

Ancient History

Advanced GCE **A2 7809**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3809**

Reports on the Units

June 2008

3809/7809/MS/R/08

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 syllabus 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 2008

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 (7809)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Ancient History (3809)

REPORTS FOR THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
2450 Document Study 1: Greek History	2
2451 Document Study 1: Roman History	5
2452 Document Study 1: Roman World	9
2453 Source Based Study 1: Greek History	11
2454 Source Based Study 1: Roman History	15
2455 Source Based Study 1: Roman World	19
2456 Thematic Study 1: Greek History	21
2457 Thematic Study 1: Roman History	24
2458 Thematic Study 1: Roman World	26
2459 Document Study 2: Greek History	28
2460 Document Study 2: Roman History	29
2461 Document Study 2: Roman World	33
2462 Source Based Study 2: Greek History	34
2463 Source Based Study 2: Roman History	36
2464 Source Based Study 2: Roman World	40
2465 Thematic Study 2: Greek History	41
2466 Thematic Study 2: Roman History	43
2467 Thematic Study 2: Roman World	46
2468 Individual Study: Greek History	
2469 Individual Study: Roman History	
2470 Individual Study: Roman World	48
Grade Thresholds	49

Chief Examiner's Report

Report for Ancient History (JACT) AS and A2 (Specifications 3809 and 7809) Summer 2008

We have seen yet another increase in the number of centres and candidates entering for this subject at both AS and A2 level. This is encouraging as we move towards the new specification. There is clearly a continued enthusiasm for the subject which we hope will be carried forward with the new specification.

There is a great deal of evidence that the candidates are showing much more confidence and ability in using the primary sources where there is much more awareness of the evidence in answering the questions. A much smaller number of candidates than in the past produce purely factually-based answers. However, evaluation of the evidence is improving, although there are still many who provide a paragraph of general comment rather than a specific interpretation of a reference to the text.

Still worrying at AS is the number of candidates who failed to answer two questions in the Document Studies (2450, 2451, 2452). Whatever the reason, this seriously damages the candidates' chances. Candidates must answer the questions on **two** passages from **one** section only. Centres are also reminded that on these papers (a) and (b) questions **must** be answered as **separate questions** not amalgamated together as one answer.

Another general point about candidates' answers is the lack of structure in the discussions. This is partly due to the failure to examine the question closely and to take a few minutes to plan the answer. In Document study there are still answers which do not mention the extract printed on the examination paper. The new specification at AS is very much focused on the study of documents and candidates will need to make careful use of the extracts. In other papers answers only marginally related to the question are offered by candidates who try to interpret the wording to suit their answer.

In Coursework at A2 it is still the case that candidates choose titles which make it difficult to achieve marks in the three objectives. Centres are encouraged to seek the advice of the moderator if they are unsure. There is a continuing tendency to avoid providing a word-count and that failure to keep within the 3000 words will be penalised; in some cases there is no bibliography. It is also the case that topics which fall within the Document Study or Thematic Study are not allowed and centres should be aware that these candidates will be severely penalised. The report on coursework highlights the important parts of the specification if centres are unsure.

It is worth repeating a comment in all the reports that legibility is an issue in a significant number of cases; it is very difficult to give candidates credit for the work when it is virtually impossible to read what they have written.

However, the vast majority of candidates presented work which displayed an engagement with the material and the subject which was both pleasing and encouraging. There were many responses which were indicative of an interest and enthusiasm for the subject. This was extremely pleasing to the examiners and encouraging for the future of the subject.

Finally, as always, the perennial plea for **assistant examiners**: this is especially important as the change is made to 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.

2450 Document Study 1: Greek History

General Comments

Examiners were pleased to note that the performance of candidates remained strong on this paper and the majority of candidates were well prepared, particularly for the (a) questions. Candidates were more prepared to evaluate the source, and almost all made appropriate use of the passage. However some failed to make sufficient explicit use of the details in the passage and dealt more with what they saw as the topic rather than the passage. To secure high marks, candidates must explicitly point to detail from the passage itself. It may be appropriate to compare the passage with other sources studied, but this should not be allowed to dominate the answer and detract from the analysis of the particular passage selected.

In the (b) questions, most candidates were able to show knowledge and understanding of the period studied, though examples were not always focused on the time periods set out in the question, and some candidates were rather vague about the events they referred to. However the majority of candidates were well-informed and generally accurate with source references. Relatively few candidates failed to refer to source material in the (b) questions, though those who failed to do so penalised themselves under AO3.

There remains the problem of candidates choosing to answer a question other than the one set on the paper. Examiners wish to stress the importance of reading what is asked and answering that question specifically.

There remain a relatively few candidates who apportioned their time badly, and there were perhaps a few more rubric errors than last year, where candidates only attempted one question rather than two.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There seemed to be a few more candidates whose writing proved testing for the examiners. Some candidates should be advised that English terms are entirely acceptable and there is no need to struggle with Greek terms, where singular/plural can sometimes cause difficulties.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Herodotus on Persia

This section was taken by a relatively few centres this year.

- 1 This question provided plenty of material for most candidates who were able to pick out the obvious references to Ahura Mazda and the points about Xerxes as anticipated in the mark scheme. Candidates in general knew quite a lot about religion both from Persian inscriptions (some candidates were impressively knowledgeable) and Herodotus. The part of the question less well-addressed was the “how well?” - only the better answers addressed this part.
- 2 This question caused some problems for a few candidates because they expressed the opinion that there was not a great deal of detail in the passage and so they decided to fill the gap with information from elsewhere. However, most candidates extracted relevant details. In (b), despite the passage, some candidates had difficulty coming up with much information about Persian society. Some fell back on religion, but others did come up with details about the king and his subjects.

- 3 Candidates felt that this passage provided a lot to comment on, and they made extensive and sensible use of the passage. Many saw Xerxes as weak and indecisive; others commented on the role of Mardonius as well as the encouragement from the various Greeks. Most candidates were able to come up with other examples in the (b) question than those in the passage. Their knowledge sometimes extended beyond the more obvious, such as Cambyses. Many commented on the fact that Herodotus was writing for a Greek readership and had edited his material accordingly.

Section B: The Athenian Empire 450-410 BC

This section was once again very popular.

- 4 The passage was dealt with very proficiently in many cases with most being aware of the context, though some thought it related to the debate in Athens following the defeat of Mytilene. However, the complexity of the language seems to have challenged some, leading to inaccurate interpretations. In (b) the better responses attempted to keep within the constraints of the dates, and were able to comment on the treatment of Mytilene and, occasionally, Scione as examples to support the argument. Many commented on tribute and its uses for the benefits of the Athenians. Some candidates found examples to support the view that the allies benefited to some degree, though there were some who failed to address 'to what extent'.
- 5 This proved a popular question which was generally well-handled, though there was sometimes confusion over who/what the Inspector and Decree-seller represented. Most did identify them with Athens but some thought they represented the allies. A lot of candidates picked out the reference to the weights and measures decree, as well as the typical wording of Athenian imperial decrees. In the second sub-question, the dates presented a problem and less informed candidates provided details from much earlier in the period, mentioning Mytilene but not Melos; some even went back as far as Naxos (outside the period). Very few seemed to know anything about the Peace of Nicias and they struggled to place the passage in the context of the period.
- 6 The authorship of this passage proved problematic for a significant number of candidates: the examiners had some sympathy for this, given the citation, though they felt that candidates should be aware of the issues about the authorship of the 'Old Oligarch' and the significance of the square brackets round '[Xenophon]'. The best answers were able to pick out the details in the passage relating to Athens' treatment of the upper classes in the allied states and their motives for doing so. Some became confused about the identities of the rich and the poor. In (b) most concentrated on the poor Athenians and picked out the typical opportunities; better answers looked at the poor in the empire more widely; many were dismissive of the rich, seeing no real benefits for them. The weakest answers ignored the reference to the empire and gave standard responses on democracy.

Section C: The Trial of Socrates

This section was once again very popular with centres.

- 7 On the whole this was well done with candidates picking up on many details, in particular the way that Socrates was portrayed as acting at the trial. The (b) question proved challenging for those who had no real knowledge of what Xenophon had to say on the subject; most referred to his comments on Socrates' religious beliefs. The weakest answers tended to dismiss Xenophon and move on to consider Plato instead. Many cited Aristophanes as a counterpoint to Xenophon's and Plato's comments. In some cases candidates ignored Xenophon altogether. There was also confusion over the two different 'trials' with many candidates not differentiating between them clearly.

Report on the units taken in June 2008

- 8 Most candidates were able to make suitable comments on the 'cross-questioning' and the use of analogy, and indeed the whole tone of the passage. The (b) question proved difficult for those who did not concentrate on the word 'conduct'. They wrote about Socrates' guilt or innocence of the charges against him instead. The best answers made references to Plato with many details from the way Socrates behaved during the trial. The weakest responses answered entirely in a theoretical fashion without making any/many references to the account of Plato. The most common feature candidates picked up on was his arrogance, tying this in with Aristophanes' portrayal and contrasting with Xenophon's; not all candidates who referred to Aristophanes commented on the genre of the *Clouds*.
- 9 This was answered by many very well with many citations from the passage. In (b) there was significant disagreement on this with some spirited defences of Socrates, but in equal measure those who thought he got exactly what he deserved. Though many referred to the political context of the trial, many chose not to explore this aspect. Most candidates showed a good understanding of the charges brought against Socrates, the reasons for them and the significance of Socrates' 'mission'.

2451 Document Study 1: Roman History

General Comments

The candidates continue to show good skills in evaluating and drawing conclusions from the material. Time- management continues to be a problem where candidates perform less well on the second of the two questions. Practice in timed exercises may be useful for candidates. There were also a number who answered only one question whether through misunderstanding the rubric or through lack of knowledge.

Most candidates had knowledge of documents set and others beyond the prescribed texts. There remains the issue of candidates introducing unnecessary material into the **(a)** sub-question which is marked on A03 entirely; placing the passage in its context and/or giving some idea of its value and the author's agenda is certainly worth marks, but extended narrative of the event is not. Some detailed references on which to base their discussions rather than a generalised assessment of the author's works was more productive. In both questions detailed and specific material is required for higher marks with interpretation and comment as to why the word, phrase or sentence has been chosen in respect of the question. Some **(b)** answers did little more than draw more information from the extract, providing no additional material when higher marks require it. Candidates need to distinguish between factual information in the extracts and the author's opinions; the former may be accurate, the latter untrustworthy.

Candidates who quote small or large sections of the extract without explaining why these choices have been made, and without relevant interpretation, are not likely to score highly. Weak answers were invariably those which virtually ignored the passages to provide a narrative of events or discussion of issues.

Evaluation of the text is an issue, as always. However, evaluation is not sufficient if it amounts to no more than a repeated sentence which tells us that Sallust is a moralising/dramatic/ melodramatic/ author or that the *Res Gestae* is biased because Augustus wrote it, especially when the comment is unrelated to any specific reference or quotation where this might be a significant factor. The candidates need to evaluate the specific evidence they are using. Some evaluation of the sources was necessary for the best answers.

Section A: The Catilinarian Conspiracy

- 1 Question 1 (Sallust *Catiline* 21 – Catiline's efforts to encourage his supporters with promises and rewards) was in generally answered well. The main problem in the (a) sub-questions was the failure to deal with both Catiline and his supporters; good answers interpreted what was said by Catiline to identify motives; very good answers questioned the probability of Catiline having said what Sallust reported. Weaker answers focused almost exclusively on debt.

In the (b) sub-question, candidates did not generally focus on Catiline's actions, as the question asked, or answers tended to argue general credibility for Sallust or Cicero. Candidates certainly seemed uncertain about the events in which Catiline was involved. There was a general inability among candidates to refer to specific events and actions; instead there was some generalising about Catiline's activities. Some argued that the portrait of Catiline in Sallust made his actions credible.

- 2 The question on the view of Cicero and the extent of support for Catiline (Cicero, *In Catilinam II* 20-21) was well-answered in (a) but less so in (b). In (a) candidates developed good ideas from the text on Cicero's views which ranged from some pity for those involved to outright disgust for others. Good use was made of short, relevant quotes from the

passage. Weaker answers assessed the passage as a whole rather than the views of Cicero on the different groups.

In (b) answers were sometimes excellent where they dealt with a number of specific groups and individuals who were said to support the plot. The best answers questioned the evidence for characters such as Crassus or Caesar although the majority simply referred to the sources as evidence. They also presented a balanced view that support varied during the period, and dealt with the issue of 'extent'. In these answers factual knowledge was good.

- 3 Question 3 (Sallust, *Catiline* 40 on the seriousness of the dangers and his effectiveness of the Senate) produced variable answers mostly because candidates could not give detail of the Senate's actions (or lack of them). In (a) weaker answers either focused on Sallust's exaggeration for dramatic effect with little use of the passage or they mentioned only the Allobroges issue. There is some information in the passage about the Senate's failure to act on the issue which few noticed.

In (b) answers generally demonstrated some knowledge of the events but tended to focus on Cicero's actions too much. Some answers discussed how the Senate was responsible for the situation which caused the conspiracy. Fewer of the candidates on this question were able to present accurate and specific detail of the events whether about the SCU, the debate at the end, the powers given to Cicero or decisions made.

