GCE

Ancient History

H407/21: Republic and Empire

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021

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.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank Page
	Omission
	Noted
	AO1
	AO2
	AO3
	AO4
	Irrelevant
	Correct point
	Knowledge and understanding
	Evaluation

Subject specific guidance

The Assessment Objectives targeted by each question and the maximum marks available for each Assessment Objective are given at the top of each levels mark scheme for each question.

The weightings of the assessment objectives remain consistent throughout the levels. For example, if the maximum marks are 5 AO1, 10 AO2 and 15 AO3, then the AO1/AO2/AO3 ratio will be 1/2/3 throughout the levels.

When marking, you must therefore give greater priority to the more heavily weighted Assessment Objective when determining in which level and where within a level to place an answer.

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 1*</td><td colspan="2">How useful is the evidence for our understanding of attitudes towards the Imperial Cult during this period? [30 marks]</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Assessment Objectives</td><td colspan="2">AO3 = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:
• historical events and historical periods studied
• how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.
AO2 = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements
AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.
Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional guidance</td><td colspan="2">The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Marks</td><td>Level descriptors</td><td>Indicative content</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>25–30</td><td>• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</td><td>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of ‘how useful’. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.
Candidates should consider the range of information provided by literary and material evidence for the Imperial Cult. They should consider the value or usefulness of the evidence in a range of examples but also will be expected to compare the various genres of evidence in order to interpret, analyse and evaluate them. Candidates will be expected to cover the period but not every emperor or reign needs to be dealt with in detail for a full response to the question. They should consider the reasons for use or non-use of the Cult by emperors and others. They should consider the differences and similarities between reigns during the period and between the evidence both contemporary and non-contemporary.
Responses are likely to include aspects of the Imperial cult, for example:</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>19–24</td>
<td>

Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2)
The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)

There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
</td>
<td rowspan="2">

Deification of imperial family members;
Specific actions, enactments and statements by emperors in relation to the Imperial Cult and their differing attitudes towards worship;
The different ways in which the emperors and their families could be worshipped including indirect means e.g. Genius, numen
Buildings, altars, reliefs, etc related to the Cult or worship of the imperial family;
The various attitudes of citizens, non-citizens and provincials towards the Cult;
The political aspects of the Imperial cult.

Supporting source details may include:

Deification of Augustus Tac. Ann. 1.10.8 temple and cult; sestertius of Tiberius AD 34/5 statue of Divus Augustus; Claudius – aureus AD 54, Suet. Claudius 45; Tac Ann. 12.69; Livia - Suet Claudius 11; Nero’s daughter, Poppaea; Seneca On consl.to Polybius Drusilla deified by Gaius;
Tac. Ann. 1.10.6 Augustus; Claudius letter to Alexandrians; Suet. Tib. 26 vetoes temples cf Gytheion; Nero vetoes temple Tac. Ann. 15.74; Gaius- divine honours Jos. JA 19.4,11; Dio 59. 28.1 precinct at Miletus; Suet. Gaius 22, Dio 59.28.2-6 temple at Rome to numen, priests, sacrifices; 59.28.5 alters temple to Dioscuri (reversed by Claudius (Dio 60.6.8); Palatine connected to Capitol (Suet. Gaius 22); Tac. Ann. 15.74 Cerialis proposed temple to Nero;
Genius of Augustus etc: inscription ILS 112 Altar at Narbonne AD 12-13 to numen of A.; Augustan Lares -inscription ILS 3612 ?7 BC; Ovid Fasti 5.140 Lares Compitales and Genius of A.; divi filius on coins e.g. aureus 28 BC, aureus 15-12 BC triumphal branches; denarius 27 BC Egypt captured; AS AD 62 Nero as Apollo

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>13–18</td>
<td>

Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2)
The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)

There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>7–12</td>
<td>

Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2)
The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1)

