common errors included mixing up the emperors - Claudius assassinated by senators (Gaius?), Gaius building a Golden House (Nero), Nero finishing aqueducts, Claudius thrown into Tiber (Tiberius- actually not literally thrown), Gaius' golden 5 years (Nero?); Pontifex Maximus was voted to Augustus in 23 BC by the Senate; he abolished the tribune.

Question 2

2* How useful is Suetonius for our understanding of the reigns of the emperors of this period? You
    must consider the accounts of at least **two** emperors in your answer.

    You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge
    to support your answer.   **[30]**

Very good responses took specific episodes and compared the detail in Suetonius with that of other writers/evidence. Reasonable responses produced narrative of episodes with sources attached offering some comparison with other evidence to match Suetonius. However, they lacked consistently developed points. The responses often assessed 'useful' in terms of how credible he and others were - for example the account of the fire in Rome (AD 64) and Suetonius differences on the cause and effect from Tacitus' more 'balanced' account. Another example was the quadrans of Gaius and the reference to the tax in Suetonius, developed with the later riot over taxes recorded in Dio or Josephus. A further example was the comparison of Suetonius and Velleius on Tiberius especially on his generosity or buildings. This allowed assessment of the positive/negative account of the reign by Suetonius.

Some very good responses, instead of dealing with emperors in turn, looked at themes within the accounts such as the relationship with the senators, the attitude towards administration, the characterisation of the emperors and other themes and assessed the usefulness of the accounts.

Assessing the reliability of written or material sources is achieved only by using specific examples. General evaluations (that Suetonius always relies on gossip, or that Tacitus is completely negative towards Tiberius) do not allow the response to deal with the context and its impact on the issue convincingly. An example of undeveloped evaluation was to mention Augustus and Agrippa's aqueducts or the Cloaca Maxima, while claiming Suetonius is not to be trusted always because he writes as a moralist. It is not explained why the account of aqueducts is no longer credible in this case.

Some very carefully selected episodes are identified and explored analytically. Good assessments were formed on the opening of Claudius' reign. Suetonius' presentation of the 'accident' of his accession was interpreted as a deliberate way to show his weakness. Very good responses developed this by showing that there were also instances in Suetonius where he is shown as administratively competent and even excellent. This suggested a more through and sustained analysis. Some responses attempted a more narrative exploration of the emperors selected which reduces the opportunity for analysis. Some candidates prioritise exploration of the sources in a generalised way that detracts from the argument being made at a given point.

The focus for the good responses was the detail provided by Suetonius for a reign; some balanced their response by contrasting the Suetonius' focus on character at the expense of the reign. Good responses selected a few key episodes which they could develop their assessment rather than a general, sometimes, erroneous overview of his biographies.

Less successful were the responses with a general sentence of Suetonius' view of an emperor followed by a (sometimes) detailed assessment of another author (e.g. Tacitus on Tiberius). They then concluded that Tacitus was more useful. This approach loses focus on the author in the question. A good comparison might be made with the Res Gestae and how Suetonius includes matters which Augustus preferred to leave out (e.g. Varus disaster or his less acceptable behaviour as a triumvir or the plots In Ch 19).

There was, naturally, a focus on Augustus, with much time spent here; There was a limited focus on a second emperor (although a number chose to do more than two).

The usual opening paragraph about the limitations of Suetonius was not applied consistently later in the response. A common opening statement was that Suetonius belonged to the senatorial order; he was in fact an equestrian - thus arguments of senatorial bias were somewhat difficult to sustain. Responses did not appreciate the different genres and approaches of authors when comparing them.

Question 3

3   Read the interpretation below.

How convincing do you find Beard's interpretation that 'Augustus appears to have abolished nothing'?

You must use your knowledge of the historical period and the ancient sources you have studied to analyse and evaluate Beard's interpretation.   **[20]**

It is important in this question to read the extract carefully and deal with the phraseology of the extract, and not rephrase it in some minor or major way.

