

Ancient History

Advanced GCE A2 H442

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H042

Reports on the Units

June 2010

H042/H442/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Ancient History (H442)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Ancient History (H402)

REPORTS FOR THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
F391	3
F392	8
F393	14
F394	18

Chief Examiner's Report

Yet again we have seen an increase in the number of centres entering for this subject at both AS and A2. All the topics on all Units were attempted indicating a wide range of interest in a variety of aspects of Ancient History in centres. This is obviously good news for both AS and A2 and the future of the subject. This is now supported by the successful launch of the Ancient History GCSE. This year examiners were working with revised marking grids which were designed to be more specific to Ancient History.

The majority of candidates at AS and A2 displayed a good knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics; they are more confident in dealing with the three-part first question; they are integrating the source evidence into their answers with greater emphasis on relevance; they are structuring their answers more successfully; at A2 where there is an hour for each question candidates explored the issues in greater depth. It is still an important factor that the candidates who take time to read the question carefully and identify the key issue and evidence (perhaps with a rough plan) eventually produce a more concise and focused answer. Giving some time to this rather than writing after a cursory glance at the question is time better spent, even when candidates feel they may have much to do in the time allowed.

There were fewer examples this year of candidates who did not appear to understand the instructions and answered questions from **two** sections instead of answering a question from **one section only**. There is, at AS for the most part, but also at A2, evidence of candidates who spend too much time on some parts of the paper. This then affects their ability to answer later questions. It is partly due to a misunderstanding of the extent to which the answer needs to be developed in the (b) and (c) questions at AS. Candidates do not always have a skill in answering a specific question concisely and relevantly. Many answers provided all the information on a topic rather than the specific issue in the question. The second answer in A2 papers was often much shorter than the first, damaging the overall mark.

Reading the whole question carefully before starting is essential. At A2 especially, but also at AS, some candidates answered part of the question, and failed to address the scope of the question in full. This was often the case where reference was made to the sources in the question; the reliability, accuracy, adequacy or usefulness of the sources was often addressed in a final paragraph rather than integrated into the answer as a whole.

Candidates generally understand the need to evaluate the evidence they are using (part of A02), and they often identify general points concerning reliability and/or the context of the evidence. However, there do appear to be a large numbers of errors prevalent about some of the sources – Herodotus is identified as Athenian, Tacitus is contemporary with Augustus to give two examples. Ignorance of some basic chronology and factual information can easily undermine an argument if based upon such errors.

Candidates responded well to the new topics and format of the A2 units. They now have one hour for each question, and there is even more reason to plan their answer before starting. This was by no means universal, and some answers lacked a focus on the questions as a result. The scope of the A2 units is more thematic and most candidates avoided simple narratives of events in favour of selected information which developed the issues over the period as a whole. Examiners found that answers which developed the issues in a concise manner displayed coherent judgements and a clear argument.

Centres should be aware that, if candidates use extra sheets, these sheets should be attached to the booklet with string or treasury tags. If this is not done, there is a danger of sheets becoming detached and lost.

Report on the units taken in June 2010

Finally, as always, we continue to need **assistant examiners**: this is especially important as we go forward with the new specification. Principal examiners need the support of those who are daily in contact with the subject and the students who enter for the examination, to provide the most reliable assessment of their attainment.

F391

General Comments

The second session of this new specification confirmed many of the findings of last year. Across the three options, candidates showed that they had covered a good range of material and were able to draw on what they had learned under examination conditions. They were clear that they needed to refer to the sources studied, and they often showed considerable skill in interpreting the evidence they selected for particular questions. Evaluation of sources remains a greater issue for many, however, as does a lack of precision in references to details drawn from the sources. It is clear that some candidates have learned general evaluative paragraphs which are often tacked on at the end of essays, sometimes repeated almost word for word in (b), (c) and essay questions. The value of such general paragraphs, divorced from specific examples, is rather limited. There were a very few candidates who attempted the wrong section; this was more of an issue last year, but it would be helpful to make sure that all candidates are very clear which option they should be attempting.

The majority of candidates appeared to complete the paper satisfactorily, though there are still too many examples of over-lengthy answers to the (a) and (b) questions, which account for 30 marks; the (c) question and the essay carry 70 marks, and candidates must make sure they allow sufficient time, particularly for the essay. There were only a very few rubric infringements where candidates answered two questions from a single section or answered questions from more than one option. Schools have clearly taken on board the need to familiarise candidates with the layout of the examination paper.

Option 3 on Sparta was again the most popular option. Athenian Democracy was next in popularity, while Option 2 (the Athenian Empire) was taken by the smallest contingent.

The great majority of candidates attempted the document question first, though a very few went first for Section B. The paper is designed so that the (a) question allows candidates a gentle introduction to the paper, based on the selection of detail from the passage chosen. For most candidates this worked well, and they were able to select relevant examples from the passage to good effect. The (b) and (c) question build on aspects of the passage set. There were a very few candidates who used the (a) as the springboard for a wider discussion of the topic; where they used the passage, they could receive credit, but if the material they introduced was from outside the passage, examiners were unable to reward its use, even if it showed an impressive understanding of the issues. As last year, there were a small group of candidates who wrote at excessive length, which could result in problems with time later in the paper. The very best answers made excellent use of the passage and briefly placed the material in context. The (b) question was designed to focus on a different area than (a) and to draw on sources in addition to the passage in the question; most candidates managed this effectively, though not all remembered to evaluate the sources that they used. In some cases candidates extended the scope of the question set; in 9(b), for example, some candidates explained at some length why the *ephors* were more important than the kings, which made the question more demanding than was intended. There were some detailed and effective answers to the (c) questions, though candidates did not always focus on the key terms in the question. The best responses were well organised, and the interpretation and evaluation of sources formed an integral part of the argument; some weaker responses limited discussion of the sources to separate rote-learned paragraphs which were tacked on, generally at the end of an answer. In many cases, these added little to the overall mark as they made little impact on the quality of the argument.

There were some interesting and thought-provoking essays which showed a close engagement with the material studied. The best essays had a clear structure, and responded to the suggestions made in the bullet points, without trying to follow them as an essay plan. One serious limitation of the bullet point approach is that it suggests that evaluation can be left until the final part of the essay; the best responses evaluated their sources as they went along, and integrated any discussion into their essay where it was relevant. Many weaker answers did not have a coherent structure, and sources were dealt with in prepared paragraphs (as in (b) and (c) above), which did not contribute to the argument. Candidates did not always state the obvious: we have a limited range of sources for Sparta, and are mostly dependent on outsiders when we focus on particular topics; in a similar way, we have a good range of Athenian evidence for the Athenian empire, but are much less well served when we look for the views of the allies.