Section B: Augustus and Augustan Propaganda

Candidates generally made good use of the extracts and many were able to interpret the poetry well. It remains the case, however, that there is still some lack of evaluation other than a generalised few sentences on the lines that the *Res Gestae* was written by Augustus and therefore inaccurate or biased. The evaluation needs to be specific to the reference used. The use of coins is a welcome development but candidates need to be careful: they too can be manipulated for a purpose and are not entirely without problems.

- 4 Question 4 (Carmen Seculare on the ideals and values and the propaganda aspect of the Augustan writers) was well-answered for the most part. In (a) there was a tendency to repeat the phrasing of the passage, without much interpretation of the values; however, the majority knew the context (and date!), and the laws which were the focus of part of the extract. Weaker answers mentioned only one or two elements. Better answers made use of the aspect of religion, traditional values, marriage, childbirth, the image of Rome and the destiny of Rome.

The sub-question (b) was attempted well, although some struggled to define propaganda in this context and tended to consider how accurate the writers were. Virgil and Horace predominated. Some thought Tacitus was a contemporary of Augustus. Not all used the *Res Gestae* which was surprising. There was some conflation of *Aeneid* Book 6 and Book 8. There was an assumption in a large number of answers that the poets were just propagandists and not much else; their quality as poetry was ignored. The spelling of propaganda was variable.

- 5 Question 5 (Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 10.2-12.2) asked about the emphasis placed by Augustus on certain aspects and the historical value of the *Res Gestae*. In (a) answers displayed very good understanding of the text, with consistently detailed use of the passage. Weaker answers omitted the importance of the legality of his actions and the support from all classes of society. Very good answers identified key phrases and used them well.

(b) answers, on the other hand, suffered where the candidate had only a vague knowledge of the book and could not supply some examples to support their ideas on its accuracy, trustworthiness or bias. Some answers focused to such an extent on accuracy, by developing information from Tacitus or Suetonius that they failed to be specific about the *Res Gestae*. There were some very good comparisons of sources but it was important to assess the *Res Gestae* not Tacitus' view of Augustus.

- 6 Question 6 asked candidates to consider the policies towards the provinces and the extent to which other sources support Augustus' version of events (Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 26-27). In (a) candidates provided secure information from the passage about his actions, without interpreting it to identify policy.

In (b) the answers lacked detail of Augustus' achievements and references in other sources. Discussions tended to be general about the overall attitude of authors towards Augustus' achievements. Some answers failed to use even the passage as source material. There are useful parts of the set sources which could have been used and only 2 or 3 achievements needed to be discussed for a good answer. Some answers focused on his achievements in Rome with reference to building works and corn supply. It is often stated that Tacitus was a contemporary of Augustus.

Section C: The Reign of Nero

Candidates, as usual, had a good knowledge of the reign of Nero, and could apply the knowledge relevantly to the questions. They were also able to make good comparisons between Suetonius and Tacitus on certain issues.

- 7 In Question 7 (Tacitus Annals 13.10 on the early parts of the reign and its presentation in the sources) candidates found a range of information from the passage for the (a) sub-question; the extract was used well by most candidates to identify the elements which Nero emphasised at this point. There was also some good interpretation of his actions and a number noted that Seneca and Agrippina are involved. Weaker answers did not focus on the style of government as requested or narrated the first few years of the reign.

In (b) the difficulty for a number of answers was making telling comparisons between the two prescribed sources. While candidates provided detailed examples of the reign up to Agrippina's death, the support from the documents was less secure. Common incidents included the death of Britannicus, the Silana plot, night-time activities, the beginnings of the chariot-racing and so on. Some comparisons were made, while better answers addressed the issue of 'typical'. Good answers compared what Tacitus writes here with his account as the reign progresses. However it was clear that 'typical' was a term that some candidates were unsure about. There was a lack of specific example in weaker answers.

- 8 The question on the importance of the return from Greece and entertainments generally (Suetonius 25) produced some sensible and well-thought out answers. Candidates could place this passage in its context and were able to identify the key elements of the events; good answers noted the importance of Naples, the Augustan connection, and the event as part of Nero's image. Weaker answers missed the context or generalised about the event.

In answering (b) on the way his interest in games affected attitudes, most candidates had some examples of attitudes, even only in general terms. There were some assertions on the lines that '*All the upper class were opposed to his performances.*' These generalisations were, as usual, unsupported by evidence. Discussion of attitudes must be related to the sources. There was good factual knowledge of his performances, however, and general use of Tacitus and Suetonius for the most part.

- 9 Question 9 (Tacitus, *Annals* 14. 56-7) asked about the dangers to Nero at this point in the reign and the extent to which Nero's advisors acted in his interests.

For the (a) sub-question the extract indicated Tacitus' characterisation of Tigellinus as part of the danger to Nero and better answers made use of this. Inaccuracies were notable – Tigellinus was the single commander of the Guard, for example. Good answers made it clear that the dangers were expressed at the idea of Tigellinus.

In (b) the answers were generally knowledge about two advisors and were able to provide some information on their actions; the discussions of how far they acted in his best interests were variable with some candidates not making judgements based upon the evidence. Seneca and Burrus were common examples, and most candidates used the passage for Tigellinus. Some added Agrippina and Poppaea.

Answers must always be supported by use of the documents. It is important to provide some evaluation of the source as evidence using precise examples where necessary. Without these elements candidates cannot expect to produce answers acceptable to the examiners in this unit.

2452 Document Study 1: Roman World

General Comments

The examiners considered the paper to be accessible and it caused no problems in so far as its content was concerned. There were still a significant number of rubric errors, with candidates only answering the two (a) and (b) parts of a single question, rather than answering **two** questions. These candidates – some 30 in total – managed to get sufficient marks to pass beyond the 'U' grade, but as a whole they were limited to the high 40s in terms of raw marks (they limit themselves in any case to a maximum of 55). They have a chance to re-sit, but need to be coached in the rigours of reading two passages and of answering 4 sub-questions in one hour. The new style of examinations coming in from 2009 onwards should see this problem disappear.

Two points should be made at the outset:

- first, the requirement of the (a) question is to **address the passage in detail** and not to write a general paragraph or even a page on an author, their context, reliability or lack thereof, in general terms. This will continue to be the case in the new suite of examinations coming in as of 2009. The candidate needs to take the question 'what does **this** passage tell us' at face value, citing from the passage, interpreting it (i.e. saying 'it tells us that') and where necessary evaluating it ('we can/ cannot trust it because . . .'). Quite a large number of entries adopted the general paragraph approach and wasted the limited time available to them; candidates should be encouraged not to do this, but rather to engage immediately with the text presented to them (or whatever other prompt/ source material may appear). Weaker responses which adopted the approach described above occasionally failed to make any reference whatsoever to the printed extract and this gains few marks (see the grids). I labour this point because the (a) questions from 2009 onwards will also require the same technique.
- The second general point to make is that in the (b) question, reference must be made to a range of sources, not just the printed extract, and these have to be referred to in some detail (ideally, to give an example, 'Tacitus *Agricola* 21 makes the point that . . .'; it is more detailed and specific than 'Tacitus says in the *Agricola* . . .', and again more than making a point and then putting (Tacitus) at the end of the sentence. A simple quote, or sometimes even a word (e.g. the Britons were 'barbarians' (Strabo) barely figures as a use of a source either. Answers need to start *from* the sources, not make general gestures in their vague direction.
- A third and final point: candidates this year were frequently unsure about which source had said what, and there were a fair number of misattributions; more so than in previous years. There were also problems with chronology: Caesar could **not** have used Strabo for information about Britain!

All three questions in 2452 saw a good number of responses, with question 3 being less popular than questions 1 or 2. Individual comments are listed below.

Britain Through Roman Eyes

- 1 The most popular of the three questions, this caused few problems to candidates who approached it carefully (see comments above, and the mark scheme). The most common problem was caused by not reading the words 'first landing' in (a) and 'first expedition' in (b), leading answers to talk generally about both invasions; the old

lessons about 'reading the question' have to be repeated afresh every year. The standard rubric about 'other sources you have studied' here simply means the rest of Caesar on his first invasion; obliquely, Suetonius, Cicero and other general sources gained marks.

- 2 The importance of the attack on Mona was well dealt with, perceptive points being made by the best responses, as had been anticipated (see mark-scheme). (a) was generally well tackled; in (b), few managed to address 'typical' and there seemed little attempt to move beyond the passage itself, or the works of Tacitus, by quite a large number of candidates; there did not need to be reference to *everything* available, just enough sources to show whether these views were 'typical'. It was heartening to see the Vindolanda tablets *Brittunculi* contrasted with T.'s views of Cogidubnus, Caratacus and Boudicca, Cartimandua and Calgacus in some responses which have been well drilled and gained the marks they merited.
- 3 This was not the least popular but probably the least well done of the three. In (a), there was plenty for candidates to respond to in connection with 'Agricola's abilities as governor', but in (b), candidates seemed to find it hard to pin down views of 'Roman governors and other officials towards Britons' – the question was deliberately worded to allow procurators, imperial freedmen, anyone at all who fitted the bill to be referred to.

2453 Source Based Study 1: Greek History

General Comments

Of the three sections the Section B (Greek History 446-413BC) was far and away the most popular with more than twice as many candidates answering this section than the other two put together.

Overall there was a good spread of marks with a high proportion of excellent answers showing both detailed factual knowledge and an ability to handle the sources effectively. Unfortunately there are still too many candidates who clearly know the details of the period and are able to discuss the issues intelligently, but fail to mention the sources, even in the sub-question (usually (b)) which directs candidates towards the evidence. In some cases this limited the overall score for a question. Some other responses fell into the trap of asking questions, but not providing any answers.

Some candidates, often from the same centres, rely heavily on generic paragraphs about the value of sources. These can receive very little credit unless they are integrated into the argument of the essay. In some cases there was no attempt to relate the discussion of the source to the topic in any way.

Many answers also did not take sufficient note of the specific date limits mentioned in some questions, and therefore wasted time answering outside the requirements of the question. This led to many candidates answering the question they wanted to be asked rather than the one on the paper.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There remain some candidates whose writing proves problematic for the examiners. Some candidates should be advised to use English terms whenever possible, rather than struggling with Greek terms, especially where singular/plural is an issue (e.g. *strategos/strategoí*). The examiners prefer candidates not to use abbreviations (e.g. Thuc.), especially in the body of a paragraph (as opposed to a source reference (e.g. (Thuc. Bk 1))), and where these are obscure or not explained (e.g. P.L., G.P.W.).

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Herodotus and the Conflict of Greece and Persia 499 – 479 BC

- 1 This was the most popular question in this section and there were a high number of very good answers to this question. Weaker answers tended to concentrate on the causes of the Ionian revolt in (a) rather than the main events of the revolt. There were several candidates who thought Herodotus was Athenian, and that it was largely the islands who were in revolt. Several candidates also thought that Athens had the strongest navy in the Aegean in 499BC. In (c) very few candidates mentioned the impact the revolt had in terms of the spread of Persian control through the Aegean islands subsequent to it. The strongest answers were able to discuss Herodotus' treatment of the revolt and in particular his views on the Ionians and why the revolt failed. Most here were able to mention the lack of, and withdrawal of, mainland support.

- 2 This was not nearly as popular a question, but with some good answers. In (a) again there was the misconception that Athens had a considerable navy in 490BC. Most candidates were able to discuss the effectiveness of the Greek forces in (b), with weaker answers not referring sufficiently to the sources. Sub-question (c) was generally well answered.
- 3 A few candidates attempted this question, unfortunately with some obviously deriving their knowledge from the film '300' (for example that Xerxes and Leonidas actually held meetings)! There were some good answers to (a) with some mentioning the problem of the risk of rebellion back within the Persian Empire as a possible problem facing the Persian forces. Some candidates overlooked the word 'before' in the question. In (b) there was little mention of the actual successes the Persians had. There was little mention in (c) of precisely what the situation was after Salamis, and lots of very general discussion.
- 4 Only a few candidates attempted this question with most answers in the mid to lower range. Again, candidates did not take note of 'after' in (a), and then failed to mention the importance of Thermopylae in (c).
- 5 Very few candidates attempted this question.

Section B: Greek History 446- 413 BC

This was the most popular section once again this year, with a good spread of centres. The best answers were conversant with a wide range of sources.