Responses which dealt with what Beard actually wrote and assessed the points with close attention to the text were clearly going to score well. They supported their views with precise knowledge of the context and details of this debate. Many were able to show Beard's analysis was in some ways superficial by detailing the various actions Augustus took: for example, the less republican numerous consulships, or his grandsons gaining it well before the legal age. The majority had the major powers to hand. Most could quote Cassius Dio on 'the monarchy' and/or Suetonius comment that Augustus thought of restoring the Republic twice. Responses which had precise and detailed. Of the reality as opposed to the pretence scored well.

There were, therefore, difficulties for candidates in not using the quote from the question in full, usually excluding 'appears' but focusing on 'abolished nothing'; this led to the view that the analysis argues the Beard is wrong since Augustus did abolish things, not all of which were constitutional (e.g adultery, Antony and Cleopatra, the civil war, books of prophecies).

The extract mentions privileges of the Senate which was translated in responses to powers. Therefore, the reduction in the senate's roll was treated as a diminution of power rather than a possible enhanced status. Good responses had examples of Augustus' new regulations on the senate which may be seen as enhancement. Many responses pointed to the rise in the qualification making it more elite, or the rules of attendance and speaking giving it more respect. More relevant, but needed developing, was the change in the organisation of provinces as a change in privilege rather than power.

Less success was gained when responses explained Augustus' settlements as if this was a question asking 'did Augustus restore the Republic?'.

It was not always clear in responses what they understood by Beard's 'governing class'. Beard's statement on the offices still being filled was often countered by the view that Augustus decided who filled them. The creation of the 'Consilium' was seen as evidence of Augustus decreasing the privileges of the Senate or changing the governing class.

Misconceptions (about how republican his powers were) was noticed in responses claiming the tribune was new or imperium was unprecedented or the title of pro-consul was new.

Good responses supported their views with reference to specific knowledge of Augustus' practice whether they argued the view was or was not convincing. A sense of the background was present in the majority of responses - Caesar's murder, the danger of appearing like a king, the traditional Roman loyalty to the Republic, all found favour in the responses and served well for candidates.

Good responses showed an understanding that Augustus had to be circumspect given the assassination of Caesar. Good responses developed the importance of maintaining relations with the upper class, which formed the basis of an appreciation of the points in the extract relating to 'appears'; in addition, the

extent to which he really did abolish some things if not in name but in reality, was convincingly argued. Concepts such as 'illusion', 'façade' were commonly found in good analyses.

The detail of Augustus' power/roles/titles and how they were acquired was variable- in better responses there was a clear knowledge of the evidence in Dio, while weaker ones claimed Suetonius as the source. The episode of Augustus resigning and receiving his powers in 23 BC after an illness is claimed to have been in Suetonius who tells us he 'forced' the senate (presumably section 28 which says no such thing).

Exemplar 1

3		Beard's interpretation that 'Augustus appears to have abolished nothing' is very convincing. Beard states that 'the governing class remained the same' which is convincing as Augustus kept the senate and attempted to make Rome appear as much like a republic as possible, even offering to step down in 27 BC in order to retain the republic. This also supported by Dio who states that this was a façade which only gave the allusion of a republic while Augustus really had total power. Although it could be interpreted that Dio opposes Beard, he is still stating that the governing class remained the same in order for Augustus to create the image of a republic, making her overall interpretation more convincing. //

Exemplar 1 is the opening paragraph from a response and is a focused analysis of the precise wording of the extract; it takes each aspect in turn in a straightforward manner. It does not rephrase what is said nor argue the issue of Augustus' constitutional position in isolation from the extract. There are some details in support of the view taken of the extract. It refers to 27 BC and the offer to step down; it includes a reference to Dio to add support indicating the concept of façade and illusion. Even in a sense challenging Beard the response notes that Dio supports her statement.

Question 4

SECTION B: Ruling Roman Britain, AD 43–c.128

Answer question 4 **and** then **either** question 5 **or** question 6.

Answer question 4.

4   Read the passage below.

How useful is this passage for our understanding of the worth of Britain to the Romans?   **[12]**

All three paragraphs have some information to be assessed and responses dealt with these with varying success.