A number of candidates present problems for the examiners through their presentation of their answers. Examiners make every effort to record the appropriate mark for answers, but this can be challenging when a script is very difficult to read. An increasing number of candidates are producing their answers by an alternative means. Where candidates are answering on a computer, it would be helpful if they consider what they are writing and the accuracy of their typing. Several very long answers were submitted this year where the standard of typing made the interpretation of what was on the paper difficult; a little more time spent on checking over what was written would render the end result more comprehensible. Paper scripts continue to be challenging at times. Where candidates feel the need to add extra material later in the examination, asterisks (or some other mark) can be helpful, but only if it is clear to what they refer. There are a small number of candidates who need to be reminded about the value of paragraphing.

The best scripts demonstrated a good understanding of the chronology of the period studied, and made appropriate use of technical terms, such as *ekklesia* or *agoge*. However it is always acceptable to use English equivalents, and those candidates who confuse common terms might usefully be reminded of this.

The very best answers were a pleasure to read and showed an excellent engagement with the material. In very many cases, candidates presented evidence of worthwhile classroom discussion and a through grounding in the subject, indicative of some excellent teaching.

Option 1: Athenian Democracy in the 5th century BC

- Q1 (a)** Most candidates were able to find a range of points from this passage, though not all placed the Old oligarch in context. Some were confused by the second paragraph.
- Q1 (b)** Most candidates were able to discuss jury pay, but were less certain about other elements in the system (as the evidence is much less clear). There were some good discussions of its significance for popular participation, though a number were too ready to assert that pay for attending the assembly was introduced in the mid-fifth century.
- Q1 (c)** Stronger answers covered a range of examples, and made some telling points about the importance of family background in the early part of the period, and the changes brought about by the Peloponnesian War and the rise of the demagogues. Weaker responses tended to generalise without making specific reference to examples from the sources to support their case; some failed to draw on the passage even when it would have been helpful to their case.

- Q2 (a)** Most candidates were able to draw out a range of relevant details from the passage, and many also put the passage in context.
- Q2 (b)** Better responses selected a range of 'decisions' for discussion, and examiners were happy to credit a range of these, some more focused on procedure and some more on institutions. Many candidates drew on specific examples, such as the trial of the generals after Arginousai (often linked to Thucydides rather than Xenophon).
- Q2 (c)** This question offered a range of approaches, and there were some very good answers. Examiners gave some credit for informed discussion of the wider population of Athens (women, metics, slaves), but there were many well-informed answers that looked at the geography of Attica and the nature of voting in the assembly. Some candidates used the passage to good effect, noting the town/country split and the divergent views on war and peace.
- Q3** This proved a reasonably popular question. Weaker responses tended to focus on court procedure, rather than the role of the courts in the democracy. Better answers dealt with the courts' judicial role, and also discussed *eisangelia*, *graphe paranomon* and the role of the courts in safeguarding Athenian imperialism. However not all answers focused on the evidence of the sources. A number of candidates confused the *Knights* with the *Wasps*.
- Q4** The best responses showed an excellent understanding of the limitations of our knowledge of Pericles' career, and made good use both of Plutarch and Aristotle's *Constitution*. Many candidates were drawn into a narrative of Pericles' career which did not keep to the 'development of the democracy', and in some cases there was very limited discussion of the sources remaining.

Option 2: Delian League to Athenian Empire

This was the least popular option. Answers were evenly distributed between the two questions in each section.

- Q5 (a)** Most candidates were able to draw out a range of examples from this source, though not all gave any sort of context for the Old Oligarch.
- Q5 (b)** There were some very detailed answers, which included a good range of material from Thucydides and relevant inscriptions.
- Q5 (c)** Not all answers focused on 'the common people of Athens', though most were able to produce some examples, with links to sources.
- Q6 (a)** Some candidates appear to have found this passage more challenging, but many candidates selected appropriate examples and kept the focus on 'other Greek states outside the empire'. Some answers focused almost entirely on Athens' allies, and were unsure of the context of this passage.
- Q6 (b)** Although most candidates had some worthwhile ideas about this, they did not always link these to the sources, and examiners felt that detail was sometimes rather limited (eg where exactly were Athenian cleruchies set up?). Candidates also need to state the obvious sometimes: the importance of the Athenian navy was not always discussed.

- Q6 (c)** There were some interesting discussions of Athenian power, though many candidates did not use restrict their answer to the date range specified (431-415 BC). This was intended to help candidates restrict their answer to a manageable length, but some chose to deal primarily with the early years of the Delian League. Better answers were clearer about the time frame, and were able to discuss important events from the Archidamian War, the Peace of Nicias, Mantinea and Melos and give a balanced answer to the question.
- Q7** Many candidates were able to draw on the evidence for the tribute found in Thucydides and in inscriptions (and elsewhere), and the best were able to connect this effectively with the uses it was put to. There was some discussion of the Periclean building programme, state pay and the development of the Athenian navy, and there were some well-balanced assessments of the benefits for Athens and for her allies.
- Q8** Many candidates were able to present a narrative of allied revolts, though not all were able to show a good understanding of the sources. Relatively few candidates made the obvious point about the imbalance in the surviving evidence, so we are often forced to rely on Athenian sources for our understanding of allied attitudes. Better responses included positive as well as negative reactions (eg states who remained loyal during times of crisis, inscriptions such as the Methone decree).

Option 3: Politics and society of Ancient Sparta

This was by far the most popular section. Question 9 was answered by many more candidates than Question 10, and Question 11 was more popular than Question 12. Many candidates failed to emphasise the problems posed for anyone studying Sparta by the lack of reliable evidence from within Sparta itself, and, as last year, some candidates seemed to add Plutarch or Xenophon to any assertion. Evaluation was often general and unclear, rather than related to the specific examples used to support the discussion.

- Q9 (a)** This proved a very popular question. Most candidates were able to draw out a range of points from the passage, though a few wrote overly long responses by expanding each point with some further discussion.
- Q9 (b)** Although this question was in general answered effectively, a number of candidates focused on the importance of others in Sparta, rather than on the importance of the Kings. A few would clearly have preferred a question on the role of the *ephors* or the *gerousia*, and devoted too much attention to this rather than the primary focus of the question. The wording of the question ('social structure') was intended to shift candidates away from a discussion of the kings' political role, but many concentrated almost exclusively on this.
- Q9 (c)** This question was also interpreted by some candidates as an opportunity to talk more about the *ephors* or *gerousia*. This was acceptable provided the primary focus was on the kings themselves. The best answers showed a clear grasp of chronology and were able to deal confidently with individual kings, such as Cleomenes, Archidamus or Agis, and comment on the importance of the personalities of individual kings. Weaker responses struggled to establish a chronology and often confused the identity of kings associated with particular stories. Relatively few candidates commented on our lack of Spartan sources. The debate in 432 BC was used by many candidates, and there were some good discussions of the reliability of Thucydides' account. Candidates did not always identify sources accurately, and relatively few used Tyrtaeus to establish an 'early' view of the kings against which to base their judgment; there were some good discussions of the evidence provided by Plutarch and Xenophon.