The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
</td>
<td rowspan="2">

Strabo Geog. 4.3.2 Altar/Temple to Augustus at Lyon, 60 tribes involved; Tac. Ann. 4.37 Temple at Pergamum to A. and Rome; temple to J. Caesar; Suet. Tib. 47 temple of Augustus in Rome cf Velleius 2.130; Gytheion inscription AD 15; ILS 6080 Inscription to Genius of Tiberius in Rome AD 27;
Virgil Aeneid 8. Augustus among gods; Horace Odes 4.15 association with Ve nus; Ovid Fasti 2.119ff associated with Jupiter; denarius 16 BC vows for Augustus' safety; Gaius: Dio 59.26.5-6 pretended he was various gods cf 28.5; Suet. Gaius 22.1 treated as a god; pretended to be Jupiter Latiaris; Dio 59.26.5 Gaius called demi-god; 26.9 mocked by a Gaul; Suet. Gaius 22 citizens become priests of Gaius;
Suet. Aug. 31 traditional Roman religion; 93 respect for ancient foreign rites; denarius 16 BC 4 priesthoods of Augustus; Suet Claudius 45 Nero neglects and cancels deification of Claudius.

Although not expected, candidates may include non-prescribed material which should be credited. For example:
Augustus: AD 9-14 Lyon altar; Dio 51.20 Pergamum; Suet. Aug. 52 opposed temples unless Rome included, and any temple in Rome; Horace Odes 4.5. 32-34 A. worshipped as a god cf 3.5; Tiberius: Tac. Ann. 4.15 temple in Asia to Tiberius, Livia and the senate. Tac. Ann. 4.37-38 Spain asks for temple to Tiberius and Livia- 'I am human'. Gaius: Inscription from Didyma, temple at Miletus (Smallwood 127) cf Suet. Gaius 21; Claudius: Temple to Claudius at Colchester (Tac.Ann. 14.32); dupondius AD 41-50 Livia deified; Nero: daughter deified Tac. Ann. 16.5, Poppaea 16.20; Sebasteion at Aphrodisias.

Analysis of the sources might focus on:

the genres, agendas and contexts of the evidence and how these affect the value of the information for the Imperial Cult, its importance and attitudes towards it.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1–6</td>
<td>

Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3)
The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2)
The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1)

Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	• The nature of the sources: history, biography, epigraphic, numismatic etc. • The limitation of the evidence for attitudes and the actions of the emperors and others. • The differences and similarities between sources contemporary and non-contemporary, and different genres.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 2*</td><td colspan="2">‘Claudius was a more effective and successful emperor than Tiberius.’ To what extent is this a fair assessment? [30 marks]</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Assessment Objectives</td><td colspan="2">AO3 = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:
• historical events and historical periods studied
• how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.
AO2 = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements.
AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.
Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional guidance</td><td colspan="2">The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Marks</td><td>Level descriptors</td><td>Indicative content</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>25–30</td><td>• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</td><td rowspan="2">No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issues of effectiveness and success in comparing the two emperors and the fairness of the assessment. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.

Candidates should consider the range of information provided by literary and material evidence for the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius. They should detail the actions, policies and aims of Tiberius and Claudius; they should consider the consequences of these for the extent of success for each emperor; they should use detailed information to compare their reigns in terms of the question. Candidates will be expected to cover the reigns but not every act, policy or aim needs to be dealt with in detail for a full response to the question. They may consider the differences and similarities between reigns and consider the reasons and contexts for these. They should consider the value or usefulness of the evidence, both contemporary and non-contemporary, in a range of examples but also will be</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>19–24</td><td>• Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically</td></tr>
</table>

		reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.	expected to compare the various genres of evidence in order to interpret, analyse and evaluate them. There should be a discussion of the fairness of the assessment and some conclusion to this issue. Responses are likely to include some of the following aspects of the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius: • their relations with the Senate and individual senators, the equestrians and the ordinary citizens of Rome and the Empire; the extent of their success in gaining good relations; • extent of success in the administration of the city and its functioning; • the provinces and security; attitudes towards expansion and resistance; • income and expenditure; • their relations with members of the imperial family and the succession; • their relations with the army, including the Praetorian Guard; • their reactions to opposition in Rome and elsewhere; • the presentation of themselves and the attitudes of the citizens. Supporting source details may include: • Acts etc: **Tiberius** e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 1.6 Postumus; mutinies Tac. *Ann.*1.46-7; Velleius 2.125; 2.126/129 achievements; cf Suet *Tib.* 32.2; Suet *Tib.* 48.2 generosity cf Velleius 2.130; Dio 58.8 Sejanus; retirement Tac. *Ann.* 4.41; greed Tac. *Ann.* 6.19 deaths - terror; **Claudius e.g.** Dio 60 3.1-7 accession cf Jos. *JA* 19.158ff, Suet. *Cl*. 11; Tac. *Ann.* 11.24 Gauls; Fucine lake Pliny *NH* 36.124; aqueduct Pliny *NH* 36.122-3 cf Suet *Cl.* 20 and Ostia (ILS 207, procurator inscrp.); Pomerium: ILS 213. • Administration: **Tiberius:** Velleius 2.130 buildings; Tac *Ann.* 4.2 Praetorian camp; Suet *Tib.* 47 buildings; shows; surplus in treasury- Suet *Gaius* 37 2,700 m HS; **Claudius:** Dio 60.1ff gifts, confiscations, various regulations; corn supply Seneca. *Shortness of life* 18.5 cf Suet *Cl.* 18, dupondius Ceres; upkeep of city, Arch of Tiberius (11), Theatre of Pompey (21); 25 slave laws; • Provinces: **Tiberius:** Sacrovir – Velleius 2.129; Tacfarinas Tac. *Ann.* 2,52, 3.20, 3.32, 3.73-4; Frisii Tac. *Ann*. 4.74; Gytheion inscr.; Suet *Tib.*
Level 3	13–18	• Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.	
Level 2	7–12	• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2)	