- 6 This was quite a popular question, but produced a large number of weaker answers. This was mainly because candidates referred to events outside the time constraints mentioned in the question - for example mentioning the use of the Athenian navy against the Persians or in the period after 413BC in (a). Where candidates did the former in (b), it could be interpreted as being within the confines of the actual question even though it is outside the scope of this Section, so some due credit was given. In (a) very few candidates mentioned why the navy was no longer required to be used against Persia, nor its importance in securing the import of grain to Athens. Most candidates were able to discuss the importance of the navy in the Archidamian War in (c), though the details of the Pylos campaign and the navy's importance to it were sketchy, and several candidates had the wrong date for this campaign.
- 7 This was the second most popular question on the paper with some very good answers, and some very weak ones as well. There was again here the influence of '300', though (a) was generally well done, though with weaker responses concentrating too much on the details of the agoge rather than how it impacted on the army. In (b) there were several candidates who stated that there were no sources about Sparta as Sparta was 'laconical'; this word was not explained though its meaning was clear in context. There was little mention of Pleistoanax' failure to encourage Athenian allies to revolt, Delium or Brasidas in the north, and probably too much discussion of the details of the Pylos campaign. There were also several answers which discussed Spartan successes during the Persian Wars. There were some good answers to (c), but weaker answers tended not to be about Sparta but to concentrate on Athenian strategy.
- 8 This was far and away the most popular question on the paper, answered by over a quarter of the total candidates, with a good spread of answers including some excellent ones. There were several candidates who referred to the Athenian government as though it was a body separate from the people, rather than consisting of the people. (a) produced some very good answers, but many which ignored the chronological confines of the question. Most picked up from (b) that the plague was a major problem, with weaker answers concentrating on it, but stronger answers were able to discuss a range of the problems the war posed the Athenians, though very few mentioned financial constraints as

witnessed by for example the Kleonymos Decree. Some thought the plague broke out in 429BC. (b) proved most difficult with few candidates having a detailed knowledge of Thucydides' account, and very many candidates from particular centres resorting to listing all the sources they knew with obviously learnt critiques of each individual source, irrespective of the relevance to the particular question. There were also several candidates who thought that Thucydides was ostracised after his loss of Amphipolis in 424BC. In (c) there was some confusion over Cleon's role in the Pylos campaign, and many candidates referred to all of Pericles' successors as being 'trained by sophists'; another common misconception was that Cleon is represented by the Sausage-Seller in Aristophanes' 'Knights'.

- 9 This was a fairly popular question with a good number of very solid answers. (a) was perhaps the weakest part of this question with little mention of Samos, though much discussion of Sparta's slowness to respond to Corinthian pressure in the late 430s, despite the fact that it was Corinth that stopped Sparta acting in 440 over Samos. Sparta wanted to act, but needed the support of her allies; this is what changed in the late 430s. Several candidates discussed the earthquake at Sparta as they thought it took place in 446BC. In (b) there were again many learnt answers in discussion of the reliability of sources. It was surprising in (c) how few mentioned the problems the helots gave the Spartans, and only a few of the very best mentioned the importance of Argos and the impending end of Sparta's 30 year treaty with her in 421BC. There was however quite a lot of mention of the importance of religion, citing examples for the Persian Wars, which, though outside the scope of this topic, was given credit.
- 10 This was the least popular question in this section, but with a high proportion of good and excellent answers. In (b) there was discussion of some examples from after 413BC (e.g. the trial of the Arginusae generals) and again credit was given for this. There was again the idea that Thucydides was ostracised, and also that Aristophanes was writing for an aristocratic audience in the Athenian dramatic festivals.

Section C: The Culture of Athens 447-399 BC

- 11 This was the most popular question in this section with some very strong answers. (a) was generally well done with most candidates showing a good knowledge of the function of the *Boule* within the democracy. (b) elicited some good discussion, but very little mention of the *graphe paranomon*, nor the role of the various leaders and how they really restricted the power of the Assembly by manipulating them. Only a few answers were able to discuss any of the particular meetings of the assembly detailed in the sources, but those that did generally did so very effectively; a relatively few candidates commented that these meetings were, in different ways, atypical. In (c) there were few attempts to define democracy before attempting a discussion, but most were able to explain who was excluded for the Athenian system.
- 12 This was not a particularly popular question, but did produce some very good answers with candidates clearly knowing the details of Athenian religious festivals and the relevant sources in both (a) and (b). There was not much discussion in (c) of the building programme and what it might tell us, nor of the impact of some of the newer ideas of the 5th century, or the opposition to them.
- 13 Those who answered this question clearly knew the details of the buildings, though there was less mention of the Temple of Athena Nike. In (b) there was some discussion of the literary sources, but little mention of the imagery of for example the Parthenon Frieze. There some very good discussion in (c).

Report on the units taken in June 2008

- 14 This was a reasonably popular question with some very good answers. Those who chose it generally knew two plays very well, though there was a suspicion that some were trying to remember what they had studied at GCSE. There were some good attempts at (b), but this was really where the differentiation between better and less good answers took place. Some candidates discussed 'The Women of Troy', but there was some confusion as to its date and whether it was a response to Mytilene or Melos.
- 15 This was the least popular question in this section with few high quality answers. There were several examples chosen from outside the period of the topic (e.g. Themistocles, Cleisthenes or even Solon!) and (b) was relatively weakly answered. (c) produced some better answers with most candidates having an idea about the political leanings and background of some of the sources, and some discussion of Aristophanes' and Thucydides' own particular reasons for disliking Cleon, though some went further, stating that Thucydides positively disliked democracy without being able to support this from his work.

2454 Source Based Study 1: Roman History

General Comments

There are now very few answers which include no sources at all, a considerable advance on the state of affairs some years ago. However, a number are limited to 'the sources tell us' without a specific reference or author named. A good proportion of the candidates are now offering the more precise reference and interpretation which shows a greater understanding of the skills for source-based study. They are generally offering less detailed use of the sources, with is either a paraphrase or a series of very short quotes without a context. Evaluation of the sources remains difficult for candidates at this level; however, candidates are making reference to the context and the author as part of their awareness of the value of the evidence. Some candidates only use sources in (b) part of the question where clearly they can be used and rewarded in all parts of the question. The dates when authors are writing still causes some problems – Tacitus is thought to be contemporary with Augustus, Appian thought to be writing in the 1st century BC. As always, all evaluation **must** be related to the specific reference not generally applied to all sources in the essay. It is worth repeating that candidates should be encouraged to quote the whole phrase rather than a word or a phrase picked randomly from Plutarch's Life of Pompey or Crassus. Candidates too should be wary too of attributions when uncertain of the author. Equally the un-attributed quotation is not helpful, as also the invented quote from a recognized author without a clearly state reference.

Most candidates are providing a concise but clearly detailed outline in the (a) section; only a few appear to think of this as meaning 5 or 6 lines.

All three sections were attempted and there were answers which ranged from excellent to weak, and no questions produced a majority of either very good or very weak answers.

Section A: Roman History 81-44 BC

Questions 1 and 4 were the most popular questions. In this section there were some candidates who, despite the strictures in the question to keep within a defined time period, insisted on writing about the whole period and usually failing to be detailed on the period stipulated in the question.

- 1 Question 1 (on Sulla's attempts to solve the problems of Rome) indicated that most candidates were able to show good knowledge of the reforms and the problems facing Rome and the empire; some provided a detailed list of reforms, with some discussion of the problems which Sulla sought to solve, while others focused on the problems and identified the reforms aimed at them. Either approach was acceptable. Weaker responses did not make links between problems and reforms and treated part (a) and part (b) as two unconnected questions. The (c) part was often answered with unspecific material. Some answers included material on Jugurtha and Marius (outside the period of study) as part of their answer to problems. The sources were often general and not always related to the issues and content of the answer.
- 2 The question on the challenges to the Senate in the 70s BC saw candidates sometimes ignore the time limit. Chronology was somewhat vague in many answers with lack of dates (or inaccuracies) and order of events confused. Answers tended to focus on military threats (usually Pompey) rather than political ones (on the tribune for instance) and some failed to mention Pompey and Crassus' consulship of 70 as being of any importance. Good answers were able to see link between military threats and politics involving the senate in Rome. Analysis of success was often the weakest part with candidates limited in their evidence for their judgements.

- 3 Question 3 on the social and economic problems of the 60s was attempted by some but generally with lack of specific knowledge. Candidates focused on military and political matters, rather than social and economic ones. Even Few linked the political events to social and economic problems (such as pirates and the corn supply). Not many candidates transferred the information from the Document Study to this question to help them when clearly all that they knew about Catiline's conspiracy would have been relevant.
- 4 Question 4 was on Julius Caesar and attitudes towards him. Again chronology was an issue with some confused timelines. A further problem for many was an inability to cover the whole time frame – some concentrated mostly on the triumvirate and Julius Caesar's consulship while other ignored the early years and concentrated on events in Gaul and then the events leading to crossing of the Rubicon. There were detailed accounts of Julius Caesar's conquest of Gaul which was marginally relevant. Few candidates made much of the opposition/optimate actions against Julius Caesar and some could not name any leaders of the opposition to him. Occasionally the answer interpreted 'differing' to mean changing views especially applied to individual politicians whose views changed over the period.
Good answers were able to discuss a number of different attitudes to Julius Caesar (both for and against) and were able to provide source as evidence.
- 5 Question 5 (on Cicero's contribution to politics in the period) produced relatively few good answers. Most answers had only a vague idea of important events involving Cicero during these years and many events were out of order and few dates were given. Some included detailed knowledge of the conspiracy of 63 (outside the timeframe of this question). Sources were largely limited to the Catilinarian Conspiracy/Sallust or Cicero Orations and in some cases the sources were approached in some detail. However there were few references outside of the year 63 BC.

Section B: The Age of Augustus 31 BC – AD 14

Question 6 was the most popular question along with Q.7. The majority used sources sensibly, especially the *Res Gestae*. Some did answer the questions without use of source material. .

- 6 Question 6 (on Augustus' powers and position) produced a number of really good answers with a good knowledge of the powers and how/when they were acquired. There was also some good discussion of the basis of his powers, often supported by well-chosen sources. They also showed knowledge of a range of honorary titles, although some appeared to know only these. Most could produce a contrasting view of *Res Gestae* and Tacitus for the basis of Augustus' powers. A number were able to compare this with Dio Cassius and Suetonius. Most knew the context of each of these writers, even if not in any depth. There was an issue with the meaning of "contemporary" and so the discussion of writers at the time of Augustus was limited. Some candidates appeared to have limited understanding of the scope of the question, although clearly judicious use of Tacitus to aid in the discussion of accuracy was seen in the better answers.
- 7 This question on the Equestrians produced a small number of answers. Most could list a range of roles for equestrians for Part A although a few appeared to have little specific knowledge of the duties both in Rome and in the Empire. They tend to have a general idea that Augustus used equestrian but are not able to provide specific examples. This was also true of the use of the sources. This affected their ability to answer the question successfully.

- 8 This question on the political allies of Augustus also produced few answers. Chronology and specific dates for events and actions affected the quality of the answers. The knowledge of individuals was limited and some took the approach of discussing larger groups such as the army and the senators, although members of the family were more appropriate to the question set.
- 9 Question 9 about the threats and opposition to Augustus saw some well-written answers. The better answers could relate a number of threats/ conspiracies/challenges in detail, and produce sources supporting the seriousness/non-seriousness of the threats. They could make judgments as to whether or not the sources underestimated the threats using a range of examples from Suetonius or Dio Cassius. While information was extracted from the sources, there was not an equally successful approach to evaluating the validity of the information. Some candidates interpreted threats more generally and wrote about the senate, the plebs, the army and discussed threats in broader terms. These tended to have less specific information and supporting sources. The tendency to generalise rather than to be specific was a weakness.
- 10 This question on the social and economic issues under Augustus was not successfully done by some because "social and economic" was sometimes misunderstood – military and political issues were included in the discussion. Some candidates restricted their answer to social issues (marriage, divorce and adultery) and only briefly touched on economic. Consideration of the aftermath of the Civil wars and the attempts by Augustus to revive society in one way or another was covered reasonably well.

Section C: Roman History Ad 14-68

This section was attempted a wide range of candidates with some producing answers of high quality; the majority of whom had a good knowledge of the period and some understanding of the issues. There was a fairly even spread across all the questions in this section.

- 11 Question 11 on Tacitus' treatment of Tiberius was quite popular. The question was focusing on the sources presentation of the emperor not how good Tiberius was. As such some candidates provided a good analysis of his reign with only a general reference to Tacitus' view of him. A number of answers failed to find a balance, where Tacitus praises Tiberius rather than condemns him. Good answers on (a) found difficulty on (b) where they clearly did not have material from other sources; the better ones could develop the views of Suetonius Dio and Velleius. (c) answers varied with some candidates making good points on the exaggeration of Tacitus' account in places.
- 12 This question (on Claudius and the challenges to his regime) was popular; the majority found a good range of challenges and were able to discuss Claudius' success with specific examples; they were less sure of the source material for these challenges and tended to ignore the 'seriousness' aspect. A good number focused on the wives and freedmen aspect, although many were able to discuss the importance for Claudius of military success in the context of his accession and continued popularity. Many answers made good points about his efficiency and good government, providing a balance in terms of the critical approach of the sources.
- 13 Question 13 (on the role of the senators) produced few answers and mostly weaker ones. Senate was interchanged with senators and the answers often had only a vague idea of what the roles were; few could name a senator or what they did; the discussion in (c) was marginally more successful, but again the lack of detailed evidence made the judgments general and less convincing.