- Q10 (a)** This passage proved less popular. However those who answered this question made good use of the evidence in the passage, and many were able to place it in context appropriately.
- Q10 (b)** Weaker responses tended to be very general, in some cases discussing only the domination of the helots. Better answers were able to discuss Sparta's approach to the Peloponnesians, her relationships with other members of the Peloponnesian League (e.g. Corinth, Tegea) and her involvement with other significant states such as Argos and Athens.
- Q10 (c)** Better responses to this question showed a good understanding of the demands of hoplite warfare, particularly within the Peloponnesians themselves. The strongest candidates showed a good understanding of the significance of Spartan weakness at sea (because of the sheer cost of naval warfare), and were able to highlight the importance of Lysander in the closing stages of the Peloponnesian War.
- Q11** This proved a very popular question. There were excellent responses that demonstrated a confident understanding of the *agoge* as training for the *homoioi* ('equals', full Spartiates), together with the importance of the messes for adult males. Some candidates very effectively highlighted the tension between the 'equals' and the emphasis on competitive excellence. A number of candidates chose to compare Spartiates with other groups present in Sparta, such as *helots*, women and *perioikoi*; although this was not the intended focus of the question, examiners accepted a range of different approaches. The various categories of inferiors within Sparta were less clearly understood. The weaker responses became caught up in the narrative of the education system and rather lost sight of equality. Relatively few candidates explained the significance of the term *homoioi*, and it was often misspelled.
- Q12** This produced some well-judged answers. Weaker responses focused largely on the *helots*, though many candidates were able to make sound comments about this, though relatively few commented on the peculiar problems we face in studying events within Sparta. Many, but not all, recalled the declaration of war by the *ephors* each year and there were some good discussions of the *krypteia*. Most candidates were able to discuss the *perioikoi* (variously spelled), though the limited evidence was not always at the candidates' finger tips (e.g. Thucydides 1. 101).

F392

1. General Comments

Centres – by which I mean not only candidates, but teachers too – deserve a good solid pat on the back this year for the greatly improved quality of entries which was noted this year. There was a general consensus among the team of examiners of this paper in 2010 that, across the board, questions were addressed with more confidence and with a more careful focus on the wording of specific questions. In particular, it was heartening to see a much greater deployment of sources, in general terms at the lower end of the range of responses, but cited in detail and carefully evaluated in answers which clearly addressed the analytical aspects of questions too. There seemed to be a greater number of 'solid' answers which, in conjunction with the new grids employed this year, justified the examiners in giving a range of marks which were noticeably higher overall than was the case last year. There were also a welcome number of very good responses which tackled the questions in depth and in detail.

- (a) questions were done pretty well for the most part; however there seemed to be some confusion on the part of candidates about the need to make a good number of points and make use of the whole passage where possible, and not just half of it (or two of four examples). There is still an occasional tendency to write a general essay in these questions, rather than doing the basic work of reading the passage, citing appropriate pieces, and commenting. There are no marks for evaluation in (a) questions, but some credit can be given for knowledge of context. The weakest responses here made little use of the passages, and sometimes only wrote four or five lines making a single point. These are straightforward questions on which most candidates ought to be able to score more highly, with appropriate training.
- (b) questions, which were a hurdle for many last year, were done much better, and it was heartening to read so many scripts where candidates knew other relevant sources and could make use of them. It is perhaps in these questions that the most noticeable improvement occurred. However, the evaluative part of these questions (eg 'How far . . .') was sometimes omitted.
- (c) questions were also generally well done, though some tended to recycle material from both (a) and (b) without noting that it needs to be used to address a different issue.

Essay structure did, on the whole, show an improvement, though there is still room for improvement in some cases. Better punctuation would help examiners make more sense out of some candidates' longer answers. The top range of responses included some very well-argued essays; weaker responses tend to include a good amount of factual knowledge, but to make no use of it in addressing the issue raised in the question (leading to much use of the caret mark) and/or leave evaluation of reliability of the sources to the end, in a generic paragraph which sometimes gave simple overall evaluation of a source not actually used.

Time was generally well-managed and appropriately balanced between the questions.

The standard of written English was very variable. For some reason this is much better in Options 1 and 2 than in Option 3, where spelling was almost uniformly poor. Very few candidates seem to be able to spell 'emperor' or 'invasion' properly ('emporer' and 'invation'), and these were not by any means the only examples of words common within the sources, which candidates really should be able to spell accurately. 'Ceasar' and 'Britain/Briton' are ongoing issues. Surprisingly few candidates were able even to spell 'writing' or 'wrote' correctly, rendering them as, respectively, 'wrighting/writing/righting' or 'wrought'! Due allowance is made for errors resulting from writing at speed, but it is important that centres focus on accurate spelling of subject-specific terms.

Candidates continue to be unable to distinguish between language used in the classroom to reinforce a point, and the vocabulary appropriate for an examination paper. Another point in the same vein is that while candidates may disagree with the question asked, they should not be writing that the view therein expressed is 'stupid and pointless' or 'ridiculous'.

2. Comments on Individual Questions

Option 1: Cicero and political life in late Republican Rome

- 1 (a) was mostly well done, with good use of the passage; few seemed to spot the irony of Cicero doing down his own exalted position as a means of criticising the opposing barrister in the first paragraph; but there was plenty in the rest of the passage to comment on, and perhaps the question directed answers more to that part anyway. In some responses there was a danger of over-interpretation!
- (b) produced some good answers, with Pompey, Caesar, Crassus and Cicero all used as examples, and good use made of Pompey, whose military career turned out not to be so helpful in the long run. This question, one Assistant Examiner noted, was a good differentiator between the best responses and the less able. Many answers dealt with other factors – making good use of the *Commentariolum Petitionis*.
- (c) led to some good, balanced answers, though the scope of the question led to some 'kitchen sink' responses where candidates used a very wide range of material but to less effect, instead of choosing a more appropriate range of examples and sources and using them in greater depth and detail.

- 2** (a) used a passage which was just outside those prescribed in the specification. As a result, it was decided at the standardisation meeting that no requirement for context should be made for an otherwise good answer to gain the full 10 marks. As it happened the candidates proved well up to the task in most instances; many provided accurate context anyway (and were rewarded), and the passage was used very well. When a detailed comparison between 1(a) and 2(a) questions was made there was no apparent disadvantage to candidates at all, and for the most part those who attempted this question produced very strong answers.
- (b) Problems arose with 'dignity' and 'honour' for some, and wrote about bribery and the use of violence in Roman politics; for some "dignity and honour" equated to morality; desire for political honour and recognition was overlooked. These however were in the minority, and some very good answers were noted.
- (c) was generally well-answered – better responses noting 'useful' and 'sources', and the question was another good mark of differentiation of ability. The extract was invariably used (though not required, discussion of the extract was credited), along with Cicero's letters. Plutarch on Pompey, and occasional references to Cato.
- 3** was often done extremely well; some responses focused solely on the optimates/populares issue and so long as this was tackled in good detail, this did not prove a handicap; several made as much use of they could of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Weaker responses could only discuss concepts such as 'amici' or personal rivalries. Cicero and Atticus were a faction for some. The question gave a clear prompt to assess reliability and most did.
- 4** Was often done very well; it was a less popular choice than (3). Most has good facts on his career from Spartacus and the consulship of 70; through to the issues in 65, the triumvirate, and the trial of Clodius. There were some very perceptive discussions on the paucity of evidence, and Crassus' shadowy involvement.

Option 2: Augustus and the Principate

- 5** (a) The new specification includes coins as part of the prescribed material; the responses to this question were a reassurance that material culture is both accessible and stimulating for students; there was a roughly 60-40 split in all the answers in favour of this question, and it was on the whole tackled in much better detail than the parallel qn. 6. As much use was made of the explanatory captions as the coins – a perfectly legitimate approach. Weaker responses were not able to interpret the sources accurately and there were one or two very poor replies, which still scored 4 or 5 marks because they made some reference to or citation from the sources which could be credited.

- (b) picked up from the idea in the coins that 'Fortuna the Home-Bringer' (Fortuna redux) was being thanked, and the personal roles Augustus is said/shown to play. This was a good differentiator; some found it straightforward and discussed his personal importance; some (legitimately, it was decided at standardisation) discussed his role in securing Rome as an empire against enemies such as the Dacians; weaker responses found it hard to get a handle on the question at all, though there was still discussion of how important Augustus was. This material was then duplicated in (c).
- (c) was generally well done, though some candidates did not focus on 'how useful' at all, merely listing sources and detail, and discussing reliability.
- 6 was (surprisingly, in the view of the Principal examiner) not often done well at all. 6 (a) was often done in a patchy way, with much of the extract unused. Several Candidates found it hard to tackle (b) and seemed unsure what a 'constitution' was; in similar vein to 5 (c), in 6 (c) a number of candidates were either confused by or ignored 'consistent attitude' and simply trotted out a list of titles without noting which ones Augustus acquired when, what he had turned down, or what he thought of them.
- 7 was sometimes done well, with a good review of the ways in which Augustus gained and kept control of power at Rome, and Actium's role evaluated; at the bottom end of the range of responses were simple discussions of Actium (sometimes mis-dated) with little understanding of Augustus' role as princeps.
- 8 was on the whole less well answered than 7; though some good responses made excellent use of the limited and confusing source material 'at Rome' and 'during his reign' were frequently missed; the weakest responses listing sources and detail, and discussing reliability.

Option 3: Britain in the Roman Empire

It needs to be noted that in this option, some of the use of sources was well below standard, with no sources being used in some of the Section A responses. Candidates seem to make their own mental additions to the sources or to interpret them too literally – 'mess and make merry' does not mean the infantry/cavalry/marines were in the Mess, Agricola did not fear that 'a general would uprising to lead the Caledonian troops', and the Conquest of Gaul absolutely does not tell us anything about Boudicca! Apart from the use of inappropriate sources based on TV programmes 'Guy from Time Team' and 'Bettany Hughes', and a failure to understand that LACTOR is a sourcebook, not a source, the vast majority of candidates, including very good candidates, displayed insecurity with regard to the original sources – mixing up Dio's and Tacitus' accounts of the Boudiccan revolt, confusing all the sources which discuss natural resources (Caesar/Strabo/Suetonius/Diodorus Siculus), being unable to distinguish between Dio and Diodorus Siculus, and confusing Tacitus and Suetonius (though the basis for this was unclear). The chronology of the sources was also poorly understood in too many cases, as was some of the geography – Caesar could not have possibly have reached Devonshire or the Severn in his first expedition.

Only a couple of candidates were able to explain that the various rousing speeches are a literary/rhetorical device, used by the source authors to reinforce the narrative and to enable characters to speak on their own behalf.

- 9** There was an approximately equal division of candidates doing question 9 or 10.
- (a)** This question was sometimes done well, but more often yielded a generally disappointing set of responses; despite the wealth of information in the sources given, very few candidates were unable to go beyond eg 'Claudius was voted imperator 16 times/given the title Britannicus/awarded a triumph... and this shows that his victory in Britain was important to him/the Senate and the people/Rome'. Some made avoidable errors in their use of the sources right in front of them, eg arches in Britain and Gaul, despite Dio mentioning Rome and Gaul, the aureus being minted in Britain although the source says Lyons; a few candidates thought that the 2 sides of the coin were 2 separate sources. Very few mentioned that the 'Mendip Lead Pig' was evidence of the exploitation of natural resources within only a few years of the conquest; most candidates didn't mention the Lead Pig at all. This was comparable to Option 2 question 6 (a); candidates right across the ability range should be encouraged to make full use of the sources.
- (b)** most candidates were able to manage at least some discussion of other reasons Claudius may have wanted to invade Britain, even if to a very limited extent/with limited balance, and there were some excellent answers amongst them.
- (c)** like (b) was sometimes done well, but for many responses were very confused. The Examiners were prepared to accept any discussion up to AD 47, be it Caesar or Claudius; one candidate tried to incorporate Augustus and Gaius Caligula as well. It had been felt that the focus on Rome's *victories* ought to limit the scope of the discussion. The divergence between weak and good responses was very marked, evidenced by weaker responses based solely on the reliability of the source authors without any discussion of the *content* of the sources. It not appropriate to say, when discussing reliability, that one has already discussed it in parts a) and b).
- 10 (a)** was sometimes done well, but more often there was a limited use made of the passage. The question revealed that some candidates think the far north begins either in Wales or around York, and that Agricola was an emperor; the 'Forth' was a legion, and 'Britons' and 'the natives of Caledonia' are the same people.