Good supporting material used was Suetonius, Dio Cassius, Mela, Strabo as well as material evidence such as Claudius' aureus and Arch, the Mendip lead pip, Vindolanda tablets. Events in Britain were used to support the idea that tribes did not cooperate to were easy to defeat (e.g. at the invasion). Evidence supported this disunity: for example the dispute that sent Adminius and Verica looking for help in Britain. Equallt sound examples were used to show resistance when subject to abuse such as Boudicca, or the Iceni revolt of AD 47. Examples of client kings/queens (Cogidumnus, Cartimandua) served to support claims by Tacitus about their readiness to submit.

For the second paragraph, responses made good use of the evidence from other authors which both supported and contradicted Tacitus on the subject of crops and minerals. Some responses dealt in detail with his claims, others took an overview, mentioning 'crops' or 'metals'. In most responses the approach was to assess what the passage tells us about the worth to the Romans- in other words what the Romans thought was there.

The third paragraph was analysed well by most; good responses took up the reference to Caesar and linked it with Claudius' invasion. Here was one of his motives – to challenge Caesar who failed.

Responses dealt well with the context of the 'Agricola' as a piece of work by Tacitus for his father-in-law and what that might mean for the accuracy of the information. Often this was in general terms rather than dealing specifically with the text and its information. Some responses did little else but discuss the reliability of Tacitus. Some responses left their discussion to the final paragraph and concluded we could not trust Tacitus because of his need to eulogise Agricola. It did mean that much of what they had declared to be sound information was undermined. Good responses linked the evaluation with specific details in the passage- such as the issue of how much gold (although to be fair Tacitus does not say there was a lot, as some seem to think).

The details of the passage were compared in some responses with other evidence or information and the credibility assessed implicitly without actually addressing the term 'useful' in the question.

Some responses focused on assessing the reliability or accuracy of Tacitus' statements such as the presence of gold or the fighting from chariots or that occasionally tribes did cooperate. This focus led them away at times from assessing the usefulness of the passage for our understanding of what the island was 'worth to the Romans' which is what Tacitus is telling us regardless of his inaccuracy. Good use of this aspect tied the assessment to the issue in the question- if he is wrong on gold, how does that affect our understanding of the worth of Britain to the Romans?

It was stated in a number of responses that Tacitus was wrong- Britain had no gold or silver- there was not much gold but the Romans mined it in Wales; extracting silver from lead ingots was common and lead and silver was a major export from Britain.

Exemplar 2

The source is valuable in telling us about British warfare - It notes ~~both~~ both their method of battle, chariots, as well as their disunity. Tacitus states that Claudius required an easy victory to subdue his troops after a small mutiny and affirm his position as princeps, which supports the idea of divisions in Britain. Britain being easy to conquer, as a result of disunity, would make it valuable to Rome. The variations in Romano-tribal relations can be evidenced by Verica's coins in Atrebati territory depicting pro-Roman images, whereas coinage from the north of Wales or Scotland remains ~~little~~ Romanised to a lesser extent. The source also supports the idea that British infantry and chariot warfare ~~were~~ were a threat, being their strength. Late in the British conquest, Vindolanda tablets suggest Britons were recruited, and thus can indicate that these strengths were desirable to Rome.

In Exemplar 2 the discussion starts by focusing on the question and quickly summarises the main points of the first paragraph of the extract. It continues with supporting background in analysing what worth the disunity was to the Romans- an easy victory as Claudius needed. That disunity is further supported by precise coinage. In addition, the response takes a specific point from the passage and develops it with further evidence, making convincing conclusion within the scope of the exercise. This exemplar from a longer response indicates a good approach to the question which is succinct and to the point. It takes elements and argues their value based on other knowledge which precise and mostly accurate.

Question 5

5* How far does the evidence help us understand the aims of the Romans in their construction of Hadrian's Wall?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[36]**

There were some very good responses which had a range of aims supported by precise knowledge and evidence. They had clearly engaged with this subject. They knew the material and knew how to deploy it effectively. They could also use other material to support their knowledge of the Wall effectively and precisely.