		• The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) The information has some relevance but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	26.1 rejects temples; Suet *Tib.* 32 taxes; 36 cults and Jews; **Claudius**: Suet. *Cl*. 17 Britain, cf aureus AD 46-7 arch; 25 changes; • Relations: **Tiberius:** Tac. *Ann.* 1.11-12 accession cf Suet *Tib.* 23-4; Tac. *Annals* 1.7.6 Germanicus, cf 1.52 distrust; 7.7 pretence of hesitancy; Velleius 129 generous;.127 Sejanus praise– contrast Tac *Ann.* 4.2.3, Dio 58.4.1-4, 5 Tib. offshore monarch, 8 fall of Sejanus; Tac. *Ann.* 1.39 mistrust among soldiers; **Senate :** Tac. *Ann.* 3.65 men fit to be slaves; Suet *Tib.* 29 respect; 30 appearance of liberty; 47 helped financially; 48 mean; **Claudius**: Suet. *Cl*. 10 support of ordinary citizens; 12 rumour of death causes riot; 21 largesse, games, Secular Games; 12 respect for senate; praetorians – Aureus AD 41-2, Suet.*Cl* 10; 25 equites; • Opposition: **Tiberius**: trials- Seneca *On Benefits* 3.26.1 national madness; Tac. *Ann.* 1.72 maiestas; 3.50 Clutorius Priscus (executed); Suet *Tib.* 41 Capri. **Claudius**: Dio 60.15 plots: Vinicianus, Scribonianus cf Suet. *Cl*.13; 60.16.1 deaths cf Suet. *Cl*. 29 35 senators, 300 equites; • Imperial family: **Tiberius:** Velleius 2.130.4 Agrippina, Tac. *Ann*. 4.39-40 animosity; **Claudius**: Tac. *Ann.* 12.24-5 Nero and Britannicus cf 12.41; Agrippina's power; 12.66ff plots cf Jos. *JA* 20.151, Suet. *Cl*. 44; Messalina Suet. *Cl*. 36 • **Tiberius:** Suet *Tib.* 26-7 rejects worship; modest, Gytheion; **Claudius:** Alexandrians letter; 25 Jews/Druids; **Views of the emperors expressed in the sources:** **Tiberius**: Tac. *Ann.* 1. 10.7 succession;11 obscure, ambiguous; 1.46 hypocritical over mutinies; 1.47/52 deceitful, hiding true feelings; 1.72 cruelty, arrogance; 4.1 T. let violence loose (Sejanus); 3.65 Tiberius' freedom's enemy'; 6.19 frenzied with bloodshed; Velleius 2.99 our greatest general; 123.1 A. leaving state in safe hands. Suetonius: *Tib.* 41 let affairs slide; 48 mean; 61 cruel; 63 hated; state of terror; 75 joy on his death; **Claudius**: DIo 60.1.1 acted in proper manner; 60.6.1 exemplary actions; 60.15 no longer confident hopes in C.; 60.14 controlled by wives and freedmen cf Suet. *Cl*. 25/29; 60.18.2-3 Claudius unaware of others crimes; terrified by plots Suet *Cl.* 36;
Level 1	1–6	• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) • The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

