AQA

ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Education

Classical Civilisation

CIV2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Report on the Examination

June examination - 2009 series

This Report on the Examination uses the <u>new numbering system</u>

CIV2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Most candidates demonstrated sound general knowledge of the buildings and towns prescribed, although the dates and, indeed, the identities of the buildings portrayed in the initial questions were often not known, particularly in Option A. Of the 10-mark questions, 08, looking at the temples, was answered better than the corresponding Question 03 on external theatre design. The difference in achievement was much narrower between the 20-mark questions, but again answers on temples generally scored higher marks as they tended to incorporate a wider range of specific examples. Many of the 30-mark essays indicated a reasonable understanding of the topics of water supply and housing. A number of detailed answers were a joy to read. Perhaps surprisingly, the question on water supply produced many of the best overall answers. There was, however, a predominance of Level 3 answers to both questions, often through poor use of examples.

Question 1

In Question 01, a disappointing number of candidates identified Drawing A as the Colosseum. Those who went on to correctly date the Colosseum in this part were awarded one mark. Examiners could then only credit answers to parts 02 and 03 which could also be applied to the theatre shown in the drawing, that is, the Theatre of Marcellus. For example, candidates who said that this theatre was larger than the one at Pompeii, who commented on the use of columns, or who noticed the difference between the first two storeys, which still exist, and the third, which does not, all received credit. There was enough common material between the Theatre of Marcellus and the Colosseum to enable those who erred in Question 01 to gain credit in 03. Candidates should be taught to look carefully at the drawings as examiners expect them to make use of stimulus materials in their answers. A number of candidates failed to identify features such as arches and columns which were clearly shown in the drawing. Again, in answer to 04, a number of candidates referred to the Colosseum. The specification requires candidates to study theatres and amphitheatres; they should be able to distinguish between the two. Comments based on amphitheatres, where relevant to theatres, were again credited. Some candidates provided effective supporting information from the Pompeian theatres and the one at Ostia; too many restricted their comments to the theatre shown.

Option B

A good number of candidates named both temples illustrated; a minority of these went on to give dates within the acceptable range, while disappointingly few provided one of the names required for 06. The two sources appear in a number of standard books and both temples are named for study in the specification. Answers to Question 08 were much better. Many combined detailed factual knowledge with good evaluation of the similarities and differences between these temples; marks were correspondingly high. Regarding Question 09, while the range of other temples cited was sometimes limited, many candidates revealed a full knowledge of the Pantheon in all its aspects. The best answers were those which saw 'innovation' in a social as well as an architectural context. The Temple of Vesta was a popular, and often helpful, choice as a contrast to the Pantheon in date, size and purpose. Some candidates missed the opportunity to bring their choice of temples together by comparing and contrasting. There were many Level 4 answers, however, and there was much to admire in many responses.

Option C

The question about the supply of water attracted fewer candidates than the alternative, but those who chose this option made use of a wide range of material to support their arguments. There were more Level 5 answers to this question than any other essay on the paper. Particularly pleasing were those candidates who did not restrict 'water' to a predictable

description of a suite of baths, but illustrated a wide range of activities, setting both life-giving and life-enhancing elements within a social and technological context. Early sources were sometimes competently dealt with, but were more often rather vague. Many of the stronger answers discussed the effects of population growth on needs, focusing, sometimes in considerable detail, on the establishment of aqueducts. Some possibly over-estimated the importance of the *impluvium*, putting it forward as a major supply source, but it was gratifying to see good detail on the more prosaic issue of sewage disposal. Common weaknesses included the tendency to over-generalise: a typical aqueduct might be described, but with little reference to the cities of Rome or Pompeii. By contrast, some candidates named many of the aqueducts of Rome, differentiated between their eras with accompanying social commentary, then went on to contrast and explain the relatively simpler picture at Pompeii. The Baths of Caracalla were, on occasion, well used in conjunction with the Aqua Marcia to give a good example of the distribution of water within Rome.

Option D

This was the more popular Section Two question. Many candidates described the features of a typical *domus*; fewer linked these to a line of argument about the social development of housing generally. The effects of population growth in Ostia were usually understood, changes in Pompeii less so, and there was often confusion regarding the status of Herculaneum. Some thought it to be a working town on the Ostia model; others saw it as a more refined version of Pompeii. Many of the specified Pompeian *domus* were cited as examples, but it was rare to see much developmental sequence suggested; some of the best answers analysed changes over time using two or three key examples: the Houses of Sallust and the Menander featured most often and to best effect. The general introductions to Ostia started well, but tailed away in a number of cases by not discussing specific *insulae* in enough detail to support the argument. Some candidates gained good marks by using three or four distinct *insulae* to prove that these were not all simply slum housing to cater for the masses. Examiners were pleased to see details of imperial measures to improve high-rise housing, but these were most productive when incorporated into the argument rather than appended in a separate paragraph.