Responses generally, and quite rightly, established the paucity of literary evidence and the difficulty of interpreting the material evidence. On this basis good responses had detail of what we do have; less successful were unable to detail a reasonable range of examples and relied on the limitation of evidence as an argument.

In good, well-founded responses the detail of construction and remains provides evidence for discussion on aims; the more detailed the more convincing would be the explanation and analysis. Responses which display a specific knowledge of the structure and terms (i.e. vallum, forts, milecastles etc) and location can clearly score well in both A02 and A03, since they provide substantiated judgements. Responses which had only a general idea (e.g. there were milecastles but no example, there was a vallum but no detail of its location and structure, there were gates without a reference to a fort) clearly found it difficult to substantiate their views on aims. These tended to have difficulty in making their arguments and judgements convincing. General overviews of the wall and its structure are unlikely to provide thorough and convincing responses since there is not sufficient evidence to answer the specific question which focused on the evidence rather than a narrative of its construction.

Precise and detailed knowledge of the limited literary/archaeological evidence apart from the wall itself can aid well-developed responses. The use of SHA varied from precise quotes to a general statements or summaries; it was not used consistently by candidates, either simply referenced or wrongly dated (despite issue over that) or misquoted. While it is not very informative, it does provide a good starting point for the response if used precisely. It does, indeed, give some hints of troubles with the British and one overall aim.

The limitation of literary evidence was indicated in a few responses; some were aware of vague indications of fighting in Statius, Fronto and Pliny (although these are not prescribed and could not be expected). However, it is pleasing to see wider reading.

Good use was generally made of the material evidence. Coins, for example, were referenced well with detail and precise contexts- As of Hadrian, for example as evidence of problems with tribes. The altars to Neptune and Oceanus and the reference to the 6th legion was used as support for the activity in Britain; as was the inscription to Sabinus (although the detail of 1000 men from each of three legions became 1000 men in total for some). Inscriptions from Milecastle 38, Halton Chesters and Benwell could all be deployed effectively provided that the details were accurate.

References to walls in other parts of the Empire can only aid the judgements if specific; support from Tacitus *Agricola* aids in terms of general policy before Hadrian but needs to be tied closely to the issue of 'aims' - and this was not always the case, especially where the response showed a lack of knowledge of the chronology of events.

Vindolanda tablets were cited without clearly stating the accepted dates for them, and used as if written at the time of the wall's construction. The location of the fort was often insecure, placing it on the wall and even north of it.

Suetonius and Dio are of limited use in the aspect of Roman Britain, although some candidates seem to think they are relevant.

Exemplar 3

In fact, it could be argued that by Trebellius Maximus' governorship, wars with the natives were on hold, if not finished. Around this time, Tacitus criticises Nero for withdrawing a legion from Britain, however it suggests that a policy of consolidation had begun. Three successive governors, Trebellius, Turpilianus and Bolanus all followed policies of pacification, soldiers being used to build towns, vici or other administrative duties. A tombstone found in Wroxeter from the mid 1st century indicates a soldier holding a role of beneficiarii, or assistant to the governor's civic duties. These three governors attest to the fluctuating policy in Britain, and thus it can be said that they did not spend all their time fighting the natives - and although Tacitus criticises their inactivity - they were more effective at consolidating below the Tyne-Solway. This policy can also be supported by inscriptions on roads that attribute the Fosse Way or Stanegate Road to being built by soldiers, meaning they weren't fighting natives, thus suggesting that the governors were not conquering native tribes.

Exemplar 3 provides an approach to the question of the Romans always fighting the British which is not based on a narrative of the period. It analyses particular issues using the information grouped together rather than narrating each in turn. The response identifies a period in Roman Britain when there was little fighting and supports the view with specific evidence, both literary and material. The conclusion is convincing, although not thoroughly developed. The reference to inscription on roads is vague, although not inaccurate. The references to Tacitus are again slightly underdeveloped if not actually misleading. While there are issues with the paragraph, the analytical approach is commendable and effective.