- 14 The question on the ways the emperors sought to gain the loyalty of the army was attempted a reasonable number; the word 'entirely' in part (c) was often not given the weight needed; better answers made good points about other factors that were important. Sources on the importance of the army were often limited to the praetorian guard and the accession of Claudius. its role in the down fall of Nero was frequently mis-understood – they were said to assassinate him. Better answers widened the scope and looked at the ways in which emperors focused on the military aspect of their position. A number had only a vague idea of what emperors did do to keep the army loyal, in terms of pay, rewards and gifts .
- 15 Question 15 asked about the imperial cult and its impact in Rome and elsewhere. A basic problem was that candidates did not always seem to be aware of the scope of the imperial cult; some gave answers describing Roman religion. Those that did had some good material on the different emperors' views of the cult focusing on Tiberius, Gaius and Nero with the usual reference to Claudius' temple in Britain. Some generalizations and assumptions about Gaius were made. Most answers could identify reactions in general but had few sources to answer (b).

Every candidate attempted a question in some form, although some found they had spent too long on one section. Some candidates provide very little or give an overview of the topic, either through necessity (lack of knowledge) or because they misunderstand what they should do. It is expected that they will give detailed accounts in (a) and follow these up in the next two sections.

The vast majority did have accurate information and some understanding of the issues involved in the questions. Some clearly misunderstood what the question was asking. However, the majority focused on the particular issue in some form. The tendency to generalize remains, especially about bias in the source-material. Specific detail of sources should be the basis of the discussions.

Legibility is becoming a more serious issue and needs to be addressed; in this age when a great deal of a student's work may be word-processed, perhaps the only time they write by hand is in the examination. Candidates need to be aware that their answers have to be understood to be marked.

2455 Source Based Study 1: Roman World

As is usually the case with this paper, once a question on Boudicca is set, the rest seem not to be noticed, no matter how the question on Boudicca is worded: some 90% of responses were to question 3, with a sprinkling of answers to 1, 2 and 5, and barely a response to question 4.

Some general remarks need to be made at the outset. Candidates have plenty of time to prepare their chosen response, but there is very little evidence of planning or before the answer itself is embarked upon. As is the case with paper 2452, there is an unfortunate tendency to make a broad, unspecific and sweeping reference to 'the sources' without actually referring to any in detail. With 30% of the marks at stake in this paper dependent on the appropriate and detailed use of sources, this disadvantages candidates from the outset.

Picking one word from a quote (often poorly remembered) or simply putting (Suetonius) or (Tacitus) after it is not what the examiners are looking for. Well-chosen sentences and expressions from relevant passages – even if paraphrased – which are used to generate discussion, support an argument, or used to highlight the unreliability or bias of an author, will gain marks under AO3. Likewise there needs to be accurate citation and attribution: many responses confuse the contents of Tacitus' works, citing 'Histories' or 'Agricola' when they mean 'Annals', or confuse Dio and Tacitus when citing sources on Boudicca. Inventing quotes is very silly and must be discouraged. The examiners know the sources well enough to spot these inventions.

Additionally, a failure to understand the concept of literary rhetoric caused several candidates to comment on the fact that sources such as Tacitus never visited Britain and would not have understood the speeches of such persons as Boudicca or Calgacus anyway as he did not speak Old British Celtic. True but pointless; the speeches as literary devices need to be taught carefully – they had a key part to play in the writing of ancient history from its outset.

There was a lot of waffle in weaker responses, and a lack of controlled writing which went on and on but led nowhere. Again, candidates must be taught that a shorter series of points which builds an argument will gain far more marks – especially if linked to source material – than several pages of stream-of-consciousness triggered by 'Agricola' or 'Boudicca'. The spelling in some answers was extremely poor, and candidates should be reminded that text language is not acceptable in an examination. The examination requires more formal language with arguments presented in a structured manner.

Too many candidates seem not to read the rubric on the examination paper, thus failing to fill in the question numbers they have attempted, or the paper code, or other items of required information, let alone doing it legibly.

One final point: the questions are split into three parts in order to provide candidates with a developing focus for their answers. If candidates attempt a general response and do not divide their answers up in line with the three-part questions, they may do themselves a grave disservice; some did it fairly well, but a majority were unable to structure their responses coherently, even when it was apparent that they had plenty of supporting knowledge: they simply failed to address part of the question.

Comments on individual questions

Roman Britain AD 43-c. 160 BC

- 1 This was generally quite well attempted by the few who tried; in (a), economic links prior to AD 43 were well detailed using Strabo, Caesar, and evidence from archaeology; there were a couple of very perceptive responses to political links in (b) with reference to Augustus *Res Gestae* and coins, as well as Gaius and Claudius' reception of political exiles; in (c), post-invasion evidence was rewarded (e.g. the 'Mendip Pig') where it was used to illustrate shift in argument from the position held by Strabo.
- 2 Again this was well detailed, and the responses to it were mostly well outlined and supported in all parts. Some weaker candidates persisted in attributing source material to Tacitus. In (b) there were detailed and thoughtful responses which made use of the wording 'up to AD 51'; in (c) weaker responses waffled about the strength and efficiency of the Roman army, while better and more balanced discussion considered economic and political benefits to Britons and Cogidubnus/ Fishbourne made welcome appearances.
- 3 As noted above, 90% of responses or thereabouts tackled this question (or something like it: there were some very weak, imbalanced and apparently pre-prepared answers which could tackle parts (a) and to an extent (b), though bald narrative often held sway here, and (c) was barely tackled – or else candidates rushed straight on to Agricola and ignored the years between. Candidates need to be coached in the art of reading all parts of a question and not being seduced by a single word.

The mark-scheme sets out what the examiners expected to see: in (a) both Tacitus and Dio were needed as sources, and both Iceni and Trinovantes discussed; in (b), success was easy to outline (bulk of the Roman army away at Mona, other units defeated or not dispatched – incidentally, the procurator's forces may only have numbered a few hundred men – failure to send more troops may not have been an oversight or personal weakness. Centres might consider the evidence from Vindolanda – specified as a source in the new specification – which illustrates the dispersal of troops). Failure was in part military, but also due – or so it seems – by the rebels' inability to recruit widespread support in Britain as a whole; Roman policy was affected in two ways, first provoking rage in Suetonius Paulinus, and then leading to his swift replacement and a more conciliatory approach dictated from Rome itself – see mark-scheme.

- 4 Very few responses to this were seen – those which were read showed a poor knowledge of the details of Agricola's moves north, and found little to say in (b); in (c) general discussion of Tacitus' reliability rather than a focus on 'Agricola's governorship' seemed to be the order of the day.
- 5 Like question 4, this was not answered well either; the primary source is the wall itself, but candidates' references to it were neither as detailed as they should have been, nor were they used in relation to the demands of the sub-questions. There was far too much irrelevant speculation or general description about the construction of the walls (NB turf is not a 'temporary' material in Roman defence construction, nor is it easy to imagine such a barrier being overcome with ease by the Britons!)

2456 Thematic Study 1: Greek History

General Comments

There was a good range of responses across the spectrum. The best candidates selected relevant detail from across the period (beginning, middle, end), showed an understanding of change and development through the period and used a range of sources, which were contextualised in a way relevant to the question. Weaker answers tended to include very general statements about the period, a limited selection of examples, often from one part of the period and little understanding of change; there was also a tendency to include generic 'evaluation' of the sources without any reference to the question and with no specific reference to what the source said, sometimes with unusual phrasing within a centre which suggests that candidates had been encouraged to learn particular phrases.

There remain a few essays that do not consider the sources at all, which significantly affects the marks examiners are able to award because of the assessment objectives. The best answers made extensive use of the sources and were able to explain the limitations of each.

Candidates usually managed their time well, though in a few cases, overlong responses to (a) could lead to very limited responses to (c). There were a few very short answers, and some excessively long ones, where candidates did not structure their responses effectively and so rather lost their way.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There were a number of candidates whose writing proved a stumbling block for the examiners. Some candidates should be advised to use English terms whenever possible, rather than struggling with Greek terms.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: The Culture of Tyranny in the Greek World c. 600-479 BC

This section proved the least popular this year, so there is limited feedback.

- 1 For (a), candidates tended to answer generally rather than to illustrate their answer with specific examples. A few strong responses gave varied reasons with particular examples including names and places. In (b), there was much confusion between Peisistratus of Athens and Periander of Corinth. Better answers used a variety of sources including Aristotle, Herodotus and Thucydides. In (c), weaker answers were very general or repeated the information included in (1b). Those who wrote with precise detail using sources scored very well indeed.
- 2 Those who attempted this question on the whole wrote with assurance and accuracy. Some however wrote in general terms rather than giving precise examples in (a). There was occasional misinterpretation in (b), and some candidates did not discuss *both* "rich" and "tyrants" in their answer, but focused only on one. Stronger responses used a variety of events to answer (c).
- 3 Very few candidates attempted this question.

- 4 This question was very well answered for the most part. Many candidates answered (a) with precise detail and wrote persuasively in (b) showing a broad range of knowledge. Weaker answers in (c) lacked precise examples, but most showed a good understanding of Herodotus. Some weaker candidates confused Periander and Polycrates.

Section B: Sparta in the Greek World 520-400 BC

More candidates addressed the issue of Spartan sources this year: there were more references to the Great Rhetra, though the details were often rather confused. Candidates for the most part avoided explicit references to the film '300', but were unable to resist giving extended detail of the *agoge* even where it seemed entirely inappropriate. In various questions there were confusions between the Spartan constitution, the Peloponnesian League and the Hellenic League. There is a general tendency for weaker responses to show knowledge of detail only of the Persian Wars.

- 5 In (a), knowledge about the assembly's functions was varied and some confused the Spartan assembly with the Athenian assembly. In (b) few pointed out that there is a lack of Spartan sources and too many answers focused only on the Persian Wars when discussing (c); there were on the other hand some excellent answers which made use of detail from the beginning and the end of the period to illustrate their analysis.
- 6 The stronger answers in (a) gave precise examples along with the names of kings and ephors, although many wrote in general terms. Some restricted their answer in (b) to kings and ephors, and others solely to decision-making within isolated events; the best answers showed an awareness of decision making over the whole period. Stronger responses discussed the Spartan constitution *and* how individuals influenced decisions. Similarly in (c), weaker responses offered answers that were too narrow. There were some excellent answers.
- 7 This was the least popular question on Sparta. There was confusion between Herodotus and Thucydides and many discussed only the Persian Wars in (c). The stronger answers argued both sides of the question. Relatively few were able to explain how the Peloponnesian League came to a decision, and candidates struggled to recall details of the changing relationship between Sparta and individual states such as Corinth.
- 8 Most focused solely on the phalanx in (a) with few examples of its deployment in battles. Few also mentioned the use of helots, perioeci and the Spartan reluctance to fight away from the Peloponnese. There were some well nuanced discussions of 'dominance' and the difficulties faced by Sparta at sea until late in the period after the alliance with Persia.

Section C: The Development of Athenian Democracy 508-399 BC

- 9 This was answered by a fair number of candidates, though not all were able to give details of the use of ostracism in (a). There were some excellent answers to (b), though some candidates did not give examples drawn from the sources, and relatively few made reference to the *graphe paranomon*. Most candidates did refer to the change of government in 411BC & 404BC, though relatively few were able to give the names of those opposed to democracy. Some candidates interpreted the question to mean opposition by enemy states towards Athens as a democratic state; this was credited by the examiners.
- 10 This question was the most popular in this section and was answered well. Stronger responses showed a wide knowledge of the sources and offered arguments on both sides.

Report on the units taken in June 2008

- 11 In (a) the most popular leaders chosen were Cleisthenes, Ephialtes and Pericles, though there were some who went as far back as Solon. Not all got to grips with (b) and (c) since they tended not to use the sources and were shaky on detail. However the best answers did cover the thematic aspect well, and were able to give examples across the period.
- 12 This proved a challenging question, but many candidates drew on what they knew to provide an effective answer; the best responses showed an engagement with the sources. There were some good responses on the developing role of the poor in Athens during the period.

2457 Thematic Study 1: Roman History

General Comments

There was a lot of waffle in weaker responses, and a lack of controlled writing which went on and on but led nowhere. Again, candidates must be taught that a shorter series of points which builds an argument will gain far more marks – especially if linked to source material – than several pages of stream-of-consciousness triggered by ‘Roman Empire’ or ‘client kings and queens’ with no reference at all to any specific instances, or, where appropriate, named individuals! Spelling can be extremely poor, and technical terms are often misused or misspelled. The examination requires more formal language with arguments presented in a structured manner.

Too many candidates seem not to read the rubric on the examination paper, thus failing to fill in the question numbers they have attempted, or the paper code, or other items of required information, let alone doing it legibly.

One final point: the questions are split into three parts in order to provide candidates with a developing focus for their answers. If candidates attempt a general response and do not divide their answers up in line with the three-part questions, they may do themselves a grave disservice; some did it fairly well, but a majority were unable to structure their responses coherently, even when it was apparent that they had plenty of supporting knowledge: they simply failed to address part of the question. An unfocused answer will always score lower marks than a focused one, and a general or speculative discussion will gain very few compared to a specific or detailed one which refers to particular events or individuals and discusses them in detail. It is not unusual in this paper for answers to be imbalanced, either across the three parts of the question, or across the Assessment Objectives – some candidates can gain access to a higher band in AO1 ‘factual knowledge’ than in AO3 ‘sources’ and the more detailed and specific their work, the more marks they get; undifferentiated or generalized responses gain very few.