- (b) There were some excellent answers to this question, well balanced and drawing on all appropriate source material on resistance to Caesar, Caratacus and Boudicca, as well as Mons Graupius. Sometimes the question was interpreted as requiring a discussion of the existence and level of resistance, rather than an analysis of the failure or otherwise of such resistance, and while a discussion of both sides, military tactics was appropriate here, this alone was not enough for higher marks. Reference to Romanisation as a form of the failure of the resistance, albeit non-military, was also rewarded appropriately.
- (c) Again some excellent answers here. Some candidates remain confused between the various northern frontiers (Stanegate/Hadrian's Wall/the Antonine Wall), none of which can be described as having been built by Agricola. There is no such thing as the Agricoline Wall. Very well balanced answers referenced the post-Agricola withdrawal and subsequent attempts to conquer Caledonia; weaker ones focused solely on the passage given, without any apparent understanding that the battle following the passage was the precursor to Mons Graupius.
- 11 This was often done well, with good use of Caesar himself, well evaluated and supported by the limited other material available. They discussed motives and context, and made good use of Caesar himself to evaluate the material – why *should* he have described so many of his own blunders? A significant number of candidates stopped their narrative of Caesar's first invasion at the end of the beachhead landing. It was clear from, for example, discussions of Caesar in 9(c) that the majority of such candidates knew the details of the whole invasion, so why they stopped at the landing in this essay question is somewhat baffling. Some accounts were rather too narrative, and some candidates were unable to switch of their mental tap, wasting valuable time on lengthy accounts of the second invasion, to the detriment of the contextual analysis and source evaluation required by the question. Some responses suggested that one reason for Caesar's invasion was the potential for corn, to reduce reliance on Egypt – Egypt was not a province until the Principate, hence did not function as the Republic's granary (nor entirely so even under the Principate).
- 12 There were some very good, very thorough essays here, though again, accounts could be too narrative, and spun off into detail about the final battle rather than remaining within the question parameters. Most candidates knew at least a little of the material evidence, mainly the destruction horizon. Source use was frequently fallible – 'the most important source is Dio' or 'the most important source is Tacitus' were frequent introductions to source evaluation discussions, and many candidates erred in their ascription of the various details to the two primary sources. Some responses suggested that the rebellion was initially successful in part because the Romans were unfamiliar with British fighting tactics, especially the use of chariots; given that at this point the Romans had been in country for almost 20 years, they certainly would have been familiar with British tactics, so this argument seems somewhat specious, as does the theory that Boudicca might not have existed. A common point of confusion revolved around Plautius/Paulinus, and Suetonius Paulinus was not an emperor.

F393

General Comments

In general, candidates seem to have responded well to the style and level of the questions set, and the new specification and changes to the examination did not seem to cause any difficulties. In fact, many candidates seemed to benefit from the opportunity to deal with topics in greater depth, and to have the chance to write two longer essays. There were only a few rubric errors, although some candidates still managed to answer on a different topic from that which they had apparently been taught, or answer essays from different sections. Such cases were rare, but teachers would be well advised to ensure that their candidates are clear about the instructions to candidates on the paper.

In general, candidates made good use of the sources to support their answers, and showed a range of accurate knowledge of the issues about which they were writing. A general weakness in the quality of argument was apparent, with candidates not really dealing with the issues raised by the questions. Many gave extensive and fairly detailed accounts of their chosen area, but failed to engage with the issues in the question. For example, in section 3, many candidates wrote about perceptions of the sophists, rather than the impact of the sophists on Athenian society. This could be remedied by more careful planning of the answers in the examination. There was a distinct lack of planning from many candidates, which led to answers which were little more than narrative accounts of the topic. There were also a number of clearly prepared essays on set topics, which again failed to gain higher marks because they did not address the issues in the question.

Some candidates included a general, prepared section on the sources within their answers. These sections gain very little by way of credit if they are not tied into the answer, and the evaluation of the sources is not relevant to the question set. For example, there were a number of candidates who wrote at length about Herodotus as 'the successor of Homer' who aimed to entertain his audience. The paragraph was of considerable length, but failed to have any effect on the rest of the answer, as the candidates then continued to recall details of what Herodotus had written without any critical comment.

Another general concern noted by examiners was the lack of detail in many answers. Candidates often seemed to lack an awareness of the sequence of events, and make general statements without tying them down to specific details. Such lack of detail not only means that candidates cannot score well in AO1, but it can easily restrict their performance in AO2, because they are not supporting their argument clearly.

Specific Questions

Option 1: Greece and Persia 499-449 BC

- Q1** Many candidates were able to recall the details of Herodotus' narrative, referring to Aristagoras and the Ionian revolt. Some were able to refer well to Persian inscriptions (The Behistun inscription and the Cyrus Cylinder.) The stronger answers evaluated the sources well and were able to point to other reasons for the invasion of 490BC, such as economic prosperity, following in the footsteps of other Persian kings etc. Some candidates questioned Herodotus' use of individuals to explain these motives and some missed the point of the question by referring to Xerxes' invasion (when the question specifically refers to 490BC). A considerable number of candidates did not think more widely about the causes of this campaign, and failed to gain marks as a result.
- Q2** Responses to this question were weaker, many simply arguing that because the Greeks fought the Persians, this meant that they were terrified. The better responses dealt with the idea of threat to a 'way of life', but most at least took issue with the word 'all' in the question. Some candidates made effective use of what they knew about both the battles and the Hellenic league to support their arguments. Candidates who planned their answers benefited considerably. Some candidates were able to identify and comment on the reactions of a number of states, such as Argos and Thebes.
- Q3** Most candidates could give examples of individuals and their roles (favourites being Themistocles and Leonidas), the better responses looked at other ways that Herodotus could have explained events. More thought could have been given to Persian individuals as well as Greeks, especially in the portrayal and role of Xerxes, who seemed to be forgotten by a considerable number of candidates. Some candidates also made good use of the Artemisia episode in the battle of Salamis. In general, however, the answers tended to be a narrative account of the roles of individuals, without clear focus on whether or not these roles were over-emphasised by Herodotus. Some candidates failed to notice that the focus of the question was on the campaign under Xerxes, and wrote at length about Darius.
- Q4** The main problems with responses to this question were that candidates gave a stock essay on Herodotus' strengths and weaknesses, rather than looking specifically at the idea of 'researcher' and 'historian'. Only the better answers looked at historiography and the fact that Herodotus was pretty good at looking at causation and motive. All candidates must remember to give examples from the text to back up their points. Many wrote generally about Herodotus, without referring in detail to the Histories. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of supporting their arguments with relevant evidence.

Option 2: Greece in conflict 460-403 BC

- Q5** Some good answers and most candidates were able to access the question and give examples of fighting and peace treaties. The better responses tackled the sources well. Some candidates made good use of inscriptional evidence, as well as Thucydides. There were a good number of candidates who questioned the assumption in the question, and produced excellent arguments and evidence to show that the Greeks found other ways to resolve conflicts. Candidates again should be reminded of the importance of backing up their arguments with specific evidence.

- Q6** Generally a lack of knowledge on this one, with candidates concentrating on tribute money only, and surprisingly not much mention of building programme. Some candidates seemed to misunderstand the idea of exploitation, although many also made excellent use of their knowledge of the building programme and the developments from Delian League to Athenian empire to support their answers. Here in particular inscriptional evidence could have been used to good effect, and some candidates did this very well. Very few candidates looked carefully at both nature and extent. There were also a moderate number of candidates who seemed to think that there was a definite point at which the Delian League was renamed the Athenian empire. A number of candidates also gave lengthy narratives about the Athenian empire and the Peloponnesian League, without really dealing with the issues in the question.
- Q7** This question elicited a wide range of responses. Some showed excellent knowledge of Thucydides' account of the plague in Athens and the effects of the Sicilian expedition. However, very few candidates took the opportunity to evaluate Thucydides' account with reference to Aristophanes' plays, with the result that the word 'accurate' was not properly addressed.
- Q8** There were some excellent answers to this question, which showed a thorough knowledge of the differences between democracy and oligarchy, and discussed them in the context of other potential causes of conflict, such as trade and control of territory. However, many failed to deal with the central issue in the question, and talked more generally about causes of conflict without focusing on the differing ideologies in the Greek world.

Option 3: the culture of Athens 449-399 BC

- Q9** A very popular question, accessible to candidates of all abilities. Weaker answers failed to deal with a range of sophists, concentrating too much on Socrates. Most answers used sources well. Some answers failed to define what a sophist was. Candidates should be encouraged to examine key words in the title – in this case *impact*. The more limited arguments concentrated on the fact that they were not popular, rather than their political significance. Sources were pretty well evaluated by a majority of candidates. Many candidates failed to look at the examples of Critias and Alcibiades, who, while not essential to an argument, would have been beneficial. This reflected the general tendency to look at attitudes towards the sophists, rather than the impact of the sophists on Athenian society.
- Q10** The best answers did not just concentrate on two plays and showed excellent knowledge of the festivals and their political, competitive and religious functions as well as their entertainment value. Weaker answers gave a general assessment of the issues in a couple of plays but at least were able to show some knowledge. There were some who simply recounted the details of two plays which they had studied, without reference to the festivals. There were also candidates who seemed to misread the question, and just talk more generally about festivals rather than the dramatic festivals required by the question.

Q11 Weaker answers did give an account of Athenian society and how women, metics and slaves were viewed. Many answers looked at how the Athenians viewed themselves, rather than how they viewed themselves in relation to other Greeks. Some answers went somewhat off course, and wrote at length about the concept of the barbarian, without bringing the content back to an argument relevant to the question. Better answers looked outside Athens and dealt with Pericles' funeral speech successfully as well as The Melian Dialogue and Mytilenean debate. Fewer candidates looked at drama and inscriptions, but the best answers were of a very high standard.

Q12 Many candidates went beyond the confines of the Acropolis and looked at developments in Athens and Attica more widely. Some weak answers just described the buildings on the Acropolis, but the better ones were able to assess these buildings and point to the difficulties of interpreting the sculptures and evidence. Some answers failed to focus on the buildings, and instead wrote at length about what we can learn about Athenian religion more generally. This material was of varying quality, but candidates should again be reminded to interpret the evidence in relation to the question set.

F394

The responses from candidates, in this first series of this unit, were informed, varied, generally well-organised and soundly based upon the evidence and sources. This was pleasing to the examiners on this new specification. Candidates found a number of ways to approach the issues and answer the questions so that in any one question there were many very good answers which covered the ground in a variety of interesting and intelligent ways. It was pleasing to see candidates attacking the question in very different ways, with the best producing a well-structured argument based upon interpretation of well chosen and relevant evidence. Examiners were generally pleased with the level of factual knowledge and source material deployed.

It should be noted that a number of questions were phrased to ask about the evidence and its usefulness or accuracy – some responses simply did not see this as part of the question and discussed events or actions by politicians/emperors without dealing with the issue of the sources. It was a common fault in all options and candidates should be encouraged to read the question carefully.

The candidates had a slightly longer time in which to form their responses, and it was gratifying to see that a number (but by no means all) took the opportunity of some extra time to plan their responses carefully. More often this time taken to plan produced a balanced and well-argued answer rather than a narrative or disjointed one. The latter answers tended to focus on the issues in the questions only towards the end of the response, as if, having provided the facts or evidence, the candidate suddenly remembered the question and the issues.

Another pleasing aspect of the responses was the wide (and usually relevant) use of source material, ranging from literary sources to archaeological and epigraphic evidence. While some were very specific in either naming the reference or quoting the sentence, others paraphrased material. The paraphrase at times became too generalised to pin down to a particular source. Expressions such ‘Suetonius tells us...’ or ‘Plutarch says...’ followed by some fairly general piece of information such as ‘Augustus built a large number of buildings’ or ‘Pompey won many wars’ needs to be more specific to score high marks. A large number of candidates quote sources, which indicated a detailed knowledge to some extent and was credited; however, misquoting created some problems when candidates then formed an argument around the reference to the source. Some candidates simply made up quotations, without giving a reference to the source. The lack of any supporting source material or evidence was seriously damaging to the candidate’s overall level. Thankfully there were very few of these responses.

Interpretation and evaluation of the material was often very good, and sometimes excellently precise and specific. At the other end, it was at times generalised and not related to the specific source material being used. It is not helpful to the candidate to say that Suetonius is anecdotal, if that does not lead to some consideration of whether the information being drawn from the author is in some way affected by this, in terms of its reliability, accuracy, or usefulness. Evaluation should always accompany the use of the source material; at the same time the repeated set phrase is not developing the argument in meaningful way. Interpretation was often much more successfully achieved where responses drew conclusions from a reference, and avoided using it as an extra piece of factual information.

Given the length of the periods to be covered, it is never the expectation that everything relevant in the period has to be mentioned or discussed. However, the candidate should display an understanding of the issue(s) across the period as a whole. Some responses were limited to a part of the period; for example responses finished at 60 BC or 50 BC on the Republic and ignored the period to 31 BC; in Option 2, some responses dealt in detail with Augustus and had little to say on the other emperors, notably Domitian; in option 3 much information was provided on the last 40 years and very little on the first 40 years. The weight of the source material may cause some unbalance but not entirely.

One issue which arose in all three Options was the general lack of accuracy in chronology. This either produced inaccurate dating of events, or events placed in the wrong order or events occurring at the same time when in reality some years apart.

Option 1: The fall of the Roman Republic 81-31 BC

Approximately one third of the entry chose this option. The candidates provided a range of responses and all questions were attempted. There was a noticeable focus on the triumvirate period to the detriment of other parts of the period where useful examples could have been explored.

- Q1** There were some very good, well-argued and well-organised responses to Q1 ('It was the growth in the power of individuals at the expense of the state which eventually destroyed the Republic.' How far would you agree with this view?). This was answered by most candidates. The candidates had displayed some very clear views on the issue of individual power and presented a variety of views of the effect of their actions upon the state. Better answers offered a range of individuals, most of whom, had, in their opinion, damaged the Republic – Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Octavian – supported by suitable source material, the best of which was tied closely to the question of the effect on the state. Very good answers also discussed other factors, quoting Sallust, Cicero and Cato (via Plutarch) in support. Some very good answers focused upon the underlying problems of the Republic such as excessive competition, optimates' exclusiveness, bribery and control of the system through clientela etc. Weaker answers either focused upon a limited number of individuals in a narrative manner, or provided a generalised discussion of problems during the period. These were usually further weakened by an insecure understanding of the material.
- Q2** asked the candidates how accurately we can assess the extent to which social and economic problems affected the politics of this period. This was less popular than the other questions. There was no need for answers to cover every instance of social and economic problems. Better answers picked the more obvious and serious examples such as the debt or slave problems of the 70s and 60s; the urban problems of Rome during the period (the grains supply and piracy were useful examples); agricultural issues; the issue of violence; the class divisions and tensions between classes and so on. The question, however, was concerned with an issue about the evidence for these and weaker answers failed to focus on this aspect of the question. Better answers made use of Sallust's view of the effect of wealth coming from the empire; Cicero's evidence was included by some as were sources on the grain supply and politicians' reaction to the problem; in addition there were references in the sources to political acts which sought to deal with the problems. More often than not answers failed to define what constituted a social or economic, as opposed to a political problem.

- Q3** (How far does the evidence help us to understand the aims and intentions of politicians during this period?) was chosen by a large number of candidates. It invited the candidates to discuss the nature of the evidence and the extent to which it helps us understand the aims of politicians. In some answers it was taken to mean 'what were the aims of politicians' and the main point of the question was hardly discussed. Some answers simplified the issue into a 'desire for power'. The vast majority of the responses displayed a detailed knowledge of the facts regarding a number of politicians but a number of these failed to relate them to specific source material. There was also a lack of evaluation where source material was used. A number of answers stopped at 60 BC. Better answers developed an argument about the sources from well-selected examples – Sallust's view of Catiline, Cicero and others; Cicero's view of himself and others such as Pompey, Caesar, Octavian; Plutarch and Suetonius were used constantly, although less successfully evaluated, generally being dismissed because they were writing so many years later. Appian, Dio and Velleius (variously rendered) appeared infrequently, and rarely in a specific form.
- Q4** (concerned with the extent to which sources support the view that political success depended upon military success) suffered a little from the same problem as in Q.3 in that some responses did not appreciate the importance of a discussion of the sources as part of the answer. Better answers provided a balanced argument citing Cato or Cicero as an example of the lack of military success (even better ones noted that Cicero was aiming for some military glory in Cilicia!). Candidates used a variety of examples of military success, Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Crassus, Octavian, Antony etc; some approached the question by considering what got most votes at elections, showing that other factors mattered with the evidence of (?) Quintus' *Commentariolum* and other sources on political activity. There was some insecure factual material concerning Caesar's military activity – claims that he had none until Gaul. However, good arguments were made about Pompey's early successes and later problems despite his military success, the need for more than military strength and the resort to force in the end by some politicians. A number of candidates had interesting and well-structured approaches to the question, other than a simple narrative of politicians' careers. Candidates who avoided a straightforward narrative of political careers tended to fare better at answering the question since they dealt with the military factor in the context of political activity during the period.

Option 2: The invention of Imperial Rome 31 BC – AD 96

- Q5** ('Succession was a major issue for every emperor; no emperor found a successful solution to this problem.' How far would you agree with this view?) was a popular choice. It produced some creditable answers; most answers provided an accurate narrative of the various efforts which emperors made to ensure a smooth succession although not all went on to discuss how smoothly the arrangements worked. A surprising number missed Claudius altogether. Weaker answers confused succession with 'success'. Others focused on whether or not the successor did a good job of being emperor. Gaius and Nero were, naturally, blamed for not making any provisions, only rarely being excused because they were young and were not expecting to die. The better answers focused on the inherent problems of the position of an emperor in the new constitution, the emphasis on a family member rather than the best man for the job (for whatever reasons) and the extent to which a smooth transition was achieved. For all Augustus' difficulties, Tiberius succeeded relatively smoothly. Some intelligently suggested that the quality of the reign indicated a lack of success in overcoming the problems of succession. There were the obvious references in Suetonius and Tacitus concerning Augustus' apparently damning comments on Tiberius, although the full context of these quotations was rarely realised and developed. Less common were references to Tacitus about Tiberius' views and efforts, and some confused use of both Tacitus and Suetonius on Claudius' approach. Some introduced Galba effectively, and most mentioned the role of the Guard, only some developing their role beyond Gaius and Claudius.