			Although not expected, candidates may include non-prescribed material which should be credited. e.g.: Tac *Ann.* 2.47f earthquakes in Asia; 4.64 Caelian fire; 6.45 Aventine fire; 4.6 Tib.'s good administration; Tac. *Ann.* 4.57 retirement to Capri- reasons speculated; Gaius succession Tac. *Ann.* 4.46, 48; Suet *Tib.* 76 Analysis of the sources might focus on: • the genres, agendas and contexts of the evidence and how these affect the value of the information on both emperors and views of them; • The nature of the sources: history, biography, epigraphic, numismatic; • The limitation of the evidence for attitudes towards the emperors and their actions. • The differences and similarities between sources, contemporary and non-contemporary, and different genres.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 3</td><td colspan="2">How convincing do you find Wallace-Hadrill's interpretation that Augustus gave Rome 'a new version of an old constitution'?
[20 marks]</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Assessment Objectives</td><td colspan="2">AO4 = 15 marks = Analyse and evaluate, in context, modern historians' interpretations of the historical events and topics studied.
AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional guidance</td><td colspan="2">The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.
Please note that interpretations can be evaluated in the context of the wider historical debate connected with the issue or of the historical context about which the historian was writing. There is no expectation that the interpretation will be evaluated in the context of the methods or approach used by the historian, or how the interpretation may have been affected by the time in which they were writing, though credit can be given for this approach to evaluation if done in a way which is relevant to the question.
A learner's knowledge and understanding of the historical period, including the ancient sources may be credited, but only where it is presented in a way which is relevant and intrinsically linked to the analysis/evaluation/use of the interpretation, it should not be credited in isolation.</td></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Level descriptors</th><th>Indicative content</th></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>17–20</td><td>• Response has a very through and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and fully substantiated evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)
• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)</td><td rowspan="2">No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with a conclusion either agreeing or disagreeing with the modern historians' interpretation, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of 'how convincing'. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.

Answers should evaluate both the interpretation locating it within the wider historical debate about the issue and using their own knowledge of the ancient sources and events and periods to reach a judgement about how convincing they find the argument.
In locating the interpretation within the wider historical debate, candidates should
• discuss the specific aspects of the restoration of the Republic in this passage;
• consider the specific actions of Augustus after 31 BC regarding the Roman constitution;
• assess whether there was change and/or continuity;
• discuss the significance of Augustus' actions for the functioning of the Republic;
• consider how far Augustus created a 'new version' or a new constitution.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>13–16</td><td>• Response has a through and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and well supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)
• The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>9–12</td><td>• Response has a good analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)

• The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1)</td><td rowspan="4">In evaluating the interpretation, answers might argue that this view is not convincing, pointing towards the following information / ancient sources:

• views taken in sources: Tac. Ann. 1.2 took function of magistrates, 4.1, revolution complete, 10 assessment; Suet Aug. 28 twice did not restore Republic, ‘best possible constitution’; Dio 53.16 complete control, 17 monarchy, Augustus’ appearance of republicanism 53.12-13;
• powers and roles of Augustus: the settlements of 27 BC, 23 BC and 19 BC; the nature of his imperium: Edicts of Cyrene (Lactor 17 M20); tribunicia potestas Tac. Ann. 3.56; the provincial commands: Egypt Tac. Ann. 2.59, Denarius Aegypta Capta; Strabo 17.3.25; censor RG 8, Suet Aug. 35 (Senate), supervisor of morals RG 6, Suet Aug. 34;
• control of magistrates and the senate; the ‘consilium’; new posts Suet Aug. 37
• opposition and challenges Velleius 2.88 Lepidus Velleius 2.91 Murena and Caepio
• creation of dynasty Tac. Ann. 1.3; succession etc: Velleius 2.90, 2.99, 2.123.2; Aureus 2 BC -AD 11 Gaius/Lucius;

In evaluating the interpretation, answers might argue that this view is convincing, drawing on the following information / ancient sources:

• views taken in sources: Velleius 2.89; RG 34, 1.1,5.1, 6.1 declines unconstitutional roles, dictatorship RG 5; Aureus 28 BC and 12 BC; Tac. Ann. 1.9 ‘first citizen’;
• the auctoritas, patronage – a traditional feature of Roman political life; RG 34, 15-16;
• the records of independent actions, legislation etc, functioning of traditional republican aspects Tac Ann. 3.7, 9; powers granted by the senate RG 6;
• attitude to tradition: Res Gestae 7 priesthoods (denarius 16 BC), 6, 8 respect for tradition; Pontifex Maximus Suet Aug. 31; buildings displaying history of Rome – the Forum, Arch; Horace Odes 4.15;
• involvement of aristocratic families: City Prefect Tac. Ann. 6.10;
• use of republican precedents by Augustus - constitutional continuity in use of the forms of the Republic; limited time-scales on grants of powers;</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 2</td><td>5–8</td><td>• Response has some analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a partially supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)

• The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1–4</td><td>• Response has a basic analysis of the interpretation, with parts of the answer just describing the interpretation. Response produces a very basic evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4)

• The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>0</td><td>No response or no response worthy of credit</td></tr>
</table>

Section B: The Breakdown of the Late Republic, 88-31 BC

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 4</td><td colspan="2">How useful is this passage for our understanding of Caesar’s political and social reforms? [12 marks]</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Assessment Objectives</td><td colspan="2">AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.
AO3 = 6 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional guidance</td><td colspan="2">The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Marks</td><td>Level descriptors</td><td>Indicative content</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 6</td><td>11–12</td><td>• The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)
• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach substantiated, well-developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</td><td rowspan="3">No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either way as to the source’s usefulness to understanding the issue in question providing the response has addressed the issue of ‘how useful’. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.

Candidates may discuss the following information in relation to contents of the passage:

• Caesar reforming the calendar to align with the solar year.
• Increase in membership of the Senate and creation of new patrician families.
• Changes in citizenship (this could be expanded to knowledge of Cisalpine Gaul)
• Reducing the number of recipients of the grain dole.
• Debt relief
• Measures related to corruption.

Other reforms may be compared using the candidates knowledge such as:

• Increased number of magistrates to deal with the increase in provinces.
• Increased Latin rights to Sicily, parts of Transalpine Gaul and foreign cities that had supported him.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>9–10</td><td>• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)
• Response uses a good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>7–8</td><td>• The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1)
• Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>5–6</td><td>• The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1)
• Response uses a reasonable range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</td><td rowspan="4">• Colonisation of veterans and urban poor.
• A large programme of public works.
• Increased number of free men working for farm owners.
• Guilds dissolved Suet. DJ 42

Examples of evaluation of the source:

• Suetonius held important posts in imperial administration under Trajan and Hadrian and therefore had good access to documents of this period from the Imperial archives (although the first few chapters of his biography of Caesar are lost)
• Suetonius' biographies concentrate on personality and characteristics – though this extract is largely contextual.

The usefulness of this passage in comparison/contrast to other sources which make reference to Caesar's reforms e.g.
• Plut. Pompey 47 colonies and land distribution cf Caesar 14; Suet. DJ 42 80,000 colonists;
• Plut. Caesar 58 Tiber, breakwaters, harbours etc;
• Land reform, freemen on farms Suetonius DJ 42; Guilds dissolved Suet. DJ 42</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 2</td><td>3–4</td><td>• The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1)
• Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1–2</td><td>• The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1)
• Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way but judgements about how the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question are either not present or are not linked to analysis and are merely assertions. (AO3)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>0</td><td>No response or no response worthy of credit</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 5*</td><td colspan="2">‘Politicians of this period were motivated solely by personal ambition.’ How far do you agree with this view? [36 marks]</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Assessment Objectives</td><td colspan="2">AO3 = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:
• historical events and historical periods studied
• how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.
AO2 = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements
AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.
Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional guidance</td><td colspan="2">The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Marks</td><td>Level descriptors</td><td>Indicative content</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 6</td><td>31–36</td><td>• Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</td><td rowspan="2">No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of ‘how far’. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.

Candidates should look at the motivations of politicians of the period and ascertain whether they were mainly motivated by personal ambition or whether it was other motivations such as the need for reform, concern for the state. Candidates should consider the evidence for the motivations of politicians, specifically that of personal ambition. They should analyse and evaluate the evidence in assessing the statement. They should assess the issue of ‘solely’ clearly in their analysis.

Credit discussion of groups of politicians – rather than taking all examples independently.