Section A: The Growth and Government of the Roman Empire 133-30 BC

Of the four questions in this section Question 1 was most popular – one large centre saw almost all of their candidates attempt it - sometimes well, sometimes in very little detail at all. Question 3 was attempted by only a few; roughly equal numbers attempted 2 and 4.

- 1 As noted above this was the most popular question in this section, and it was generally answered fairly well, with specific relevant factual knowledge; sources were often referred to in detail but not integrated into the answer, and there was little focus in (b) on ‘why’. In (c) there was often little appreciation that ‘deliberate policy’ was often lacking except in terms of individual intentions. It was rarely backed up by sources or examples (even Caesar omitted); some weaker answers made little or no mention of sources and occasionally most of the factual information referred to Rome’s expansion after the Punic Wars, well outside the period.
- 2 There were some well-developed and sound answers to (a) with lots of detail; in (b) weaker responses mostly involved a recounting of Verres; Many candidates focused on the theme that the Senate could not control individuals while in post, and had little discipline over them once they had left – leading on the final occasion when a governor was challenged to civil war! (c) was often poorly dealt with and lacked support from sources or detailed evidence.

- 3 Definitions were forthcoming but very few answers contained appropriate examples, despite the wording of the question. Sources were better used in (b) and (c) than was the case in Question 2.
- 4 Some responses only focussed on the negative in (a) and their answers were imbalanced. Strangely, Verrès hardly put in an appearance here! There were several factual answers in (b) which made no attempt to use sources at all.

Section B: The City of Rome 33 BC – AD 117

- 5 This with Question 6 was the most popular in this section. Some responses only chose one monument, or described three by Augustus, and some of the choices were only tendentiously connected with victory over Rome's enemies. A number of answers were superficial (in (a)). Reference to monuments enabled marks to be amassed in AO3.
- 6 A very popular question – in fact, gaining the most responses in this section along with Question 5. Some candidates wrote too much narrative without recourse to sources in (b); where sources did appear, Juvenal's 'bread and circuses' and Suetonius' ref. to Claudius being pelted with stale crusts (or bread rolls, or bread,...) replaced 'bricks and marble' as the year's most over-used and under-exploited quote. Many stuck with food supply throughout, though this was not necessary (see mark scheme).
- 7 Very few responses were noted to this question and there was little attempt to discuss change over time; instead there were general definitions with few actual examples in (a) and little recourse to sources overall.
- 8 Most responses had more to say about the cults than about traditional Roman religion – some candidates gave masses of unnecessary GCSE-type detail about the Olympian gods, each with a biography! Again (b) often contained narrative without evidence.

Section C: Emperors and Empire

This section seems to have fewer centres taking it than A or B.

- 9 This question was answered well in (a) but several responses to (b) retold Boudicca's story without a mention either of Tacitus or Dio. Despite the obvious, few students used Trajan's column as evidence for campaigning on the frontiers. See mark-scheme.
- 10 This saw the least satisfactory responses in section C. Candidates were able to discuss the functions of provincial governors far better than procurators; some believed them to be the same. Very few sources were used in (b) and very few responses could distinguish the role of equites from that of senators.
- 11 This proved to be a more straightforward question; most responses were relevant and used some sources to support judgements made. Boudicca again put in many an appearance. In (c) there was only occasionally a clear conclusion, though lots of discussion was seen.
- 12 This was generally poorly answered with most accounts in (a) lacking range and detail. The oath of loyalty was not mentioned once, and sources (whether literary or epigraphic) were conspicuous by their absence.

2458 Thematic Study 1: Roman World

The paper caused no particular problems save that many candidates appear to be tired by the time they came to tackle it. The questions seemed to be fairly accessible, but given the requirement to write only one essay, many seemed drawn to (apparently) more familiar material, even if there problems posed by parts of the questions which they were unable to address – this was a failing in the Boudicca question in paper 2455, and occurred again in 2458, especially in the most popular questions, which (in order of responses) were 4 and 3; there was a limited number of responses to question 2, and hardly any at all to question 1; perhaps candidates were put off by the transition from ‘women’ in (a) to general ‘elites’ in (b) and (c).

There was a lot of waffle in weaker responses, and a lack of controlled writing which went on and on but led nowhere. Again, candidates must be taught that a shorter series of points which builds an argument will gain far more marks – especially if linked to source material – than several pages of stream-of-consciousness triggered by ‘Agricola’ or ‘Boudicca’. The spelling in some answers was extremely poor, and candidates should be reminded that text language is not acceptable in an examination. The examination requires more formal language with arguments presented in a structured manner.

Too many candidates seem not to read the rubric on the examination paper, thus failing to fill in the question numbers they have attempted, or the paper code, or other items of required information, let alone doing it legibly.

One final point: the questions are split into three parts in order to provide candidates with a developing focus for their answers. If candidates attempt a general response and do not divide their answers up in line with the three-part questions, they may do themselves a grave disservice; some did it fairly well, but a majority were unable to structure their responses coherently, even when it was apparent that they had plenty of supporting knowledge: they simply failed to address part of the question.

Comments on specific questions

The Romanisation of Britain AD 43-415

- 1 As noted above there were hardly any responses to this, and those seen were not very good; some discussed only Boudicca; one tried to use the Barates' inscription (out of the period); in (b) there was little attempt to discuss elite involvement in administration and local government, and poor use of evidence in (c) – see mark schemes for potential responses.
- 2 Quite a popular question, though often poorly done, with either very general discussion of pre-Roman animism in simplistic terms or discussion restricted to Druidism. A few better answers noted the potential raised by the wording of the question and used archaeology as evidence in support (cf. mark scheme); in (b) there was an all-and-sundry approach to Roman army, which appears to have been responsible for every religious change; (c) was mostly done very poorly with little supported discussion of ‘to what extent’.

- 3 A popular question, and similar to questions on urbanization set in previous years, but poorly done; there seemed little focus on reasons for the development of towns in the first century AD, less on the contribution of towns to Romanisation (whatever else they did, they didn't build villas!) and only the best responses were able to discuss change of functions in (c). The mark-scheme indicates what the examiners expected to find. Incidentally, this question again saw a pattern of responses in which not a single town was mentioned by name, and little source-material was used to support the discussion.
- 4 Almost identical comments apply to this question as are found above on Question 3; the sources on the economy were generally quite well done; agricultural practice was sometimes well discussed, more often than not discussed (if that is the word) without any detail, much less a source in sight; in (c) it was the exception to find a road cited, let alone one with a direct relation to clear economic development (no *mansiones* or small towns mentioned at all). Again, refer to the mark-scheme for possible material candidates could have used.

2459 Document Study 2: Greek History

General

The standard of work produced this year was a little higher across the board than in previous years, with a few candidates producing work which fell below an acceptable standard for an E grade at A Level. Many seemed to have a grasp of the issues relevant to their chosen topics, and were able to create reasonable answers in response to the question.

In general candidates performed better on the (b) sections of the questions where they could show general subject knowledge, and found the analysis of the passages more challenging.

Section A: Herodotus on Persia

Only a few candidates took this option, so the comments are limited.

- 1 1(a) Many responses lacked sufficient subject knowledge to do this question justice.
 1(b) Some good answers with a good range of knowledge.
- 2 Candidates seemed to find these questions challenging, and seemed to lack the necessary knowledge to do justice to the questions.
- 3 These questions were well answered in the main, with candidates able to respond adequately to the demands of the question.

Section B: The Athenian Empire 450-410 BC

- 4 Many candidates confused enemies with allies in question (a), but were able to produce good responses to (b).
- 5 The (b) question was generally well answered, but in (a) candidates failed to interpret the inscription in its context.
- 6 Whilst (a) received good answers, many seemed to lack sufficient knowledge to deal with (b).

Section C: The Trial of Socrates

In all the questions in this section, candidates performed well when they kept in mind the wider context of Socrates' behaviour and ideas. Those who used their knowledge of Alcibiades and Critias, for example, in 8(b) performed well. In question 9, many candidates failed to address both consistent and credible. Candidates should be reminded to ensure that they address all aspects of the question.

2460 Document Study 2: Roman History

The majority of candidates display the skills required to interpret and evaluate the sources. They show good knowledge of the material, the authors and the political or social contexts. Most candidates understand that all answers must include source evidence for good marks. Some good and most weak answers tended to display a lack of secure chronology and specific examples from the sources.

There is still a failure of some candidates to address the question which asks how useful a particular extract is. Many answers deal with the factual content and the interpretation of the passage well but fail to answer that part of the question. It is too often the case that the candidate cannot provide evidence from the sources other than from the passage on the paper. This makes it difficult for the candidate to develop answers about consistency, accuracy and reliability. It is often stated, for example, that we cannot believe everything in the *Res Gestae* because Augustus wrote it, and it is biased. However, there is rarely any effort to relate this to the actual information in the book – and indeed candidates proceed to use the information from it as fact having stated that we should not. Speeches are commonly evaluated as ‘untrue’ because the speaker was not present, whereas some discussion of the ancient writer’s attempt to recreate what might have been said would be more useful.

As always, some weaker answers are factually accurate and relevant but fail to develop the source evidence.

As in previous years, reference to a particular period, or group of people, or terms such as accuracy and consistency, or specific events all require that the answer focus in that direction.

The three sections A, B, and C, were all attempted, and candidates performed creditably in all three and showed understanding of all the prescribed texts. The most popular option was Section B, followed by C and then A.

Section A: The Catilinarian Conspiracy

In Section A all three questions were attempted. There was good knowledge of the Conspiracy, but the wider context was often sketchy and vague.

- 1 On (*Sallust Catiline* 52 the Cato’s view of the conspirators and his role in the events of 63 BC). Question (a) saw the majority of the answers place the speech in context and use that to assess the reliability of his comments. There was generally good factual knowledge of the situation, although there was also a tendency to narrate too much of the event; candidates need to resist the temptation to tell everything they know in the limited amount of time they have. Better answers also used evidence from Cicero wisely as support. In (b) answers were generally sound, although less successful answers discussed Cicero’s role after a brief nod towards Cato. While relevant the key issue was to assess Cato’s role and the effect his few actions had. Better answers had good information on the debate and the effects on Catiline’s army with support from Sallust and Plutarch. While Sallust clearly dramatises the situation, it does not follow that he is also completely unreliable given the sources he could have used.
- 2 Question 2 (*Sallust Catiline* 48 on the importance of Crassus) produced some very good answers, although as always information about Crassus took precedence over the issue of the usefulness of the passage. A number of answers ignored this issue completely, or it was answered by some general statement about Sallust’s reliability or his melodramatic

tendencies. This was usually added without much attempt to explain how this affected the particular part of Sallust being employed as evidence at the time.

In (b), good balanced answers gained the higher marks where the evidence from the sources was used critically. Everyone could say something relevant about Crassus.

- 3 Question 3 (Sallust, *Catiline* 33 and Cicero *In Catilinam* II 20-1) produced some good answers comparing the material and assessing the accuracy of the passages in (a). A number produced very detailed answers analysing the extracts and using specific references. There was good background knowledge from most candidates, although some narrative crept in. Not all candidates realised the Sallust passage is Manlius' letter, and their views were accordingly unconvincing. Answers were better on the Cicero passage. For (b) the knowledge of the period and situation was important; some answers dismissed the economic aspect in a sentence and proceeded to discuss every other motive, thus not answering the question, or rather presenting an answer to a question which was not set. Debt dominated the discussion with fine references to the sources in most cases. Better answers distinguished between the groups of supporters as always.

Section B: Augustus and Augustan Propaganda

All questions were attempted and a good range of answers was provided by the candidates. There is a common practice to see Horace and Virgil as propaganda and very little else.

- 4 Candidates answered Q.4 (Tacitus *Annals* 1.9) well on the whole; those who did not failed to recognise that this was a piece of reported speech by Tacitus and not Tacitus himself and is followed by a passage which presents the opposition view more forcibly. Equally the context of the passage was not clearly indicated, and some of the details of the content caused some candidates to confuse dates or events. Good answers displayed specific factual knowledge in terms of the content of the passage in (a). In (b) the question focused on the consistency of the sources. Most candidates were able to make a contrast between some of Tacitus' *Annals* and the *Res Gestae*. In weaker answers this was in general terms; better answers contrasted specific information and provided some explanation for it. Most candidates still produce a set paragraph of evaluation in general without relating it to the specific quote or reference being used. Good balanced answers considered a number of sources.
- 5 Question 5 (Suetonius *Augustus* 28-30 on Augustus' building policy and his use of art and architecture) was attempted by a number of candidates. In (a) candidates needed to consider what the passage suggested about Augustus' aims interpreting the detail for an answer. Good answers knew the details of the buildings and the likely aims, as well as offering further detail from the *Res Gestae*. Some consideration of the genre and author was present in better answers where this was related to the aspect of usefulness. For (b), specific reference to the architecture, especially works not mentioned in the extract, was needed for good answers and some interpretation of the ideals represented by them. The question of success in promoting his ideals and values required careful use of the evidence, and how one measured success. Good answers made use of the relevant sources to indicate support for and/or opposition to his ideals.
- 6 The answers to this question (*Res Gestae* 7.3 and Suetonius *Augustus* 31 about religion) displayed a good factual knowledge of the ways in which religion played a part in the regime. There were good discussions about the importance for Augustus from the passages; some answers dealt with the question of accuracy very well using other evidence to support the information in the extracts. Most candidates could develop a view on Augustus' use of religion, and relate it to what is said elsewhere (such as Horace *Odes* 5).

Good answers in (b) were very concise and clear about Augustus' policies and the extent to which there was evidence for success both in implementing them and having an effect. There was some discussion of the ways in which the policies manifested themselves in building projects, the imperial cult and events such as the Secular Games. Good answers used this information to inform their judgements about success. Weaker ones were inclined to discuss the issue of religious revival without much evidence to support their views. This resulted in a range of assertions which were supported only by generalisations. Not all candidates emphasised the royal aspect of Roman religion and its importance.

Section C: The Reign of Nero

One general point: it is still common for candidates to suggest that Tacitus provides an account of the end of Nero's reign. Close analysis of the text was often the failing in (a) sub-questions. Question 7 was more popular than Question 8.

- 7 This question (Tacitus *Annals* 13.17-18 on the murder of Britannicus and Tacitus' view of Nero) saw a range of answers. In (a) candidates produced good material analysing the passage and developing some interpretations of the style and content to answer the question. The better answers went beyond simply repeating the passage with a comment and evaluated the extent to which Tacitus was providing facts and opinion. Some weaker answers did not refer to 'others described' in the extract. It is apparent that candidates who examine the extract carefully could gain good marks rather than those who took a general approach on Tacitus' view of Nero with an occasional mention of some part of the extract. (b) required candidates to consider the extent to which Nero gained and kept support. Most candidates took the view that he was popular for five years then lost support. A number simply stated this with very little evidence of attitudes towards Nero from the sources. Most used the extract to show he used gifts and so on, but a number were unable to go beyond this in providing source material. Better answers saw the issue in more complex terms and identified the groups of support and opposition with some factual knowledge and sources in support. The ways in which he gained support were generally well-known.
- 8 The answers to the Question 8 passage (Dio Cassius 63.26.3-27.1) asked about Dio's view of Nero and how far this view was shared by other writers. Candidates were able to identify the context of the extract, and make use of this in their answer. Careful analysis of the extract allowed candidates to identify a number of points and support them from the text. There was some general evaluation (although not all candidates seem to know when Dio is writing). Equally some candidates could not identify the people mentioned where it would have been useful in analysing Nero's behaviour. In (b) sub-question, most answers took the view that Dio's opinion was shared by other writers entirely. Better answers noted that Suetonius, at least, presents a different portrait of Nero in the early chapters. Even Tacitus has some good things to say. It would be useful for candidates to be aware of those parts of the selection where the authors have some praise for Nero. Better answers focused on a small number of incidents using references to more than one author for contrast or comparison.
- 9 Question 9 looked at accounts of the start of Nero's reign (Suetonius *Nero* 9-10 and Tacitus *Annals* 13.4). In (a) the question concerned how accurate and consistent the accounts were, and often candidates failed to address both aspects of the question. In general consistent was better done, by analysing the extracts carefully. Better answers placed both extracts in the context of the accession gaining marks in 01, and could identify the factual information in the extracts. Good answers noted Tacitus' implications in some of his phrasing which allowed them to question the accuracy.

Question (b) asked candidates to consider how well Nero lived up to the promises he made at the start. Good answers took a number of detailed incidents and related them specifically to the promises, either in the extracts or elsewhere. Some connections were at times a little forced, but sound judgements were made about how far he did keep to his promises. General discussions of his reign's decline were less successful, often lacking specific information and clearly referenced source support. As in previous questions, there was a tendency to assume everything was wrong and he kept none of his promises despite the evidence to the contrary.

There appeared to be more candidates who ran out of time this year, perhaps because they spend too much time on the (a) questions since they focus on the passage in front of them. Candidates also introduce narrative into the (a) sub-question where it is not needed. It needs to be repeated that candidates need to ensure that basic and essential terminology is properly used for their A01b mark. Spelling is important to an extent (Cataline, Ceasar, Seutonius, Tactus, Mycenae, Horis, Virggill); the lack of punctuation, and sentence structure can all contribute to unclear expressions and arguments. Organisation of ideas is problematical for a large number. A paragraph structure, where an idea is stated, explored and supported by evidence is a straightforward approach that many might adopt.

2461 Document Study 2: Roman World

General remarks

Candidates did well with this paper on the whole, and it posed few problems; there was only one rubric error involving the answering of one question, and only one instance of a candidate answering questions 1 and 2 (both questions were marked and the better mark awarded). One candidate specifically complained about the limited time to answer the questions, and there were some other instances of imbalance or a truncated final answer which may have been due to this issue.

In most cases candidates answered the optional question better than the compulsory one, but that said, most were able to find something to say on the latter (see comments below on Question 3). Many candidates concentrated in their (b) responses on the reliability of authors, and lost sight of the question - not focusing on plans for invading Britain (1), relations between Britons and Romans (2), or military tactics and practices (3). This produces stereotypical answers which would have read the same whatever the wording of the question, and they score low marks – it may help to make candidates familiar with marking grids and the way marks are awarded. Likewise, weaker responses saw comments to the effect that if a later source agrees with an earlier one the earlier one must be true; that Caesar had no reason to lie and 'he was there'.

Comments on specific questions

Britain Through Roman Eyes

- 1 This question was answered by about 2/3 of the candidates. (a) posed few problems, though 'how useful' was omitted by weaker responses; in (b) there were many vague and general discussions of Caesar's writings and too often little focus on the plans for invading Britain – narrative of the two invasions tended to predominate. The question was deliberately set very narrow so that there could be sharp focus.
- 2 Again (a) posed few problems; perceptive candidates here and in (b) noted the clash between Suetonius P. and Classicianus, the role of the latter with his 'hot-line' to Rome, and the reaction of all to the arrival of the imperial freedman Polyclitus. In (b) weaker responses gave general discussions on Tacitus, often providing vast detail on Domitian, and missed the focus on 'relations between Romans and Britons' – it was noticeable that very few responses to this question actually made any use of the passage and its very varied testimony. See mark-scheme.
- 3 This proved most problematic, but most found enough to get to band 3 or 4. As noted above there was sometimes little focus both on 'British military practices' and on 'reliability'. At the top end of the responses there were some very detailed controlled and accurate answers which received appropriate credit.

2462 Source Based Study 2: Greek History

This paper produced a range of responses, with a considerable number of candidates opting for Section B, Greek History 446-413 BC. In general, most candidates made use of sources in their answers, but there were still a few who lost a considerable number of marks by failing to include and evaluate the relevant sources. Teachers should be reminded that for the highest marks it is not enough to write a general evaluation of Herodotus or Thucydides: this evaluation must form part of the answer, and be related to the specific issues raised by the question.

Section A: Herodotus and the Conflict of Greece and Persia 499-479 BC

- 1 This proved popular, with some candidates demonstrating a good knowledge of the details of the revolt and good ideas on other aspects of causation which were not given by Herodotus.
- 2 Most candidates produced an adequate account of the battle, but very few considered 'both Athenians and other Greeks'. Some showed a poor knowledge of the detail of Herodotus' account.
- 3 Candidates often did not look carefully enough at the link between Darius' and Xerxes' motivations. Some accounts of the relevant battles were well organised, but lacked focus on the question itself.
- 4 This proved a challenging question, not least because the evidence on the Hellenic League is rather tenuous. Some candidates moved off and started to look at the Delian League.
- 5 Only a few candidates took this question, and most of these failed to make use of their knowledge of the battles and other aspects of the interaction between the Greeks and Persians.

Section B: Greek History 446-413 BC

- 6 This produced some good responses, with some candidates showing an excellent knowledge of both epigraphical evidence and details from Thucydides. However, very few candidates considered the question of 'to what extent' fully.
- 7 Only a few candidates took this question, and those that did seemed to miss opportunities to use obvious parts of Thucydides (such as the account of Pylos) to support their answers. Some also confused slaves in Athens with Helots in Sparta.
- 8 This question led to a number of good narratives about the plague, and most candidates made mention of the impact of the death of Pericles. Some used Thucydides and epigraphical evidence with a suitably critical attitude, but many failed to consider the relationship between the plague and what followed.
- 9 This question produced rather poor answers in the main. Very few candidates were able to recall the details of Alcibiades' contribution or the account by Thucydides.
- 10 In the main candidates who took this question knew some basic facts about slaves and metics in Athens, but were unable to relate these to original sources. Here, Aristophanes and Plato in particular might have been useful.

Section C: The Culture of Athens 447-399 BC

- 11 Many candidates who took this question failed to connect with the issues surrounding 'effective political power'. Most dealt competently with the Assembly and its position, and many then moved to consider the jury courts and other aspects of the Athenian system. Some made good use of Aristophanes and Thucydides, but these were in the minority.
- 12 Candidates who took this question mostly failed to connect with the nature of the drama festivals and the debate which is raised by the plays. Most used Aristophanes and produced outlines of two plays, but did not really connect these with the idea of a 'democratic process in Athens.'
- 13 Some candidates showed an outline knowledge of the buildings on the Acropolis, but in the main failed to consider the buildings carefully. They showed very little knowledge of the detail of the Parthenon, and some mistakenly allocated to Thucydides' comments on the buildings. Some made good use of Plutarch's comments on the programme.
- 14 Very few candidates had any clear knowledge of Athenian religion. Some made an attempt to answer the question using Aristophanes as evidence, and produced competent responses. Very few, though, were able to consider whether the picture was 'full and accurate' because their knowledge of religion seemed rather thin.
- 15 Some answers to this question were well executed with a clear understanding of the relationship between the sophists and rhetoric. However, candidates must ensure that they know something of the details of individual sophists, and that they consider both aspects of the question – 'behaviour and ideas.'

2463 Source Based Study 2: Roman History

Candidates, as in previous years, showed a good range of knowledge and understanding. There is more consistent use of source material although there is a tendency to add the source reference rather as an afterthought. This is especially true of general evaluation of the source and its context which is not then related to the specific evidence being used. Discussion and forming valid judgements is an issue for a number of candidates. Candidates for the most part express themselves well and clearly, and thankfully few use inappropriate language in their answers. However while one may abbreviate Tacitus to Tac. in a reference, it is not acceptable in a discussion of the author or in any general reference to him or any other of the sources.

There are many candidates who use the source material as a starting point which is excellent. This approach, as always, will produce the better answers. Establishing the context of the source, its genre, the author's agenda are all likely to produce a more successful answer.

All sections were attempted by the candidates with Section B being the most popular.

Section A: Roman History 81-44 BC

- 1 Question 1 (on Pompey and the Sullan reforms) naturally produced a number of answers which focused on either Pompey or Sulla, while the better ones managed to link the two as the question asked. There were good discussions concerning other factors which affected the success of the reforms. Most were accurate on Pompey's career, although even the very best at times could not provide accurate dates. Some responses strayed outside the 70s with their narratives of Pompey, although reference to his use of the tribune was quite legitimate as part of the argument for his ambition. Better answers also dealt with the idea that Sulla's reforms were a genuine attempt to deal with Rome's problems. A range of sources was used by most. A number are inclined to say not much more than 'Plutarch says' and follow it with paraphrase without the slightest indication where the evidence is from, which Life, let alone which part of the Life. Evaluations are also general with the idea that Plutarch lived so long after the events that he cannot possibly be trusted. Alternatively he wrote Lives not history and must be treated with caution. It is never clear which part of the Lives or reference can be trusted as a result.
- 2 This question about Cicero's importance was either answered very well or very badly. The weaker answers had little idea of his career beyond the year 63 and perhaps 50-1 BC. The scope was limited and the evidence (even where the Document Study material was useful) was rarely used. Better answers had more of his career (especially his importance in 70 BC and in the 60s) and could discuss the issues to show that Cicero had his moments. Good use was made by some of the evidence from Cicero himself, and some excellent efforts were made to contrast what he says with the views of others. Here again Sallust could have been useful to the candidates if they had thought to use it.
- 3 Question 3 on the contemporary sources and their bias was rarely attempted. Those who did had a little difficulty with the concept of 'contemporary' and used information from Suetonius and Plutarch. These might be relevant in the context of assessing the reliability of the sources, but that was not always how they were used.
- 4 This question on the outbreak of the Civil war was popular and generally well done with a good range of information and sources. There was not always a clear grasp of the events which led up to the war, apart from Caesar crossing the Rubicon. Better responses detailed the events and the roles of the people involved. Some went back to the triumvirate as a cause. Usually Caesar was mostly responsible but the oligarchy was blamed by a good number of candidates. There was some attempt in better answers to

gain a balance of views and evidence. Most candidates came to some sort of judgement based upon the factual knowledge if not the sources. Very good answers contrasted the evidence in the sources and evaluated the various opinions voiced in them.

- 5 Question 5 (on the use of religion by politicians) produced some good knowledgeable answers. Caesar's consulship of 59 BC, the role of Pontifex Maximus and his actions during the 40s were used as evidence of the manipulation of religion. Answers were generally sound, but the extent of success was less well addressed with candidates finding difficulty in producing evidence for their judgements.

Section B: The Age of Augustus 31 BC – AD 14

- 6 Question 6 (on Augustus' efforts to overcome the hostility towards a dynasty) was a less popular choice. The candidates did not successfully address the idea of dynasty (and the importance of a successor), tending to discuss the creation of a monarchy. Answers did not explore the extent of the hostility which Augustus had to overcome, by looking at the opposition or lack of it, and some of the views of those at the time and later. Equally the extent of his success in getting acceptance of the system he created was assumed rather than argued with reference to evidence. Evaluation of the evidence was usually in the form of a general critique of the *Res Gestae*.
- 7 This question on Augustus' concern for the Republic was very popular. The majority addressed the statement with one view or another, using a range of sources and factual knowledge. The majority of candidates knew his basic position and powers; the better ones could add the various roles he undertook beyond the *maius imperium* and *tribunician potestas*. Some developed the privileges he had also. Occasional responses focused on Augustus' rebuilding of Rome as a sign of his concern for the Republic. Good answers used Tacitus *Annals* 1.9 and 1.10 to indicate attitudes towards Augustus. Balanced answers showed understanding of the ways in which he maintained certain aspects of the republic; some argued this was simply to avoid opposition rather than a genuine concern. In all, there were some good, thoughtful and informed answers to this question which went beyond the simple description of his powers.
- 8 Question 8 (which asked about the way Augustus ensured the loyalty of the army) were well answered in the main. Better answers simply knew the various measures which he took; weaker ones did not and so could not make out a convincing case. The exact rate of pay, length of service, donatives and retirement arrangements were only vaguely understood. While Tacitus' comment on 'seducing the legions' was usually used, very little else was provided for source evidence.
- 9 Question 9 asked candidates to consider how the Senate's roles changed under Augustus. This was a popular choice, largely because it gave an opportunity to focus on Augustus' powers and argue from that about the reduction in the Senate's power. However, the administrative, judicial and financial roles of the Senate were important to any answer and some barely touched upon this. Candidates did not always address the question as a result. The ways in which their duties changed during the reign as various roles were removed or altered was again only addressed in a limited way.
- 10 Question 10 (on Augustus' measures to control the urban populace) was occasionally well done but some seemed to define the urban populace as senators and equestrians only. Some responses detailed Augustus' marriage laws and the laws on slaves and freedmen. It was not clear how this controlled them (or indeed whether they were successful. This was not primarily a question on social legislation. Better answers identified a number of ways from the corn supply, to the creation of the vigils, providing decent amenities and entertainments and so on. Control of the upper classes was addressed by reference to

employment and inclusion in the government. Evidence for success was present only in the best answers, where candidates looked at the effects of some measures on the lives of the people or the lack of opposition to Augustus. While most can identify the measures, the analysis and discussion of the issues in the question remains an area where candidates tend to be less successful.

Section C: Roman History AD 14-68

- 11 A number of candidates opted for Question 11 (on the effectiveness of Tiberius as emperor) with candidates very divided on whether he was or was not effective. There were some lively and informed discussions naturally based around Tacitus' view of him. Good use was made of the sources which praise him for his administration, and good contrasts were made between, for example, Velleius and Tacitus. Candidates were more willing to engage in detailed evaluation in this question with good comments made about some specific reference to the texts. Candidates showed awareness of the context of the sources where this was relevant. Some candidates did add on a general evaluation of an author without making it relevant to the question. The best answers provided a balanced view based upon the sources, showing that Tiberius could be effective when it mattered. Weaker candidates repeated the accusations from Tacitus or Suetonius without much comment.
- 12 Question 12 (Claudius' principate) was also popular. As in Question 11 some candidates did not use the sources critically and tended to accept the views that he was controlled by wives and freedmen. Better answers detailed some of the actions he takes and the effects they had. Good, balanced answers developed both sides of the argument with evidence to support the discussion; they pointed to his invasion of Britain, his building projects, his generally sound management of the frontiers, and his administrative innovations.
- 13 Question 13 (on the sources and the imperial cult) was attempted by some; the knowledge of the cult was weak in a number of examples. Even weaker was the use of the sources, whether literary or otherwise. Even where there was some knowledge of the cult, the issue of development was not easily answered with information from the period as a whole.
- 14 This question on the ways in which emperors gained and maintained the support of the ordinary citizens was reasonably popular. Good answers showed an awareness of a range of ways and means, with the better answers providing specific examples of the games, corn supply, the amenities and so on. There was good use of the material on at least two emperors, usually Claudius and Nero, or Tiberius and Nero. Good answers again attained a balance by showing that even Nero was able to keep the support of the citizens almost to the end by various means. It is, however, important, to use specific examples in questions such as these which can lend themselves to generalisations if the candidate is not careful. It is also important to consider the effects on different groups within the populace of Rome and how they are treated.
- 15 Question 15 asked candidates to consider why it was that the Julio-Claudians lasted so long. Some argued that it was a failure in general, and that there many aspects which were good. Others pointed to the loyalty of the army (if not the senate), and the generally peaceful and prosperous period. Nero was blamed for bringing the dynasty to an end. Good knowledge of the emperors was displayed. Weaker answers as always generalised about them without really assessing what they did. Better answers focused on the opposition and its weaknesses, as well as how well the emperors stifled that opposition in one way or another.

Report on the units taken in June 2008

It is important to remind candidates that they must support their views with evidence if they are to gain good marks. Speculation on the effects of actions or events, or what would have pleased or displeased the people or the senate is not sufficient. Equally the addition of *probably* as a way of justifying a conclusion should be considered. It is essential that candidates justify their views with evidence or indicate that the evidence is limited or may not exist.

2464 Source Based Study 2: Roman World

General Comments

As might be expected this paper saw no rubric errors or major time issues. A small number among this year's entry appeared to have a lack of knowledge unusual at A2. All answers made at least an attempt to use sources, one deciding to cite Tacitus *Agricola* in Latin! The overall quality of responses was poorer than in 2461.

Of the five questions, the majority of responses were to Questions 1, 3, and 4; these had about the same number of attempts, each twice as many as question 5, while very few indeed had anything to say about towns (Question 2), which came as a surprise to the setter. The quality of writing was generally very good, though some candidates need to be encouraged to write in an appropriate register for an examination essay and to avoid slang.

Comments on individual questions

Roman Britain AD 43 –c. 160

- 1 This generally saw some of the best responses, though there was a tendency to write narrative at length beginning with Caesar and see Claudius appear about half-way through. Poor responses did not venture out of Britain. Few gave really full answers on the extra-British situation – limiting their discussion to Claudius' physical impairments.
- 2 As noted above there were very few takers for this. One response was very detailed and thorough; the others barely mentioned a specific town between them and limited themselves to abstract speculations.
- 3 A wide range of answers was seen on this. Few thought to consider Roman policy **before** the revolt as a context for changes afterwards, other than offering the causes of the revolt. Few covered Roman policy immediately after the revolt in any detail, skipping straight from Suetonius Paulinus to more reconciliatory governors or even Agricola.
- 4 Again this saw a range of responses across the range and bands. Weaker responses lost sight of Agricola's achievements or didn't have it in the first place – instead there were generalizations of a stereotypical kind on Tacitus. Candidates need to be made aware of the nature of ancient historiography and the role of rhetoric in the writings of Tacitus.
- 5 There was a lot of discussion about the frontiers (as expected – see mark-scheme) but little on **why** the frontiers moved – though there were notable well-informed exceptions.

2465 Thematic Study 2: Greek History

In general the performance on this paper was in line with previous years, with the candidates who obtained lower marks failing to show any detailed knowledge of the relevant history or sources. Overall there seems to be a failure to address all elements of the particular questions attempted. For example, with the question 'How far did the rights and responsibilities of the ordinary Athenian citizen change during this period?' there was often a general discussion of rights and responsibilities, yet little attention to 'how far... change during this period'.

The failure to recognise or address all elements of the question appears to account for the tendency to include much which seems only relevant in the widest interpretation of the given topic. This is often very noticeable with the discussion of the relative value of historical sources. While it is encouraging to note that some emphasis is being given to the reliability of sources, it seems that there is rather less on how this may be used in understanding the events discussed.

A number of candidates unnecessarily lost marks on this paper because they misread the instructions on the paper. Candidates must ensure that they answer the right questions as instructed on the paper.

Section A: The Culture of Tyranny in Greek World c. 600-479 BC

Very few candidates took this option, so the comments are limited.

- 1 There was a tendency to concentrate on the ending of the various periods of power of Peisistratus with remarkably little on Hippias, who might have been the more obvious subject.
- 2 There were too few responses to comment.
- 3 A variety of tyrants were discussed in the more successful answers. However, there was a tendency to concentrate on anecdotal evidence, predominantly the stories related by Herodotus regarding Cypselus, Polycrates, Peisistratus and Periander. Little mention was made of any underlying social, political or economic reasons for the rise and fall of any particular tyrant nor of tyranny in general.

Section B: Sparta in the Greek World 520-400 BC

- 5 This was reasonably well answered with most candidates able to give some details regarding the powers of kings and ephors and some supporting anecdotal evidence. Only the better scripts were able to demonstrate how the powers changed over time. There appears to be an emphasis on factual learning rather than any development of interpretive skills – the result being that often, even with the better answers, a candidate adequately supports fact with evidence yet shows little understanding of the relevance of the material in the evolution of the society in question.
- 6 This question was favoured by slightly more candidates and generally received more complete answers. Most were able to give a reasonable account of the nature of the Spartan education system and relate it to Sparta's position in the Greek world in a general way. Most covered the positive aspects, rather fewer considered the negative effects of the system.

- 7 The relatively narrow focus of the question gave the opportunity for those candidates with sufficient knowledge of express ideas relating to most of the relevant events and consider the changing relations between Sparta and Corinth.
- 8 This was by far the most popular question in this section, perhaps because it appeared to be more straightforward. While many candidates were able to debate the strengths and weaknesses of Herodotus and Thucydides as historical commentators, relatively few were able to use those sources to provide any firm information regarding Spartan strategy. Perhaps most alarming was the number of candidates who failed to draw firm distinctions between the works of the respective authors, many attributing parts of Thucydides' work to Herodotus.

Section C: The Development of Athenian Democracy 508-399 BC

- 9 The majority of answers were superficial in that while varying degrees of knowledge relating to the structure of the assembly were demonstrated, the element of change was less well addressed. It seems that while many candidates are aware of the facts, the chronology and circumstances relating to change are not always fully understood.
- 10 The various reforms/reformers were related, in varying degree, by most attempting the question – yet again, few could relate this to changes for 'the ordinary Athenian citizen'. It is of note that many candidates seemed uncertain as to the identity of 'the ordinary Athenian citizen', although the better answers did attempt to define this entity as a basis for discussion.
- 11 Most candidates had a reasonably good grasp of at least one of Aristophanes' plays. Often there was little evidence, or even discussion, of 'ridicule or abuse of the common people' beyond comic plays.
- 12 This was moderately well answered with discussion most often focussed on the treatment of Cleon by Aristophanes and Thucydides. The better answers gave adequate attention to Alcibiades and the events surrounding the Sicilian campaign and its aftermath; otherwise there was little mention of political and military events with the focus once again generally upon evidence from the plays of Aristophanes.

2466 Thematic Study 2: Roman History

There was a very good range of subjects across the whole specification attempted by the candidates. There was some impressive work by some candidates and a generally good performance from most candidates who displayed specific knowledge and understanding of the issues and texts. A number of candidates remain who either use no sources or refer only to the prescribed sources, making it difficult to assess Pliny, Horace, Juvenal or Cicero without some external evidence. This was especially true, again, of their first question. Better answers avoid generalisations about the sources, or vague references to the content and instead produce a few well-chosen and specific examples (with a clear reference) to illustrate their arguments.

A few candidates ran out of time having spent too long on their first questions, often due to extended narratives. The balance of answers on scripts was variable with some producing very good answers from the prescribed material and much weaker ones on the period as a whole. As always, it is important for candidates to be aware that they should provide information from the whole period and not one limited part of it. This can be true of all the sections, where, for example, there is a concentration on 70-50 BC for much of the answer. Equally it is often only the second half of the first century AD which gets addressed.

Section A: The Growth and Government of the Roman Empire

All four questions were answered.

- 1 Question 1 focused on the rates of expansion during the period. Answers were generally sound and often detailed with examples from 133 BC onwards. Despite some confusion over dates in some cases most answers were sufficiently detailed to offer reasonable discussions on the causes; the better ones identified different causes at different times from the need for security to the ambitions of individuals. Better answers also identified the different rates of expansion. Weaker answers focused on the 60s and 50s to a large extent. There was some good detail of the source material, although it was usually concerning Pompey or Caesar rather than the earlier part of the period.
- 2 Question 2 (on the ease with which provincial could acquire justice) was generally well done by candidates. Some responses did not detail the nature of the court system in Rome and the efforts to minimise corruption. Good answers emphasised the practical difficulties involved. A number focused almost exclusively on Verres and Cicero's experiences in Cilicia. There was an assumption that justice was virtually impossible but limited evidence was produced to show this. Some concentrated on the justice within the province from the governor and ignored the question of the prosecuting of governors. Better answers had a number of examples of cases and results and distinguished between justice in Rome and in the provinces. They were able to point to failures and successes and show that these depended on a number of factors. Very good answers discussed how it was easier at some times than others, that the publicani played a role and that offenders often got away with a nice exile in the South of France!
- 3 This question on Cicero's letters and the effect of Roman rule on the finances of the provincials was less popular than Question 4. Answers generally focused on the activities of Appius in Cilicia, with sufficient references to support the discussion; Scaptius and Brutus were also included by most in some form; the burden of governors on provincials was mentioned by a few, with examples of Cicero's refusal to billet troops on the towns and so on. However, few answers went beyond the evidence in Cicero to refer to Pompey or Caesar, and so were in difficulty addressing the question of 'how far they help us to understand' the effect of the Romans on the provincials during the period as a whole. A

comment that they only refer to one year and so do not help us is not really answering the question.

- 4 Question 4 asked candidates to assess how useful the Letters are with regard to the powers governors had. This was more popular but again the issue of their usefulness was sometimes ignored in favour of a detailed series of references to areas of power. While this is part of the answer, candidates need to be able to make comparisons with other governors for a higher mark. There was good definition of imperium. The restrictions on a governor's powers were addressed by some candidates but not all, leading to unbalanced answers; a few answers simply listed the powers the Letters tell us about.

Section B: The City of Rome

All questions were answered in this section with more opting for 5 than 6. However, it is still the case that much effort is spent on Augustus to the exclusion of the other emperors of this period. Since answers should bring together themes from the period as a whole, this is a disadvantage to candidates when answering these questions.

- 5 Question 5 focused on the differences between the building programmes of emperors. Answers, as often in this sections, made a great deal of Augustus' programme and, occasionally, very little of other emperors. Nero only built the Golden House; Domitian was said to do very little building; Vespasian and Titus provided an Arch, and so on. Even Trajan had sometimes very little discussion. Good answers focused on the differences rather than gave a list of buildings, particularly on the themes and purposes exemplified by the buildings and/or monuments. The issue of self-promotion as opposed to providing amenities for the people of Rome was well-discussed by a number of candidates. Weaker answers provided detail of the buildings but very little on the reasons for them.
- 6 There was considerable detail in Question 6 (on whether a good or bad emperor can be identified by their policies). Policies towards the city were discussed with good factual knowledge and with specific examples. A range of emperors was often used and a range of policies. However, candidates at times had difficulties with the question of 'good/bad', failing to establish the criteria for their discussion. There was also a tendency to oversimplify the definition. Nero was all bad and Augustus almost perfect for example. The answers which lacked any use of sources were not able to consider that the view of emperors which we have from them may be questioned. How the sources present these emperors is an issue in this question. The *Res Gestae* was used but few used it critically in this context.
- 7 Question 7 (Juvenal's *Satire* 3 and tensions in Rome between ethnic groups) was popular and provided some very detailed answers. Some candidates seemed to have trouble with the idea of ethnic groups, since they included the plebeians and/or poor in the discussion. Better answers indicated Umbricius' opinions were not necessarily Juvenal's or even commonly held one. Detail of the range of ethnic groups and evidence for them was lacking in a good number of answers, especially for other parts of the period than Juvenal's. Discussion of freedmen was useful where it was made clear they were non-Roman. Good answers interpreted the views voiced in the poem to support their ideas on the extent of tension and the reasons for it.
- 8 There was much the same problem with Question 8 (the reliability and usefulness of the texts and how powerless the people of Rome were) where answers found difficulty in relating the text to the issues, and offering information covering more of the period. Some answers focused on the situation in the city of Rome for the poor and the dangers they encountered as an interpretation of their lack of power over their lives. Others were able to

provide factual knowledge on instances where the poor did affect decisions in one way or another. Better answers explored the wider context of social, political and economic powerlessness. Most candidates addressed the issue of reliability in general terms; the better answers made use of specific claims by the poets in order to challenge their accuracy.

Section C Empire and Emperors

Of Question 9 and Question 10, Question 9 was the more popular although a fair number attempted Question 10. There was a common use of Tacitus' *Agricola*, as well as Pliny's *Letters* which allowed for some contrast and comparison of evidence. Other sources were used sparingly but nonetheless effectively by some.

- 9 In Question 9 (concerning the different attitudes towards expansion, better answers looked for criteria first before launching into an extended narrative. Some narratives stopped at Nero. Emperor by emperor accounts dominated at times, while analysis was less secure and superficial. A simple distinction between emperors who did achieve expansion and those who did not sufficed for some. More interesting discussions looked at why expansion occurred or did not occur, in terms of the pressures on the empire and emperors.
- 10 Question 10 (on Romanisation) was less popular. A wide range of sources was employed by the better answers (e.g. inscriptions, coin etc). These also distinguished between the effect of the Romans on the elites and the general populace of a province. Equally the difference in the East and the West was noted by some, although care needs to be taken over the East – the building of a theatre for example is not necessarily a sign of Roman influence! The range of information across the period was thin at times, as were the aspects of Romanisation which might be identified. Tacitus *Agricola* 21 was almost universally used, with some general understanding of its value as evidence.
- 11 This question focused on the value of the Letters of Pliny and Trajan as evidence for tolerance of local customs and beliefs. Better answers used more than Letter 96/97, making reference to Judaea and to Christians in Rome. Other factual knowledge (the foreign mystery cults for example) was used in a few cases. This information was used to show the limitations of the Letters.
- 12 In Question 12 (on the evidence of the Letters for the roles and responsibilities of governors) answers varied considerably, from the highly detailed specific use of the evidence to the rather general overview of the situation in Pliny found himself. Weaker answers did not mention Letter numbers or place names; some conflated letters into one incident, other confused place names and people. However, those with secure knowledge performed well on identifying the roles or tasks Pliny had to do. Better answers interpreted the replies to argue about the restrictions on these roles and responsibilities because of Trajan's tendency to control from afar. Good answers also identified the less obvious role of keeping the elites happy or being responsible for good relations with the locals. The comparison was made with Agricola's governorship, sometimes with detailed study of both texts. A few answers developed information from the earlier part of the period about governors. It was commonly said that we have no other source about how governors worked apart from Pliny's Letters, when we do have information on what governors did from other writers during this period even if not quite so detailed.

Candidates were better this year at comparing different parts of the period within the scope of the question. The Thematic Paper is concerned with change and development over time; it is important to make comparisons no matter how slight when the question is asking about the value of the evidence for the whole period. Pliny's Letters may have little relevance to the reign of Tiberius for a number of reasons, but these need to be argued not simply stated.

2467 Thematic Study 2: Roman World

General comments

This paper presented rubric problems for only one candidate who answered questions 3 and 4. Overall the most popular questions were 2 and 3, though there were a significant number of answers to 1 and 4 also.

While there seems to be a general difficulty in getting all candidates to write coherent and developed arguments, there did seem to be an improvement in their ability to use inscriptions, which raised their marks for questions 3 or 4; there seemed to be the same dearth of sources in question 1 or 2, however. Overall, in the Principal Examiner's view there was a better response at the lower end, with more marks awarded here, but fewer really well-argued and thoughtful essays at the top end. Weaker responses tended to go on at great length but to little purpose on occasion – some candidates might find more examination practice useful in order to develop the skills needed to write focused answers.

With reference to the use of sources, candidates also need to be taught to avoid the 'cart before horse approach' where they write narrative answers and then put something like '(Tacitus)' at the end. Likewise, 'Todd says . . . Tacitus supports this' needs to be reversed! Some of our secondary works are aged, but not ancient! Citing modern authorities against one another does not help develop an in-depth argument either – it really counts as assertion or factual recall, but does not go far in supporting an argument. Quality of writing was generally very good, though some candidates need to be encouraged to write in an appropriate register for an examination essay and to avoid slang.

Comments on specific questions

The Romanisation of Britain AD 43 -415

- 1 'Economic activity' was sometimes poorly defined, though there were some good responses which embraced pottery, mining, agriculture, consumer goods and imports of luxuries and examined these in great depth with good sources from literature and archaeology.
- 2 This question raises a number of issues regarding the information recalled by candidates; the Roman army was scarcely 'over 55,000' and despite its obvious consumption it was only 2 – 4% of the total population – **local** impact may have been enormous, but overall in Britain? In similar vein candidates must be taught that while there *were* large numbers of troops based in Britain the same was true of other provinces 'on the periphery'. Far too many answers attributed every aspect of Romanization to the army in an uncritical way (?mosaics?) and failed to address 'extent' in any meaningful way. Incidentally students need to be reminded that despite what Tacitus says about the purpose of colonies in Annals 12, Colchester in AD 60 is scarcely the best example to use of their positive benefits!
- 3 The requirement here was to discuss what we can learn from **inscriptions**. The best answers started here and evaluated what we can learn from them in the light of other evidence; weaker responses tended to range far and wide, and to refer obliquely to source material, especially inscriptions, though they were there in most answers. (Incidentally all sources are credited under AO3, though if inscriptions are absent the AO2 mark is badly affected as well as the AO3). One odd tendency noted here was repeated reference by several candidates to 'religion in a secular context' in connection with the Caerleon curse. The point needs to be communicated that in ancient societies every

aspect of life had a religious dimension (unlike our own largely secular age) and it is misleading to interpret the ancient world in terms of our own world.

A further error found more than once is the idea that Christianity was present in Britain **before** the Romans came!

In addition, the terms of this question required a discussion of **development**; this means change over time, and muddling up inscriptions chronologically (one candidate started with Christianity in the fourth century) is very damaging to attempts to construct an evaluated response and limited marks in AO2.

- 4 Provincial administration was not expected to see many responses, but it is included in the specification and is a legitimate question. It was generally well addressed by those who wrote about it, and covered both provincial governors and procurators (Agricola and Classicianus being well discussed and linked to literature) as well as more local administration, including Cogidubnus and evidence for members of the *ordo* and the lower functionaries in the various *ciuitates*.

2468 Individual Study: Greek History

2469 Individual Study: Roman History

2470 Individual Study: Roman World

The candidates generally performed well in the coursework assignments. Most were marked within tolerance, but some centres were inclined to overmark on AO3 and AO1b. Many scripts were clearly annotated, which is a great help in moderating the marks. However, a significant number were either completely 'bare' or had ticks or comments which did not relate to the awarding of the Assessment Objectives.

Most titles chosen enabled candidates to fulfil the AOs. Some still do not point the way clearly for candidates to use the sources and interpret them in the argument contained in the essay. Merely referring to them as factual evidence does not move candidates to the higher levels in AO3. Overlong quotations from sources ancient or modern are also to be discouraged.

The content of some titles chosen gave rise for concern this year. The following information has been given, in essence, for several years and must be adhered to:

Any topic in the history of the Greek and Roman worlds between 600BC and AD450 may be submitted, provided that

- it is chronologically or thematically related to the group of papers (Greek History, Roman History or Roman World) that the candidate is studying in Modules 2459 - 2461 and 2465 – 2467 and must be based on the topics specified in the Source-based Study. If centres are in any doubt about the suitability of a title, or require advice, the title can be submitted to OCR and the Principal Moderator, using the coursework proposal form for Ancient History which can be found on the OCR website.

Titles which are based on thematic or document studies are unacceptable.

This information is contained in the specification on page 23 (Section 4.2.1) of the OCR website.

It is also a requirement that a word count is attached, together with a bibliography of all material used; ancient sources, modern commentaries, websites and site/museum visits.

Many centres encourage candidates to choose their own titles, or one from a range. Where an entire centre uses the same title there is less scope for individual research and interest. Increasingly, some seem to have been written to a template.

Although some centres and candidates present problems, they are the minority and most present work which is well researched and presented, and competently assessed.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE (Ancient History) (3809 7809)
June 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2450	Raw	100	73	64	55	46	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2451	Raw	100	79	70	61	52	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2452	Raw	100	79	70	61	52	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2453	Raw	100	77	67	57	47	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2454	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2455	Raw	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2456	Raw	100	76	68	60	52	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2457	Raw	100	81	72	63	54	46	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2458	Raw	100	80	71	62	54	46	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2459	Raw	100	74	66	58	50	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2460	Raw	100	80	70	60	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2461	Raw	100	81	71	61	52	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2462	Raw	100	75	66	57	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2463	Raw	100	80	70	60	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2464	Raw	100	78	69	61	53	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2465	Raw	100	78	69	61	53	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2466	Raw	100	78	70	62	54	47	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2467	Raw	100	75	66	57	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2468	Raw	100	84	73	62	52	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2469	Raw	100	84	73	62	52	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2470	Raw	100	84	73	62	52	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3809	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7809	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3809	15.6	39.3	63.8	81.9	93.7	100.0	1082
7809	19.0	45.0	75.3	91.8	99.2	100.0	674

1756 candidates aggregated this series.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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