- Q6** The question concerning the accuracy of our assessments of the extent to which the social and moral life of Rome was transformed (Q6) was quite popular but less successfully tackled in most cases. This was partly because of a failure in some responses to clearly define the terms of the question, and partly because of lack of detail about the actions taken by emperors. Augustus was often the focus of much of the answer; however, the sources do give some detailed information on Tiberius, Claudius and Vespasian, and even some references to Gaius and Nero and Domitian. Much of this was omitted. Even concerning Augustus, details of his legislation were rare, and sometimes insecure. Most especially, knowledge of the extent to which these laws had an effect or were welcomed was frequently generalised and unsupported by evidence. Candidates took the social aspect of the question to mean provision of games, baths, protection and food, which was acceptable to an extent. However, often assertions of how welcome this was and how far their lives were changed replaced reasoned argument. Very few used the writers of the latter half of the period to suggest what social and moral life was like. Even where Juvenal was used, the evaluation was general. Religious changes were introduced as part of the transforming of both moral and social life; yet again, few could cite specific details of the introduction of Isis worship, for example. Some candidates confused moral transformation with improving morale.
- Q7** focused on the relations of emperors with different groups in Rome and what support the sources provide for their success and/or failure. The problem here was one of range, both across the period and across the classes. Some answers failed to deal with different groups, in the sense of assessing the validity of the quotation in the question. Instead they focused on the 'people of Rome' as a single group, even translating that into the 'ordinary' people of Rome. The answers therefore focused on the supply of grain and games to the exclusion of other actions by emperors designed to maintain good relations. Emperors' dealings with equestrians, senators, the Praetorian Guard, freedmen and women, citizens or non-citizens as well as the poor or 'working class' were not addressed in some answers. Not all groups needed to be dealt with in the same detail; a selection of representative groups produced very good answers. However, the focus on one section of society was a partial answer. In the same way, some answers gave good accounts of the relations between emperors and groups, and the extent of their success but failed to deal effectively with the part concerning the sources. On the other hand, there were candidates who distinguished between not just emperors but the changing relations of emperors and people within their reigns, noting how Gaius goes rapidly downhill after good start and Claudius moves in the other direction to some extent.
- Q8** (How far would you agree that the building projects of the emperors would have made the Rome of Domitian unrecognisable to Augustus?) was a popular choice. As in other questions, there was a tendency to focus on Augustus, naturally, since he engaged in so much building and the sources provide ample information about them. In some cases too much time was spent on Augustus in setting the scene for the changes about to take place in subsequent reigns. Also all that was provided was the name of building with no details of its position and size and content as far as that was relevant. Weaker answers tended to narrate (with varying degrees of accuracy) the works of other emperors usually reaching Vespasian and the Colosseum at the end. Domitian's works were rarely mentioned (nor was there much discussion about the problems in identifying his works). Given the fire in AD 80 and his need to rebuild, it did seem that it was worth bringing him into the answer, especially since his name appeared in the question. There were some very good answers which really tried to envisage the scale of changes and differences in both content and style. Much was obviously made of The Domus Aurea, but only better answers pointed out that it was much changed during Vespasian's time. Good answers also identified the destruction by fires and tried to discuss intelligently what this would have meant for Rome's appearance by the time of Domitian. Good use was made of regulations to change the width of streets and heights of building, and attempts were made to go beyond the centre. Intelligent responses pointed out that much of the work of Augustus would still exist, but he

Report on the units taken in June 2010

might be surprised by the palaces of later emperors given his austere style. Even structures of foreign cults, such as Isis, might have caused him some surprise, as some claimed. Some candidates took the opportunity of this question to display a range of knowledge and thoughtful understanding and thought which was pleasing and even unexpected.

Option 3: Ruling the Roman Empire AD 14-117

- Q9** concerned an assessment of the extent to which Rome succeeded in romanising the provinces. This was a popular option producing a range of answers. Very few answers failed to cover both East and West, although not necessarily in equal detail. There was an emphasis on Roman Britain in some answers – not necessarily a problem provided there was also some discussion to set Britain the context of the entire Empire and compare the province with other examples. There were a number of answers which used inscriptions from the Lactors (8 and 18) very well in support of the argument. Tacitus Agricola 21 was used extensively, mostly with some detail. There was a general tendency to assume romanisation among all classes of provincials, although better answers identified élites as a factor. Better answers made use of Claudius' inclusion of Gauls in the Senate to show how far romanisation had advanced. Weaker answers did not sufficiently address the issue of 'how accurately can we assess...', some ignoring the opening entirely. Answers generally included some discussion of revolts (Boudicca and Judaea being popular choices) as examples of lack of success. Better answers looked closely at the causes given in our sources and considered how far they were reactions against romanisation. The destruction of Colchester, for example, was rarely developed in the argument when it would appear to be worth some evaluation as a reaction against Roman values. Good discussions resulted from those who considered that the sources are not very helpful in certain respects.
- Q10** concerned the policies of the emperors towards the frontiers during this period but also how far the sources are adequate. As in Q9 some candidates gave a detailed narrative/analysis of the policies of every emperor, without referring to the sources in any detail. Some answers detailed the policies (or at least actions) of the emperors, with sources in support but failed then to engage in evaluation and interpretation of the evidence; they simply quoted (or paraphrased) the sources as fact. Better organised answers grouped the emperors in terms of similar policies rather than approaching the answer as a chronological narrative. There was a general assumption that Nero was not interested in expansion, not was Gaius. The East was less well-covered than the West or North with some confusion over the names of kingdoms and provinces. Equally accurate geographical knowledge is clearly not universal.
- Q11** was a less popular choice (How far does the evidence help us to understand the effectiveness of the administration of the provinces during this period?). Answers showed some understanding of the roles of governors, procurators and other officials, using Pliny's Letters and Agricola as benchmarks. There were a number who were able to construct sensible discussions around these two sources, and better ones considered the limitations of both sources. However, wider knowledge of the empire and its administration was not as evident, nor was there much support from the source material in some answers. Often the focus was on Agricola ignoring the rest of Tacitus' work, and information in the Annals about Britain under earlier governors; the role of the procurator might have explored using Catus or Classicianus; there are mentions of freedmen and procurators in Pliny's Letters. Josephus was alluded to for the situation on Judaea but again opportunities to explore the quality of administration under various governors was not taken by most. Answers rarely mentioned extortion trials of governors to support views on the lack of effective administration. Some, however, noted the role of local councils and leaders, who sometimes effective but not always - this might indeed have included client kings and queens.

Q12 (How helpful are the sources for our understanding of the ways emperors promoted their image in different parts of the Empire?) was a popular choice. Candidates generally made use of the imperial cult in their answers and there was a good range of information about its spread and use, especially in the East. There was good knowledge about Aphrodisias, for example, and its reliefs. Equally the temple to Claudius in Britain was included, with reference to Tacitus and/or the head of Claudius' statue. Gaius' attempt to get a statue set up in Jerusalem, while sometimes credited to Nero, and sometimes set up in every temple in the East, was further evidence. Some candidates devoted most of their answer to the cult which gave an unbalanced picture of the ways emperors promoted themselves. Good arguments were made using coins as evidence of the promotion of images and messages. Better answers had specific examples indicating the date (if possible), the legend and the particular occasion as indicated on the coin. Very astute responses noted the type of metal as indicative of who used them. Reference was made to structures in Rome which promoted their image, without making a clear argument as to how this related to the question. As in other questions, good approaches included some consideration of the limited nature of the evidence when considering the issue of 'how helpful the sources are...'. It was also important to consider 'different parts of the Empire' and the role of governors in this- another chance to use Pliny's Letters.

Across all three options many answers named the sources in the opening paragraph, name-dropped them in the essay and added a general evaluation of them at the end, often the same in both essays. Some of the name-dropping was inappropriate when Tacitus was given credit for describing the invasion of Britain by Claudius or the reign of Gaius to name but one example of mis-attribution.

Some answers displayed little understanding of the use of paragraphs, and punctuation was in some cases such that the line of thought was difficult to follow. Lengthy sentences became obscure in meaning.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553