Question 6

6* 'The Roman governors of Britain spent all their time fighting with the natives.' To what extent do you agree with this statement?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer.   [36]

There were some very sound and well-organised responses which avoided the narrative of the period and took a more thematic approach dealing with the fighting periods and then the non-fighting periods separately. These responses presented an organised and well-constructed answer which offered a balanced account in answer to 'all their time'.

Some responses approached the question with a narrative of the period AD 43 to Hadrian's Wall (AD 122 but not always correctly dated). To some extent this was acceptable unless the narrative did not produce supporting evidence for the events thus failing to meet the A03 criteria either entirely or partially.

Some responses exhibited excellent detail of the invasion, Scapula and Boudicca's revolt but did not develop further into the period nor establish the same detail for the governors who did not fight constantly. This may have been due to a failure to plan the response for the time allowed.

While emphasis was rightly given to the fighting in the early period, there was a general failure to note that in this period there were client kings/queens who were on good terms with the Romans- even the Iceni had periods of peaceful co-existence.

Some responses had a focus on Romanisation in general rather than what governors are doing. to achieve this. Good responses gave specific examples of activities other than fighting. This included the setting up of towns (Colchester) or diplomacy with client kings and queens or facilitating trade in London. Others were unbalanced in the limited reference to non-fighting activities mentioning only an occasional example - the colonisation of Colchester (Tacitus) or the lead pipe from Chester (although this relates to fort building rather than Romanisation).

Very good use was made of Tacitus' *Agricola* as the major sources, although largely on Agricola himself; less used were the A*nnals* and *Histories* (both prescribed materials). There was excellent evaluation of aspects of Tacitus' account in many responses, notably his view of 'lazy' governors and use of speeches by British leaders. These evaluations were mostly focused on the issue in the questions. For some they became the central focus rather than support for the argument.

His attitude towards not expansionist governors was universally criticised either as an attempt to boost Agricola's reputation or because he thought conquest was what Romans should be doing. Occasional references were made to Suetonius: Nero's idea of giving up Britain or Vespasian's conquests in the West. Dio Cassius was, naturally, used for the invasion and Boudicca. Good comparisons were made on this with Tacitus.

Very good responses dealt in specific terms, both in events and sources, with the minor governorships in the 50s and 60s; less successful in A01 and A03 were those which skipped over this period to focus on Plautius, Paulinus and Agricola. This could be the basis of a good response provided the issue of 'always fighting' was addressed as well. Good points were made about the lack of information in the sources for some governors, relying much on the account in *Agricola* and the *Annals*; however, as noted, the accounts in the *Annals* and *Histories* were less used, affecting the balance of the judgements.

There was limited use of the range of inscriptions and tombstones which showed the movement of the legions and, to some extent, the fighting and non-fighting activities. Equally most responses did not

discuss the reduced level of military activity after Agricola- the setting up of the Stanegate line, the Vindolanda tablets which are of more use here than for Hadrian's Wall.

A misunderstanding resulted from insecure knowledge of the tribes, confusing Brigantes with Iceni most often, Catuvellauni with Trinovantes less often. The same confusion arose over the order of governors and, occasionally, the precise names of some.

In the same way insecure chronology led to errors of judgement. For example it is difficult to argue that the Boudiccan revolt was a factor in Hadrian's decision to retrench and build a wall 60 years later in the north. Suetonius Paulinus, not infrequently, named as the 'first' governor (as if the period started with Boudicca).

The use of the lead pipe with Agricola's name is not always understood since the link is not made with the fort- it is assumed that this is part of Romanisation. A more relevant example would be the forum at St Albans but this was rarely mentioned.

Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website. If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

activeresults

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. Available for GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance

- analyse results at question and/or topic level*

- compare your centre with OCR national averages

- identify trends across the centre

- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses

- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle

- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

*To find out which reports are available for a specific subject, please visit ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/

Find out more at ocr.org.uk/activeresults

CPD Training

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website.

www.ocr.org.uk

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.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk.

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

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

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/

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Customer Support Centre

General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998
Facsimile   01223 552627
Email 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 2019** 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.