Answers are likely to include information on some of the following:</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>25–30</td><td>• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>• The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed and judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</td><td rowspan="4">• Background to the problems in 88 BC, including issues stemming from the Gracchi and Marius
• Sulla’s actions 88 BC-80 BC and his reasons for them
• The reforms of Sulla as a dictator, and changes in policy; the aims and intentions
• Pompey’s career and motives fo his actions
• Motivations related to the Catilinarian Conspiracy
• The purpose and actions of the First Triumvirate;
• The Civil War: Pompey, Caesar, the optimates, other such as Cicero- their motivation and aims.
• Caesar’s dictatorship and assassination; Brutus, Cassius and others involved
• The behaviour by politicians in the aftermath of Caesar’s death.
• The Second Triumvirate: Octavian, Lepidus and Antony
• Octavian’s achievements
• The means politicians used and what it tells us about motivations e.g. political marriages and scandals; largesse; violence; corruption

Supporting source details may include:

• Plutarch, Sulla 7-10, 31
• Plutarch Pompey 14-15, 20
• Denarius of Sulla 84-83 BC
• Denarius of Sulla 82BC
• Sallust, The Catiline Conspiracy 12-13, 36-39
• Plutarch Caesar 57
• Denarius of Brutus 43-42BC
• Appian, The Civil Wars 5.12-5.13
• Cicero de lege Agraria 11.7-10
• Suetonius Deified Julius 38-39

Analysis of the sources might focus on:
• The ability of each source to truly report the events from whatever historical distance they were written.
• Whether the sources actually seek to chronicle, analyse or explain the decline that was occurring within the Roman Republic.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>19–24</td><td>• Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>13–18</td><td>• Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)
The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</td></tr>
</table>

Level 2	7–12	• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) The information has some relevance but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	• How far the sources recognise the interrelationship between the events depicted, e.g. that one event may have caused another. • The bias implicit and explicit in the sources, as a result of the author's own historical and political position, for instance Cicero's views of the Triumvir and upper-class bias.
Level 1	1–6	• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) • The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 6*</td><td colspan="2">How far were the actions of military commanders responsible for the breakdown of the Republic? [36 marks]</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Assessment Objectives</td><td colspan="2">AO3 = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:
• historical events and historical periods studied
• how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.
AO2 = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements
AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.
Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional guidance</td><td colspan="2">The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Marks</td><td>Level descriptors</td><td>Indicative content</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 6</td><td>31–36</td><td>• Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</td><td rowspan="2">No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue ‘how far’. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.

Candidates should look at how far the actions of military generals were responsible for the breakdown of the Republic – or whether there were other factors such as other individuals (e.g. politicians) or social and economic reasons. Candidates should analyse and evaluate the evidence for the various factors and assess ‘how far’ in the question. The response should focus primarily on the actions of military commanders in reaching a conclusion on the issue.

Answers are likely to include information on:
• The military commands of Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Antony and Octavian
• Nature of imperium, constitutional and unconstitutional
• The threat of military action
• Violence, bribery and corruption: Clodius
• Crassus
• Catiline
• Brutus and Cassius</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>25–30</td><td>• Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>• The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed and judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</td><td rowspan="4">• Cicero: oratory
• Land bills, corn doles and largesse
• Factions: optimates and populares

Supporting source details may include:
• Sallust The Catiline Conspiracy 14, 18-19
• Cicero in Catilinam II.17-23
• Cicero ad Atticum 1.16, 2.19
• Cicero de lege agraria II.7-10
• Suetonius Deified Julius 28-33
• Sallust Histories 3.34 = 3.48M
• Plutarch Caesar 13-14,
• Plutarch Pompey 47-8
• Denarius of Antony 43BC
• Appian The Civil Wars 5.12-3, 5.127-5.132
• Suetonius Deified Augustus 26-28

Analysis of the sources might focus on:
• The ability of each source to truly report the events from whatever historical distance they were written.
• Whether the sources actually seek to chronicle, analyse or explain the breakdown of the Roman Republic.
• How far the sources recognise the interrelationship between the events depicted, e.g. that one event may have caused another.
• The bias implicit and explicit in the sources, as a result of the authors own historical and political position.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>19–24</td><td>• Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1)
There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>13–18</td><td>• Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)
• The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2)
• The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)</td></tr>
</table>

		The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.	
Level 2	7–12	• Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) The information has some relevance but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.	
Level 1	1–6	• Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) • The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk