

Ancient History

Advanced GCE **A2 7809**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3809**

Reports on the Units

June 2009

3809/7809/MS/R/09

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the 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 2009

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	4
2452 Document Study 1: Roman World	7
2453 Source Based Study 1: Greek History	9
2454 Source Based Study 1: Roman History	11
2455 Source Based Study 1: Roman World	14
2456 Thematic Study 1: Greek History	16
2457 Thematic Study 1: Roman History	18
2458 Thematic Study 1: Roman World	21
2459 Document Study 2: Greek History	22
2460 Document Study 2: Roman History	25
2461 Document Study 2: Roman World	29
2462 Source Based Study 2: Greek History	31
2463 Source Based Study 2: Roman History	33
2464 Source Based Study 2: Roman World	37
2465 Thematic Study 2: Greek History	39
2466 Thematic Study 2: Roman History	41
2467 Thematic Study 2: Roman World	44
2468 Individual Study: Greek history	46
2469 Individual Study: Roman History	46
2470 Individual Study: Roman World	46
Grade Thresholds	47

Chief Examiner's Report

There was yet again a pleasing increase in the number of entries for A2; AS being taken largely by candidates for the second time. This is encouraging for the new specification which will be taken at A2 for the first time next year.

There were very few errors with candidates failing to follow the instructions. Where these occurred it involved the Document Study papers.

Candidates displayed continued confidence and ability in using the primary sources, with very few candidates answering in a purely narrative manner. The 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. The majority of candidates displayed specific knowledge in parts of their answers; however, the range of material used was sometimes limited, failing to cover the period or issues thoroughly.

In the answers this year at A2 it was noticeable that many candidates did not take the time to examine the question carefully and identify the issues which needed to be addressed. The result was usually an answer only marginally relevant to the question. Candidates could do well to realise that answers which focus on the issues and are concise in their approach tend to have a clearer line of argument and use evidence succinctly and accurately. A good, well-organised and cogent discussion is better than a lengthy discursive account of material.

Legibility has become a serious issue in a significant number of cases; this is an even more important issue for centres to address given the nature of the new marking grids to be used with the specification. It is very difficult to give candidates credit for the work when it is virtually impossible to read what they have written.

Finally, as always, the perennial plea for new examiners: this is especially important as the change is made to the new specification at A2. 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

The relatively small number of candidates who entered this paper were generally well prepared for the document study, and were able to score good to very good marks on the (a) questions. There were very few candidates who struggled to recognise the context of the passages, but some wrote short essays in response to the (a) question, without making sufficient reference to the passage on the paper.

In the (b) questions, the majority of candidates were able to show sound knowledge and good 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. There were a few candidates who failed to use sources in their responses, though there were some excellent answers which used the passage and an extensive range of other sources.

It remains the case that a very few candidates appear to be answering a question that they have done previously. Such answers can be frustrating to mark, as it is difficult for Examiners to reward the knowledge displayed.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There were a very few candidates whose handwriting caused problems for Examiners.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Herodotus on Persia

This section was taken by very few centres this year. Because of the small candidature, it does not seem appropriate to comment on the individual questions.

Section B: The Athenian Empire 450-410 BC

This section was once again very popular.

- 4 The passage was dealt with very effectively by most candidates. A few struggled with the formal language of the decree, but the majority seemed well prepared, and were able to select appropriate examples for the (a) question. Responses to the (b) question covered a range of examples, the better answers were well supported with reference to the sources. Some candidates struggled with the chronology of the period, and the number identified the island of Melos as a subject of the Athenian Empire.
- 5 This proved a popular question with some very effective answers. The best responses made good use of the passage in the (a) question, and a number commented on the reliability of Plutarch's sources. There was generally a good understanding of context. Answers to the (b) question demonstrated a good understanding of the methods used by the Athenians, and many candidates were able to give examples of revolts (eg Samos) and assess the effectiveness of the Athenian response.

- 6 Most responses to the (a) question made good use of the passage, though a number were unclear about the context. The responses to (b) generally addressed well the advantages of loyalty, and the very best were able to show how the attitudes of the allies changed over the course of the war.

Section C: The Trial of Socrates

This section was yet again very popular with centres.

- 7 This passage proved challenging to some candidates, particularly those who were uncomfortable dealing with the sophists. However most candidates were able to draw on the passage effectively for (a), and many were able to deal very effectively with the (b) question.
- 8 Most candidates were able to make good use of the passage to deal with the (a) question and showed a good understanding of the way Socrates conducted himself in Athens. The (b) question produce some interesting answers, and candidates were generally able to draw on a wide range of evidence. The better candidates made judicious use of Aristophanes' *Clouds*, and were clear about the relative dates of the play and the trial; they were also able to give details of those associated with Socrates and show why this might have led to ill-will at the time of the trial.
- 9 This proved popular with candidates, and the majority were able to draw on the passage to answer the (a) question. There were also some candidates who were unable to give an accurate account of the charges against Socrates. The responses to the (b) question generally showed a good knowledge of Aristophanes' *Clouds*, and there were some good discussions of Socrates' religious beliefs, drawing on a range of relevant evidence.

2451 Document Study 1: Roman History

General Comments

Most candidates answered two questions, using the time well. Some wasted time unnecessarily in providing additional material in the (a) sub-question, which asked for an analysis or evaluation of the extract only. Some (b) answers did little more than draw more information from the extract, providing no additional material when higher marks require it. Most candidates could answer the (b) sub-questions using additional material to support their judgements.

Some evaluation of the sources was necessary for the best answers. Most could at least offer some reason for bias even if they could not relate the bias to the specific part of the source under discussion.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: The Catilinarian Conspiracy

- 1 Question 1 was in generally answered well. The main problem in the (b) sub-question was the failure to deal with both Catiline and his supporters; most focused simply on Catiline and weaker answers did not do much more than summarise the extract. The issue of reliability was sometimes answered with a set passage on the author (usually Sallust).

In the (a) sub-question, candidates mostly focused on the extract with some good answers able to evaluate it as well given it was partly a reported speech by Catiline.

- 2 The question on the view of Sallust on politicians and Caesar's role in the conspiracy (Sallust, *Catiline* 49) was answered quite well in (a) and in (b). In (a) candidates did mention all the politicians in the passage where they used the extract carefully; weaker responses mentioned only Caesar and/or Cicero.

In (b) answers were sometimes quite detailed although limited at times on Caesar's situation at the time. Other sources were only occasionally used.

- 3 This question (Cicero, *In Catilinam* II. 18-19 on the dangers to Rome and the reliability of Cicero's speeches) produced variable answers mostly because candidates could not give detail of the speeches. In (a) weaker answers either focused on simply the content without interpreting it for the dangers or mentioned dangers in general. Better answers noticed the context and suggested that Cicero was exaggerating.

In (b) candidates generally had some knowledge of the speeches but were not able to develop a close evaluation of the text other than the extract. Some answers discussed the contexts of the speeches, the intended audience and how this affected the content.

Section B: Augustus and Augustan Propaganda

- 4 Question 4 (Tacitus, *Annals* 1.2 on the views of Tacitus concerning Augustus' rise to power) was well-answered for the most part. In (a) candidates had a tendency to repeat the phrasing of the passage, without developing the views which Tacitus takes. Better answers examined the language he used to suggest his attitudes.

The sub-question (b) on the consistency of Tacitus' view in relation to other sources showed some understanding of the difference between the sources in terms of agenda and context. Specific comparisons were needed for the higher marks and most candidates could provide some examples. It was assumed that Horace and Virgil were simply propagandists in some answers.

- 5 Question 5 (Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 19-20) asked about the emphasis placed by Augustus on certain values in (a) and answers displayed very good understanding of the text. Detailed use of the passage was noticeable in better answers. Weaker answers omitted the range of material included in the extract or simply repeated it without some explanation of the emphasis.

In (b) (on the *Res Gestae*) 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 what it leaves out and why Augustus did leave things out. Views on why this might make it more significant were sometimes limited. Information from Tacitus or Suetonius could be used to identify what was left out.

- 6 Question 6 asked candidates to consider the passage from Virgil's *Aeneid* Book 8 (711-31). In (a) candidates provided usually good analyses of the passage and what Romans expected. There was detailed interpretation of the poetry with some understanding of the exaggeration and poetic style.

In (b) the answers lacked detail of Augustus' achievements and the portrayal in Virgil's *Aeneid*. Discussions tended to be general about Virgil's relationship with Augustus. Some answers failed to use even the passage as source material. Some answers focused on his achievements in Rome ignoring the foreign aspects of the passage. Reliability of poetry as a source was attempted reasonably well but some assume that it is propaganda without really going into detail.

Section C: The Reign of Nero

Candidates were able to make good comparisons between Suetonius and Tacitus on certain issues.

- 7 In Question 7: (Tacitus *Annals* 13. 6-7 on the impression Romans had of Nero at the start of his reign and the views the sources took of his early period) candidates developed the two opposing views in the extract for the (a) sub-question; the extract was used well by most candidates to identify the way Tacitus presents these views and where, perhaps, he places his emphasis. Better answers noted that these were reported versions. There was also some good interpretation of Tacitus' language. Weaker answers did not focus on both views.

In (b) the difficulty for a number of answers was dealing with reliability. While candidates provided detailed material on the success of the reign, they were less sure about the views of the sources and how far they presented an accurate account. Common incidents included the death of Britannicus, early successes in Armenia, the general prosperity and

security and so on. There was a lack of specific examples in weaker answers. Both Suetonius and Tacitus were used to identify good acts and well conducted issues.

- 8 This question, on the characterisation by Suetonius (Suetonius Nero 35), produced some sensible and well-thought out answers. Candidates could place this passage in its context and were able to identify the events and personalities; good answers interpreted these and Nero's actions for aspects of character with some evaluation of the presentation by Suetonius. Weaker answers simply repeated parts of the passage.

In answering (b) on the reliability of Suetonius for Nero's reign, most candidates had sufficient examples to make a reasonable case. A range of examples was used by candidates, and some answers developed a balanced approach while others took one view or another. There were some generalisations unsupported by evidence, and some factual knowledge of Suetonius which was sometimes used to effect. Better answers used some Tacitus to test the accuracy of Suetonius.

- 9 Question 9 (Tacitus, *Annals* 14. 15-16) asked about the views Romans took of Nero and the extent to which the sources help us understand how his contemporaries viewed him.

For the (a) sub-question the extract indicated a number of views from opposition to support, including Tacitus' won view of Nero acting on stage. Good use was made of Tacitus' language and how this showed his disapproval. Better answers were aware that the views of Romans were filtered through Tacitus' perceptions.

In (b) the answers showed good knowledge about attitudes towards Nero; the discussions about how far they help us to understand were variable with some candidates offering judgements without support from the evidence. Various incidents were used such as his chariot racing, Octavia's removal and Britannicus' death. It was important to focus on the views of Nero's contemporaries for a successful answer.

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

Examiners considered this paper, the last of its kind, to be fair and accessible, and it caused no problems in so far as its content was concerned. As a legacy paper it was expected that the vast majority of candidates would be re-sitting, though in the event over 20% of candidates (a little under a hundred in total) sat it for the first time. There were still a fair number of rubric errors, with candidates apparently thinking that the two (a) and (b) parts of a single question satisfy the rubric requirement to answer two questions (which it does not).

Two points need to be made about examination techniques and the requirements of the questions:

- 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, context, reliability or lack thereof, in general terms. The candidate needs to take the question 'what does **this** passage tell us' at face value, citing from the passage, interpreting it (ie saying 'it tells us that') and where necessary evaluating it ('we can/ cannot trust it because . . .').
- Second, 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 (eg the Britons were 'barbarians' (Strabo) barely figures as a use of a source either. Candidates need to start *from* the sources, not make general gestures in their vague direction!

Candidates varied in their performance, with a range of secure answers matched by some very poorly-prepared attempts which demonstrated widespread insecurity about which source had said what, and there were a fair number of misattributions; it is also frustrating to note continuing naïve reading of many authors, particularly Strabo, and what appear to be attempts by candidates to 'make up' quotes and then pass them off as citations of ancient authors. Candidates should be clearly informed that Examiners do know the sources and will be able to recognise made-up quotes. On a more positive note there were some well-prepared candidates whose work showed a clear grasp of issues raised by the sources and detailed knowledge of them.

All three questions in 2452 saw a good number of responses, with Questions 1 and 3 being more popular than Question 2. Individual comments are given below.

Comments on Individual Questions

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 that some candidates seem not to have read the word 'effectiveness' in (a), instead re-wording the passage as it stood; this however still enabled candidates to amass respectable levels of marks. The old lessons about 'reading the question' have to be dinned in afresh every year! In (b), very few made the obvious point that Caesar *does not* explicitly tell us why he made a second visit to Britain, though the level of preparation indicates his intention to complete some 'unfinished business' for which he had received very ample rewards! The standard rubric about 'other sources you have studied' here simply means the rest of Caesar on his second invasion; obliquely, Suetonius, Cicero and Tacitus' brief comments gained marks.

- 2 As noted above, fewer candidates attempted this question, perhaps because the period between the actual conquest and the Boudiccan revolt is not covered in depth in the sources (or is this source neglected?) A number of answers dealt with only one of the two paragraphs. Few picked up the auxiliaries' point or made any comment about Tacitus' praise of the defeated. Likewise, there were only a few good responses which stressed the 'chaotic' state of Britain, or Ostorius Scapula's rapid and decisive steps so that the province was secure. Few candidates appear to know where the Iceni were located or how widespread this rebellion was. In (b), few managed to address issues other than general discussions of 'military superiority', though again the better-informed responses offered detail of the conquest itself, including Vesasian's work in the south-west, using literature supported by archaeology, and also discussed co-operation from friendly tribes including the Iceni (cf. the prompt in the passage, 'they had voluntarily become our allies'), Cogidubnus, and the Brigantes under Cartimandua. The specific requirement 'before c. AD 60' was intended to steer answers away from Boudicca; it failed to do so, by and large.

- 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 'economy' which was not picked up, and Examiners wonder if such terms as 'economy' are meaningful to candidates (although they do appear in the specification). There was some reference to the passage, but 'potential' was rarely picked up. In (b), candidates seemed to find it straightforward to include at least two sources (Caesar and Strabo, as a rule) to compare with the passage from Tacitus, though 'reliable' was less well dealt with. Some at least mentioned Tacitus' relation to Agricola and noted that he had an eye-witness to use as a source; others were hard put to go beyond general discussion of the likely reliability of the sources.

2453 Source Based Study 1: Greek History

General Comments

Once again Section B proved the most popular, with very few candidates attempting the other two sections.

Examiners were encouraged to see a number of excellent responses; many candidates had an excellent grasp of detail and were well versed in the sources of their chosen period. There were relatively few candidates who seemed underprepared for this paper.

There seem to be less reliance this year on generic passages about the sources which betray little or no relevance to the actual question. The better answers covered a wide range of sources, where appropriate, and were able to evaluate the usefulness of this for the given question.

As in previous years, candidates were all too ready to ignore the date ranges given in questions, and some candidates seem to have struggled with the chronology of their chosen period.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There were a very few candidates whose handwriting caused problems for Examiners. A number of candidates struggled with Greek terms unnecessarily, as English terms would have been equally exceptional. Examiners prefer candidates not to use abbreviations (eg Thuc.) in the body of their answer (eg 'Thuc. tells us that ...'), though it is acceptable when giving references.

Comments on Individual Questions

Because of the small candidature, there will be limited comment on individual questions.

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

- 1 This question was generally well done, though some candidates were more comfortable with the Ionian revolt, and seemed to find the (c) question less straightforward.
- 2 A number of candidates tackled this question to good effect, and were able to deal with all three sub-questions effectively.
- 3 Responses to this question were generally well detailed and showed a good understanding of the period.
- 4 Very few candidates attempted this question.
- 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 question was popular and there were a number of very effective responses. Most were able to deal effectively with the (a) question and there were some perceptive responses about the limitations of our sources for the attitudes of other states. Candidates were usually well able to assess Athens' preparedness for war.
- 7 This proved a popular question. Most candidates had a good grasp of events in the period for 446 to 432 BC, though a number were unaware of the Spartan attitude to the revolt of Samos. The role of Corinth was well understood by the majority of candidates, and there were some very effective discussions of her involvement with Athens in this period. Candidates were generally well prepared for the (c) question and there were some effective responses.
- 8 Very few candidates attempted this question.
- 9 This proved a popular question. The majority of answers demonstrated a good grasp of events in this period, and the best responses were very clear about what we can learn from the sources, particularly Thucydides. There was an excellent responses to the final part of this question; not all candidates considered Pericles' strategy the best and there were some very effective critiques offered.
- 10 Very few candidates attempted this question.

Section C: The culture of Athens 447-399 BC

This section was taken by a relatively few centres this year. Because of the small candidature, it does not seem appropriate to comment on the individual questions.

2454 Source Based Study 1: Roman History

General Comments

The vast majority of candidates produced some work including the sources. There were generally more precise reference and interpretation. Evaluation of the sources is much improved; candidates are making reference to the context and the author as part of their awareness of the value of the evidence. As always, all evaluation **must** be related to the specific reference not generally applied to all sources in the essay. Equally the un-attributed quotation is not helpful, as also the invented quote from a recognized author without a clearly state reference.

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.

There were occasional answers which did not take note of the restricted timescales in the questions. Chronology was somewhat vague in many answers with lack of dates (or inaccuracies) and order of events confused.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Roman History 81-44 BC

- 1 Question 1 (on politicians' attempts to solve the problems of Rome) was generally well-answered with some detailed lists of problems and some discussion of the solutions; there was a focus on Pompey as expected but also some information on others during the 10 years after Sulla. Better answers had specific ideas on the issue of success and provided some sources to support their views.
- 2 This question on the main conflicts and their effect on the Republic in the 60s BC saw candidates sometimes ignore the time period. Answers tended to focus on Pompey and Crassus and/or Catiline with little reference to some of the issues during the decade such as Egypt, the optimates/populares issues and so on. There were assumptions about the effect which were not supported by any evidence.
- 3 Question 3 on the career of Pompey in the 60s and 50s focused on the issues of the triumvirate and/or the build up to the civil war largely with narrative accounts supplemented by vague references to Plutarch as the evidence. Analysis of aims was often limited to the aims of 60 BC.
- 4 This question, concerning the assassination of Julius Caesar and attitudes towards him, produced answers which made little of the actions leading to his murder. Equally evidence for the views of those who did the murder was weak. Most candidates spent the longest time on the extent to which they were justified in murdering him. Few did more than offer personal opinions with little evidence to support their views.
- 5 Question 5 (on the army's role in politics) produced some sensible answers. There was a focus on Sulla and Pompey and some discussion of Cicero's success despite a lack of armed support. Good answers produced a balanced discussion and a range of politicians to discuss.

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

The majority used sources sensibly, especially the *Res Gestae* and at times little else. Some did answer the questions without use of source material.

- 6 Question 6 (on Augustus' powers and his aims) produced some good answers with factual knowledge of the powers. There was less secure knowledge of the sources for his aims, some failing to use the extracts from Tacitus to provide the answers with some good pieces to evaluate and use critically. The discussion on how far he was sole ruler allowed candidates to explore the situation and consider both side of the questions. Weaker candidates took the line that no one else had any power.
- 7 Question 7 concerned the Rhine frontier and how far Augustus had a coherent policy. Detail of the activity (and the sources in support) was largely lacking other than the Varian disaster of AD 9 and some reference to Tiberius and/or Drusus in the north. Those who had material could make a good case out for Augustus' policy and develop the idea of success, or failure in contrast to the claims made in the sources.
- 8 This question, on the social and moral legislation of Augustus, also produced few answers. Specific information and dates for the laws affected the quality of the answers. The knowledge of the laws and their impact was limited. There was an assumption about success with no regard for the evidence in Suetonius and Tacitus that Augustus had problems implementing the laws despite the *Carmen Saeculare*.
- 9 Question 9, about the problems of the succession, saw some good detail of the various choices and the reasons for the changes. The better answers could use the sources to develop the views taken about them and offer sound arguments about the range of problems. Answers differed over the extent of Augustus' success but usually sound arguments were used either way.
- 10 This question, on Augustus' attempts to improve the lives of the people of Rome and the benefits he provided, was not successfully done because candidates made assumptions about the success of these measures. Better answers were suitably cautious about the evidence for Augustus' success. However, factual knowledge on the measures and his reasons was usually detailed.

Section C: Roman History AD 14-68

- 11 Question 11 on the challenges to Tiberius and how far they damaged his reign was occasionally well done. The question was usually answered by reference to only early challenges such as Germanicus and the army mutinies. Later events were often not included. The issue of treason trials was a common feature but few could give detail of trials and outcomes. Sejanus was mentioned but again there was a superficial discussion about his role and impact. Most answers took the line that his reign was damaged by the way in which he dealt with the problems. Evaluation took the form of describing how Tacitus was biased because he belonged to the senatorial class and was writing under Domitian, who was cruel, and this affected Tacitus' view of Tiberius.
- 12 Question 12 (on Claudius and the criticisms in the sources) was popular; however, the majority did not have a good range of criticisms and sources. Some were able to discuss Claudius' success as emperor with specific examples; most tended to take what the sources said at face value. A good number focused on the wives and freedmen aspect, although some 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 freedmen) produced few answers. Two emperors (Claudius and Nero) were covered quite well with specific details (even names) of freedmen included and some evidence from the sources of views about them. It tended not to be questioned but some did develop the reasons for their use with suitable examples other than the most obvious.
- 14** This question on the ways the emperors sought to gain the support of the upper classes was rarely attempted. Specific information was needed about the members of the classes and how they were used. A range of measures from public office to providing wealth could have been supplied with evidence of the extent to which emperors had support.
- 15** Question 15 asked about the women of the imperial family and the fairness of the sources. A standard answer dealt with Agrippina the Younger and Messalina, less often with Livia and Agrippina the Elder; sometimes Poppaea and Octavia were included. Political activity was often confined to organizing the succession although some had information about the activities of the women behind the scenes in palace intrigues. The antipathy of the sources to women in these roles was usually discussed but often in general terms.

Most candidates provided worthwhile answers – the commonest failing was not evaluating the material and losing sight of the issue in the question.

2455 Source Based Study 1: Roman World

General Comments

As has always been 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: so it was this year that Question 2 was far and away the most popular, with very few responses to Questions 1, 3 and 4, and a fair number of answers to Question 5.

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 notes being made 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. This year there were some good answers with fine reference to original source material from a number of well-prepared candidates, while others produced narrative with little support apart from their own knowledge.

Picking one word, and often the least interesting word at that, 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 candidates confuse the contents of Tacitus' works, citing 'Histories' or 'Agricola' when they mean 'Annals', or confuse Dio and Tacitus when citing sources on Boudicca in question 2. There was even confusion between the walls commissioned by Hadrian and Antoninus Pius in some instances!

There was a lot of waffle in weaker responses, and a lack of controlled writing which went on and on but led nowhere. Again, such 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'. Spelling can be extremely poor, and there is no excuse for confusing 'Britain' and 'Briton', or writing 'Ceasar'.

Comments on Individual Questions

Roman Britain AD 43-c. 160

- 1 There were very few responses to this question; in (a) there were some attempts at narrative, in (b) a focus on Prasutagus as a useful ally (despite his geographical isolation) and only limited discussion of (c).
- 2 This was the most popular question on the paper. There were long descriptions of causes of the rebellion, usually with reference to both Dio and Tacitus; the omission usually was any reference to the Trinovantes and Colchester etc. Some did confuse Dio and Tacitus. One or two used *Agricola* as well as *Annals*. Equally there were good detailed answers to (b) ranging from the incompetence of the Romans to clever tactics by the Britons. The aftermath was the weakest part with many having little factual knowledge to develop an answer; again answers went on too far into *Agricola*'s time and beyond in places.

- 3 As noted above, there were few responses to this question. There was general discussion of (a), often attributing Tacitus *Histories* to his *Annals* or to Dio (or once even to Strabo!). Part (b) was sometimes treated quite well (the aftermath part of a 'Boudicca' question, after all!) and so was (c) with good focus on Agricola's 'role as governor' and the reliability (or not) of Tacitus' account of it.
- 4 Very few responses to this were seen – those which were showed a poor knowledge of the details of colonies, with none that Examiners can recall making use of Tacitus' discussion of the establishment and purpose of Colchester in the *Annals*, let alone other colonies in detail in (a) and weak discussion, often without specific examples, in (b). As usual the invitation to discuss 'Romanisation' led to a lot of general and superficial discussion with few actual examples or sources.
- 5 Like Question 2, responses to this question varied a great deal. The primary sources are the walls themselves, but many candidates discuss them as though literary sources (and few of them there are!) were all we have; a significant number of answers seem to think that the Vindolanda tablets are post-HW and more detailed teaching on them as a source needs to be introduced to correct this so that they are used intelligently (nor do they provide us with direct information about *legions*). It should also be noted that 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! Weaker responses discussed purpose without actual evidence.

2456 Thematic Study 1: Greek History

General Comments

There were some very effective responses in all sections. Many candidates were able to select detail from across the period (beginning, middle, end), and used it appropriately to show an understanding of change over time. The majority of answers included a range of sources, and the very best developed a detailed evaluation of the evidence which was well focused on the question. There were relatively few over-generalised responses.

Most candidates manage their time effectively and there were a few overdeveloped answers to the (a) question this year.

Quality of Written Communication

Most candidates scored well and used names and technical terms appropriately and accurately. There were a very few candidates whose handwriting caused problems for Examiners; in some cases neat but very small writing proved challenging.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: The culture of tyranny in the Greek World c. 600-400 BC

This section proved the least popular this year, so there is limited feedback. In general, those candidates who attempted this section showed a very good understanding of the main sources and of the detail of the period. Answers were not confined to a very limited number of city states as has been the case sometimes in the past, and the very best answers made effective comparisons between the tyrants of different city states on the mainland, on the islands and in the West. There was in addition some good use of archaeological evidence.

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

This proved a popular section this year. The sources were generally well used, though a few candidates tended to attribute everything we know about Sparta to either Herodotus or Xenophon. Better candidates usually commented sensibly on the paucity of Spartan sources, and were able to draw on the detail from different parts of the period; weaker responses often focused exclusively on the period of the Persian Wars. There were some misunderstandings about the relationship between the Peloponnesian League and the Hellenic League.

- 5 This proved a less popular question. Many candidates were more comfortable dealing with the (b) and (c) questions about the royal families; some struggled to think of names for the (a) question, although many were able to discuss Sthenelaidas, Brasidas and Lysander. Most candidates made effective use of the evidence provided by Herodotus, and better responses drew on a range of sources to good effect.
- 6 The better answers in (a) gave a great deal of information which demonstrated a very good understanding of Herodotus' narrative; a small number were excessively long. The (b) question was less well done; some candidates wrote confidently about Sparta's role at the start of the war, but they were unable to show how this changed over time. The better answers to (c) selected particular examples from across the period and discussed them in some depth.

- 7 This proved a fairly popular question. Most candidates were able to give an effective answer to the (a) question, and were able to select a range of examples across the period. The best answers to the (b) and (c) questions drew on a range of sources and a number of different states within the Peloponnese. Most candidates were able to comment on Corinth and Argos. The very best answers address the issue of Sparta's success in the fifth century with a good command of detail.
- 8 This was a less popular question. Most candidates were able to deal effectively with the (b) question, though there were a number of excessively long answers. There were some very good responses to the (c) question, but some responses were not well focused on the demands of the question.

Section C: Athenian Democracy 508-399 BC

- 9 This proved a less popular question. Most candidates were able to give an outline account of what generals did for the (a) question; the (b) question was generally better answered, with a range of examples from across the period. There were some effective answers to the (c) question; many candidates were able to discuss a range of examples and use the available evidence to good effect.
- 10 This question was the most popular in this section and there were some excellent answers. The majority of candidates were able to deal with the (a) question effectively, and they were able to suggest a number of ways in which these reforms were important for the remainder of the fifth century. There were some interesting discussions of political leadership; the very best answers drew on examples across the period, though there were few and concentrated mainly on Pericles.
- 11 Very few candidates attempted this question.
- 12 This appeared to be a fairly popular question. Candidates offered a variety of suggestions in (a), and offered a range of examples in (b); the best responses discussed a range of sources, both positive and negative towards the democracy, whereas weaker answers focused mainly on ostracism and on general comments about the assembly. Most candidates discussed the reforms of Cleisthenes in the (c) question, and there were some interesting comments on the importance of the Council (*Boule*).

2457 Thematic Study 1: Roman History

General Comments

The paper caused no particular difficulties other than those candidates brought upon themselves by not reading the questions in sufficient detail or by tackling questions which they were not equipped to answer; comments on individual questions appear below. In particular there was a lack of use of sources in some responses, often with a simple statement to the effect 'the sources say that' which acts as an introduction to more factual knowledge. There was a lot of waffle in weaker responses, and a lack of controlled writing which went on and on but led nowhere. Again, such 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!

Very few responses were seen written as one continuous answer; they followed the order of the questions and were divided into three parts, which ensured that all parts of the question were addressed.

Comments on individual Questions

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, and there were limited answers to 3 and 4; a very few only attempted question 2.

- 1 There were some good responses to this question, though a number could not give three reasons (or three examples if they got the reasons), partly because they appeared to only have information as far as Caesar in Gaul. There was quite a lot on the Senate's reaction, not much of it at times from the sources; this part produced lots of generalised assertions about the reaction. Answers were better in (c) because there was information about the gradual lessening of control; even so much was focused on either Pompey or Caesar, but not both.
- 2 Only one or two responses were noted to this question. They were hard-pressed to find sufficient detail in (a), but gave more information in (b); answers in (c) tended to see disadvantages but not advantages for client kings' and queens' involvement with Rome.
- 3 The governor question was reasonably well done although limited in information as to specific governors and their duties – it was not done by many. Again specific factual knowledge of the laws applying to governors was not very common and examples of governors were few. Some use of Cicero (in Cilicia) and Verres was noted.
- 4 This gave candidates the opportunity, sadly, to be vague and answer in general terms – some only focused on the negative in (a) and their answers were unbalanced. Strangely, Verres hardly put in an appearance here! There were several factual answers in (b) which made no attempt to use sources at all. There were some examples of good and bad reactions to Roman rule in Gaul, Spain or the East. Verres was the obvious candidate for provincials suffering.

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

Questions 5 and 8 were the most popular in this section, with a number of responses to 6, but very few indeed to 7.

- 5 In part (a) examples of buildings were not always buildings and not always part of a forum. Parts (b) and (c) were answered better, although there were few which could develop specific material or discuss the work of more than one emperor (usually Augustus). The interpretation was often quite interesting and relevant. The discussion about benefit again produced some interesting answers, with candidates offering balanced views about the way programmes both benefited the people and helped the emperor. Extra employment was not always included. A number of answers were superficial in (a) where one might expect some detailed description, context, and purpose. Reference to relevant monuments enabled marks to be amassed in AO3.
- 6 These answers appeared weaker than the others, especially in dealing with (c) where again there was a tendency to generalise about success. The setting up of the vigiles was included but details were confused; building regulation after AD 64 was sometimes included; Juvenal's comments about fires very rarely. Some candidates did not expand the question beyond 'fires' in (b) and (c), while others went beyond the terms of the question and discussed in a very general way all the benefits which emperors brought to the people of Rome.
- 7 Very few responses were noted to this question and there was little attempt to discuss change over time; in those which were noted there were general discussions with few actual examples in (a) and little recourse to sources overall.
- 8 This question on foreign cults produced responses of mixed quality. There was a lack of specific information about practice and even giving three examples in detail was beyond the abilities of some in (a). In (b), the changes which emperors made were often limited by the lack of knowledge even when using the imperial cult. Specific instances of emperors favouring one cult were few. Most could make something of the interest emperors took and develop the idea of its importance as a means of control, or as part of their image; some did mention he was pontifex maximus!

Section C: Emperors and Empire

This section seems to have far fewer centres taking it than A or B. It is to be hoped that its omission from the new AS Classics: Ancient History does not discomfit too many. Question 9 was the most popular, followed by Question 11; there were next to no answers seen to Questions 10 or 12.

- 9 In (a), 'changes' were quite well addressed, though they were often limited to the Danube or Dacia. In (b), the difficulties were often given as being the Jews, sometimes the Parthians. Most who answered this had decent knowledge and could make good use of Josephus but were a little short on source material (as one might expect for the second half of the century). They tended not to make any use of the early part, and client kings were not prominent. Even so, coherent answers about policy were provided.
- 10 There were very few answers to this question, and they were not well done. They were lacking in sources and specific examples.

- 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, and British examples and sources were quite detailed. Other answers made good use of Herod. In (c) there was only occasionally a clear conclusion, though lots of discussion was seen, and little exploration of change over time. Consistency of policy was addressed using limited information, but some answers did use Gaius and Claudius as examples of emperors who liked to use the clients while others did not.
- 12** No answers to this question were noted.

2458 Thematic Study 1: Roman World

General Comments

The paper caused no particular problems. There appeared to be a good range of questions from which all candidates could select something to get their teeth into, and compared to previous years there were far fewer very weak responses; there was also a marginally larger entry for 2458 than for 2452 or 2455. There were very few responses to Question 1 but there were roughly similar numbers of responses to the other three questions on the paper.

As a general comment on the paper, it covers a very lengthy period (the whole occupation period) and 'development' or 'change over time' are sought in the questions set, but are often not explored. There was evidence of much general and unsupported discussion which tried to address issues raised in the questions but which really led nowhere.

The Romanisation of Britain AD 43-415

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 As noted above there were hardly any responses to this, and those seen were not very good— see mark schemes for potential responses. Generally answers did not include accurate supported information on local government and local elites in the administration. It was usually quite vague. Part (c) allowed the candidates more scope and some decent answers were produced but still a lack of specific detail about Romanisation and evidence for it. The limitations of the evidence were not usually addressed.
- 2 There were disappointing answers to the functions of the army: functions/role could be identified but not examples of what they did nor how they might have changed; Strangely enough, the initial 'impact' in terms of conquest and subjugation was often omitted completely! 'Impact' was assumed in most cases in terms of the economy, increased trade and travel, ideas and culture etc so that it seemed the army was responsible for every aspect of Romanisation including making mosaics and building villas! Generalised accounts of the later period were usually the answer to (c). However, some did have detailed information on how the structure of the army altered in the final part of the occupation.
- 3 Finding three examples (or remembering to insert them) in (a) was difficult for some, although others were very detailed. Where the candidate knew the material, answers were very good in all three parts, with clear judgements about the elites and how far it had spread. Some candidates used a non-British example (the Augustus statue from Prima Porta) and they should be encouraged to use a Romano-British 'find'. Good examples were used especially of British art (architecture was less successful). Roman art in Britain was less well supported; good answers again discussed the difficulty of making judgements from the evidence. There was some confusion regarding 'Celtic' styles (guilloche is not purely Celtic).
- 4 Answers to (a) were weak, though one or two discussed the evidence from Colchester and the altars from Maryport; (b) was better done, though responses were frequently general, and there were inaccurate or fictitious names for gods included; (c) was also fairly general, with rare exceptions (see mark scheme for suggestions as to what candidates might have included).

2459 Document Study 2: Greek History

General Comments

This year's paper worked well, and most students seemed to perform well. Unfortunately there are still a number of candidates who did not follow the rubric, and answered two of the first questions, and failed to answer the asterisked question. For a number this rubric error meant they gained a considerably lower grade than they would otherwise have done on the paper. There was a slight improvement in candidates focusing on the passages rather than writing general comments on the sources, but there were still a number of very weak responses, which failed to make use of the help provided on the paper – in the form of the passages.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Herodotus on Persia

There were a number of excellent scripts on this topic, with candidates showing a thorough knowledge of the Persian sources, and using these to evaluate Herodotus. Other candidates could be a little more perceptive on their thoughts about Herodotus' sources.

- 1** This question was very well handled. Many candidates produced excellent responses to question (a) and showed excellent knowledge of the use of religion by a range of kings. This made evaluation of the passage a practical option. Some seemed to have the notion that this was propaganda, which made them then conclude that it was unreliable as a guide. Question (b) also elicited excellent responses. Some candidates took it as an opportunity to write more widely on Herodotus' treatment of Persian kings, and did not focus on the ideas of status and role, preferring to look at his characterisation of the kings as individuals. In the main, however, the responses to this question were thorough, and demonstrated an excellent knowledge of a range of kings.
- 2** This question proved to be more difficult than expected. Very few candidates seemed able to respond accurately to (a), and develop ideas on the relations between the different parts of the Persian forces. A number did not seem to know who Artemisia was or question the different languages used by the Persian forces. Moreover, very few candidates questioned Herodotus' sources for this event. Question (b) was more successful, with candidates choosing various examples from Herodotus including the various Greeks who appeared at the courts of Persian kings. Again, very few candidates seemed to question how Herodotus might have known these events, but the best candidates did make reference to the relevant Persian inscriptions to support their arguments, and produced some impressive arguments in response to the question.
- 3** Many candidates produced good answers to each element of this question. In (a) most got the key ideas on the nature of the Persian royal household, although very few noted the nature of the stories, or used these to help question their usefulness. Question (b) produced an excellent range of responses, with candidates recalling accurate detail from both Herodotus and the relevant inscriptions to form a view on Herodotus' reliability. Particularly impressive was their treatment of Herodotus on Cambyses, and the issues surrounding his sources for these episodes.

Section B: The Athenian Empire, 450-410BC

The responses to this topic were more mixed. It seemed to be the most popular topic. Many candidates seemed to have a vague notion of the Delian League/Athenian Empire, and had general comments to make about the reliability of Thucydides, but did not make full use of the inscriptional evidence. The weaker responses also failed to evaluate the inscriptions effectively – often simply offering the idea that they were fragmentary and therefore unreliable, rather than responding to the detail in the text or the known function of the inscription.

- 4 Many candidates began with a general treatment of Plutarch, with nebulous reasons as to why he either was or was not a reliable source on this topic. Very few candidates engaged with the detail of the passage, and a surprising number failed to identify correctly the key ideas about the ‘Greek temples’. On a more positive note, some managed to bring in archaeological evidence to support their arguments, whilst others made use of inscriptions and passages from Thucydides to develop ideas on the Athenian intentions towards other Greek states. Many answers, though, failed to move beyond a basic treatment of the issues. Question (b) was generally not well handled, with very few candidates demonstrating any knowledge of the Panathenaia. A number commented in general terms on the use of oaths or the importance of religion generally in Greek society. Other candidates noted that religion was not that important – without giving any real evidence – and then moved on to a seemingly pre-prepared answer on Athenian methods of controlling other states.
- 5 This question again seemed to be challenging for some candidates. Most got the idea of the difference between oligarchic and democratic states and their potential alliances. Some then moved to a general treatment of the development of the alliances within the Greek world. Only a few candidates looked at the idea of revolution, and used this as a basis for their answers. Very few, however, evaluated Thucydides as a source effectively. With passage such as this it would be very helpful for candidates to identify clearly the events which are being described so that they can anchor their answers in clear facts. Question (b) proved more successful, as candidates were able to recall a range of different examples from the period. However, many candidates failed to consider the idea of the impact on ‘internal politics’.
- 6 Most candidates were able to use source A effectively, and make some comments on its usefulness as an inscription. The idea of judicial interference more widely was not always developed, but most candidates showed some understanding of its significance, and some were able to refer other sources (especially Aristophanes) to support their answers. However, source B was far less successfully handled. Very few candidates identified the passage accurately, and a number seemed to think that it was Thucydides himself who was speaking in the passage. This led to considerable confusion, and a failure to really deal with the issues outlined in the question. Again, the importance of candidates knowing the basic facts on a source cannot be overstated.

Question (b) elicited a number of good responses. The main difficulty with this question was a lack of sources in candidates’ answers. Many had a general sense of reasons why the Athenians would have wanted to keep their allies, but they failed to tie these down with specific examples or reference to specific sources.

Section C: The Trial of Socrates

In the main, candidates who attempted this option did well. Many produced thorough answers, showing good knowledge of the relevant sources, and presenting intelligent arguments about Socrates. Candidates should, however, be reminded to state the facts – such as the charges against Socrates – clearly when they are required by the question.

- 7 This was well done, with most responses discussing the relevant ideas, in particular the *elenchus* and Socrates' approach to religion as shown in the passage. Candidates should be careful that they evaluate the passage precisely – many comment on the fact that it is from a comedy, but fail to go further and look at the implications of this. That said, a number showed a thorough knowledge of Xenophon, and were able to contrast Aristophanes' portrayal with statements from Xenophon.
- 8 Candidates generally made good use of the passage, and extracted the key points about the sophists and their relationship with Socrates. There were also good responses to the (b) questions, with a number of candidates showing good knowledge of Socrates' involvement with Critias and Alcibiades, as well as discussing more widely his philosophical activities.
- 9 The (a) part seemed to be challenging for many candidates, but they were able to produce intelligent responses, and made good use of the passage. Question (b) showed that candidates had a good knowledge of Socrates' actions in the trial, and many made thorough use of both Plato and Xenophon. The only weakness in some answers was their failure to evaluate these sources.

2460 Document Study 2: Roman History

General Comments

As in previous years, most candidates showed skills in interpreting the evidence and displayed a good knowledge of the topics, the authors and the political or social contexts. There were good answers with a few outstanding ones. Most provided specific detail of events and sources, although not consistently throughout the paper.

There were still some candidates who did not focus on the document in (a) sub-questions or who produced narrative answers rather than analysis. There were many who did not fully develop their answers to 'how useful is the passage...', or 'how accurate...' as asked in the question. Equally some answered using only the extract and no other source material. As always, some weaker answers were factually accurate and relevant but failed to develop the source evidence. Answers did not always establish the context of the extract nor explore its significance. The approach to the use of speeches, whether Cicero's or recorded ones in histories, was limited: they are historical evidence, but not objective reports. They also serve a purpose for the historian, which was too often dismissed because the speech had been 'made up'.

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 approach to 'reliability' was generally sound but the prepared broad or general paragraph on the source, detached from the body and theme of the essay, is not helpful. A secure factual knowledge of the event or period was often the basis of very good answers where the candidate provided source material as support.

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

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: The Catilinarian Conspiracy

In Section A: The Catilinarian Conspiracy, all three questions were attempted. There was good knowledge of the Conspiracy, but the wider context was often sketchy and vague, specifically the events covering the period 65-63 BC.

- 1 (Cicero In Catilinam IV 19-20 on the differing views of the events of 63 BC). Part (a) saw the majority of the answers focus on Caesar and Cicero. There was generally good factual knowledge of the situation, although there was also a tendency to narrate too much of the debate and not the issues; better answers also used evidence from other sources to consider Cicero's usefulness. Detailed knowledge of the events was not always present; the highly charged atmosphere of the context of the speech was rarely addressed where evaluation of the extract was attempted. Few were able to refer to the use of the SCU, the Rabirius affair, the problem of land and Pompey's imminent return.

In (b) answers were generally sound, although less successful answers discussed the seriousness of the conspiracy rather than the views of politicians. While relevant the key issue was to assess the views of the Romans at the time. Better answers had information from Sallust and tried to consider how reliable it was. While Sallust clearly dramatises the situation, it does not follow that he is also completely unreliable given the sources he could have used.

- 2 This question (Sallust Catiline 11-12 on the various problems facing Rome) produced some very good answers, although as always some produced generalised information about the situation with limited use of examples. Again, narrative took precedence over the issue of the usefulness of the passage. Very good answers had a range of issues from political rivalry to economic problems, although there was too much stress upon debt to the exclusion of other issues. Some could only refer to Sulla as a problem. This was especially true when candidates answered the question about Catiline as typical of politicians where Sulla was taken as a model.

In (b), good balanced answers gained the higher marks where the evidence from the sources was used to compare Catiline with other politicians. Too often there was no attempt to place Catiline in the context of political activity at the time. Few took the time to explain what was typical of politicians at the time. Sallust was given little credit as a historian, being stereotyped as a moralist.

- 3 Question 3 (Sallust, Catiline 18 and Cicero Letters to Atticus 1.2) produced some good answers comparing the material and assessing the accuracy of the passages in (a). The date and contexts of the two passages caused some problems for candidates. There were some good detailed analyses of the extracts assessing consistency; most were aware of the problems. Some seemed unsure of the date of the events. Better answers introduced the reference to the plot in Suetonius and compared accounts.

For (b) the knowledge of the sources beyond the two extracts was needed for higher marks but many answers focused entirely on the passages; some answers discussed the accuracy of the two passages only. The question did focus on the events of 65-63 BC and candidates appeared not to have developed this aspect. General comments on the authors lacked detail.

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 Question 4 (*Res Gestae* 20-22) effectively for the most part; good answers displayed specific factual knowledge in terms of the content of the passage in (a) concerning the reasons for Augustus to include the material. Some were aware of the genre of the work and its specific purpose as a normal practice. Most candidates offered sensible reasons for his use of the material but failed to develop these in terms of the aims of the *Res Gestae* as a whole. Some explained why the content of the passage was important to Augustus.

In (b) the question focused on the purpose of the *Res Gestae*. Most candidates were able to make an argument for the *Res Gestae* as more than simple propaganda. 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 examples apart from the extract.

- 5 Question 5 (Tacitus Annals 1.10 1-7 on Augustus' rise to power in (a)) was attempted by a number of candidates. Candidates needed to consider what the passage suggested about Augustus' actions interpreting the detail for an answer to the question on usefulness. While answers were familiar with the events, there was less success when assessing the extract from Tacitus, especially as it is supposedly the thoughts of people at the time of Augustus' death. Good answers provided further detail from the *Res Gestae* on the same events. Some consideration of the genre and author was present in

better answers where this was related to the aspect of usefulness. Some answers did not develop the discussion up to AD 14.

For (b), specific reference to the various authors was needed, especially examples not mentioned in the extract, for good answers. Some candidates seemed uncertain of Tacitus' dates and when he was writing, and weaker answers were unable to identify the authors by name. Some gave a general paragraph on each author without any specific reference to support their assessment or reference in detail to achievements. There were good arguments on either side and these were generally supported by two or three examples from the works.

- 6** The answers to Question 6 (Horace Odes 4.5 and Virgil Aeneid 8.714ff about their reliability and the success of Augustus' policies for the Empire) displayed a good factual knowledge of the achievements of Augustus which the poets were writing about. There were good discussions about the consistency between 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 the aims of the poets and their position within the regime, although over-stated at times. Evaluation of the poets as source material was less well done with limited attempts to assess what the poet might be trying to achieve in a creative approach to the topic. Some assessments offered superficial views of the works as merely propaganda and exaggerated because they were paid to write them. The issue of patronage was generally not addressed.

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 reference to the laws on marriage and social laws which were less relevant to the Empire. There was little discussion of his policy of peace, reorganisation of the provinces, the army, religion, the economy and so in some answers. Weaker ones were inclined to discuss success generally with an assumption that the policies were very effective. This resulted in a range of assertions which were supported only by generalisations.

Section C: The Reign of Nero

There was a more than usual tendency to attribute the reference to the wrong source, and to have Tacitus tell us of a number of events which occurred at the end of Nero's reign.

- 7** Question 7 (Tacitus Annals 14.48-49 on the relationship between Nero and the Senate) saw a range of answers.

In (a) candidates were generally able to analyse the extract and use parts of the passage for their answers on the nature of the relationship. The better answers went beyond interpreting the passage and evaluated the extent to which Tacitus was providing facts and opinion. Some weaker answers did not refer to the usefulness of the extract at all. It is apparent that candidates who examine the extract carefully could gain good marks rather than those who took a general approach on Tacitus bias against emperors with an occasional mention of some part of the extract. The date and context was not always dealt with and there was limited understanding of the treason law.

Question (b) required candidates to consider why the relationship between the senate and Nero declined. Most candidates took the view that there was a good relationship until about AD 62, although some referred to incidents such as the death of Britannicus early on in the reign. A number simply stated this with very examples from the sources to support the judgement. Most used the extract to show either that Nero controlled the senate or at least tried to. Better answers traced the relationship through examples of

Nero's use of the Senate in various roles. Specific incidents were used, such as Agrippina's death, to highlight the behaviour of the Senate. It was often stated that the senators disliked his acting without any attempt to provide evidence of this attitude.

- 8 Question 8 (Suetonius Nero 22) asked about the reliability of the extract for Nero's interest in entertainment. Candidates were able to identify the context of the extract, and make use of this in their answer. Candidates used examples of his involvement in games and acting. Better answers supported their ideas with Tacitus and Dio. There was some general evaluation (although not all candidates seem to know when Dio is writing). In the (b) sub-question, most answers could provide some reason for Nero's interest and some points as to why it was important for Nero to perform but again there was a lack of supporting evidence, so that much of the answer was assertion, which may well be reasonable but was not argued cogently. Better answers focused on a small number of incidents using references to more than one author for contrast or comparison. Discussion of the motives produced some very good answers from those who thought about the difficulty of assessing these in history.

- 9 Question 9 took accounts of Tiridates' visit to Rome as the starting point (Suetonius Nero 13 and Cassius Dio 63 4.3-5.4). 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 event gaining marks in 01, and could identify the factual information in the extracts. Good answers noted the critical tone taken by both authors, more so in Dio. Few mentioned the speeches in Dio and the more imaginative aspects of both extracts in assessing the different approaches of the authors. The approach of the different authors was addressed in some cases, but few considered the genres and the issue of character and motivation in ancient historiography.

Part (b) asked candidates to consider which account of Nero's reign they thought most trustworthy. Weaker answers dealt with the extracts only ignoring the reference to the reign of Nero, and some did not mention Tacitus at all. Good answers took a number of detailed events and compared accounts, such as the Fire of AD 64 or the death of Agrippina. Some contrasts were lacking in detail but sound judgements were made about the reliability of the works. General evaluation of the authors was less successful, often lacking specific information and clearly referenced source support.

It is quite clear that candidates do not take time to check what they have written, from simple errors and unclear sentences. The use of the paragraph seems to be in decline, making it difficult to understand where one idea stops and another starts. Punctuation seems to be a thing of the past. Organisation of ideas is problematical for a large number, as was organisation of time for some. A paragraph structure where an idea is stated, explored and supported by evidence is a straightforward approach that many might adopt. There are also an increasing number of difficulties with legibility which can make it very hard for Examiners to follow the discussion.

2461 Document Study 2: Roman World

General remarks

Examiners concurred that the level of difficulty of the paper was in line with that of previous years. Candidates did relatively well with this paper on the whole, and it posed few problems; Examiners noted only one rubric error involving the answering of Questions 1 and 2, omitting the compulsory Question 3. As in previous years, there were some other instances of imbalance or a truncated final answer, which may have been due to poor time management.

As was the case with the other AS Roman World papers, candidates' ability to express themselves clearly and succinctly varies very much, even with such a small entry. It was notable this year that there was a very wide spectrum of ability and skill on display in matters of spelling and appropriate register of language. In particular, it seems that many candidates entering this examination needed some help in developing an argument; linking phrases were often absent, with points and supporting material simply juxtaposed. In addition, a significant number of candidates seem unable to develop an argument; having lighted on a relevant and significant piece of information or a source, they move away from it after only the briefest consideration of its importance, with little or not attempt made to evaluate or interpret it, let alone to consider whether other material might argue in a different direction.

In many 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 in very general terms, and lost sight of the question. This same phenomenon occurred last year, and now as then it produced stereotypical answers which would have read the same whatever the wording of the question, and they score low marks – it may help if candidates are made familiar candidates 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. There were also some gaps in knowledge which ought to have been there in relation to Questions 1 and 3, in that many answers (especially to Question 3) spent more time on Pythias of Marseilles than any other point, and seemed to have very little awareness of even the most obvious improvements in the Romans' knowledge of the geography of their own province (for example roads, milestones, itineraries).

Comments on Individual Questions

Britain through Roman Eyes

- 1 This question was answered by about two thirds of the candidature, showing a distinct preference over the shorter passage in Question 2 set on Boudicca's rebellion. Part (a) posed few problems, though 'how reliable' was omitted in the weakest responses, and posed a challenge to some candidates, who found it difficult to work out how the issue could be tackled. There was a divergence between those who asserted that 'Tacitus had never been to Britain so he couldn't know' and 'Tacitus was Agricola's son-in-law (or step-son, or grandson, or nephew – all variants were seen this year)' so he had an eye-witness to draw on. Some inserted Pythias as the root cause of Tacitus' ignorance, at the very outset of the paper. Better answers were able to balance these issues and other factors such as Strabo's evidence that Britons were present in Rome, even with servile status, at an early stage (and one answer cleverly worked in the eye-witness accounts there must have been of Caratacus at Rome some 50 years before). There was a little evidence that the theories of Barry Cunliffe about sea or coastal migrations

along the Atlantic Seaboard had been aired – or else enterprising students have been ‘reading round’ the subject!

In (b) there were many vague and general discussions of the presentations of Britons. The question was worded so that any and all material on the topic might be used within the time-frame available, and some very perceptive and thoughtful answers were read. More often than not, the conclusion (frequently stated at the outset) was that the approach was always the same and that the Britons were never regarded as anything else than ‘barbarians’; such an unsubtle reading was frequently found, with a scattergun smattering of exempla in ‘support’. If anything the responses noted showed that closer reading of texts in class is required.

- 2 As noted above, this was a far less popular question than Question 1. Like that question it elicited a range of responses from the careful and well-argued to some which barely focused on the question set at all. In (a) the wording was deliberately chosen in order to sharpen the focus and to move it away from the usual topics on Boudicca’s rebellion, because of time limitations. The result was that those candidates who read the question carefully and then combed the passage in detail could pull out key points which could be contrasted with both literary parallels (Dio’s two towns contrasted with Tacitus’ three) and archaeology. There were some responses which gained full marks for quite succinct answers. Others lost focus but most were still able to make some use of the passage. The mark scheme shows possible approaches to the question.

In (b), a broader approach was possible, and candidates who had struggled with (a) tended to score higher marks, sometimes repeating material. There were some perceptive discussions of the motives of writers leading to reliability being evaluated, and there were good instances of detailed knowledge being brought to bear on the topic.

- 3 This proved most problematic, though unlike last year, where the task of comparing and contrasting two passages under pressure in an exam in the (a) sub-question was a trial for some, this year it was the (b) sub-question which made the greater demands, and many found it hard to progress beyond Tacitus (and on some occasions they stopped at Caesar!).

Sub-question (a) demanded two issues be explored, ‘consistency’ and ‘accuracy’. This proved a good way of separating out the range of responses; most tackled ‘accuracy’ in quite good terms (no-one agreed that Britain’s west coast faces Spain – no-one stopped to wonder why the Romans thought it did) but fewer compared the two in great detail. However, there was good use of the passages and marks were awarded in line with the grids so that if responses did not score higher than 3 marks on AO2 they compensated in AO1 and AO3. At the top end of the responses there were some very detailed controlled and accurate answers which received appropriate credit.

Sub-question (b) revealed a lack of overall knowledge of the *later* periods and sources, as noted above; much discussion was confined to the period up to and including Agricola, though good points were made based on this in some instances. The difference between the view of Britain’s geography in Britain itself, and from the humdrum perspective of the military (self-evident from roads and milestones – they knew fairly precisely what the geography of Britain was) with the persistent view of a land full of marshes and strange barbarians (Dio and Herodian) was not really in great evidence. It received appropriate credit when it did make an appearance.

2462 Source Based Study 2: Greek History

General Comments

The paper worked well, and none of the questions seemed to pose particular problems to candidates. There were still the perennial difficulties with candidates not referring to sources, or failing to show adequate knowledge of the issues concerned in their answers. There were even some candidates who failed to mention sources at all in some answers, despite the clear instructions to do so. For success in this paper, candidates must show adequate knowledge of the relevant sources, and evaluate them in relation to the issues raised by the question.

A striking feature of this year's answers was an increasing tendency to fail to address the question clearly, and to talk generally about the topic, so answers took the form of an account of 'all I know about Pericles', rather than a detailed and focused treatment of his leadership based on the sources.

Comments on Individual Questions

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

Very few candidates chose this option, so meaningful comments on individual questions cannot be made. In general, however, the standard on this section was high. Some candidates, however, failed to engage with the issues in the questions – for example, the question on the consequences of the Battle of Thermopylae was treated as an opportunity to write about the battle. Question 5 on the Greek background of Herodotus was not well handled, as many students seemed to assume that 'as an Athenian'(!) Herodotus was simply biased. They did not go into any further detail about how this might affect his work, nor did they give any specific examples from his work.

Section B Greek History, 446-413 BC

This was a popular option in which the standard of work was not that high. Many candidates did not engage with the issues in the question, or failed to include adequate detail. One point stood out from a number of answers: many candidates had only very basic understanding about how to evaluate inscriptions, and did not seem to know how to use them to help to construct an argument. In addition to this, there were numerous candidates who attributed almost everything they knew about the period to Thucydides, including a considerable number of details – such as ships collecting tribute from allied states – which are conspicuously absent from Thucydides' account. Others muddled Thucydides and Herodotus.

- 6** In answers to Question 6 many candidates failed to make use of the examples from Thucydides, and even fewer managed to use inscriptional evidence to help to evaluate his account. There were some excellent answers, but in the main this question was not well handled. A precise knowledge of the Mytilene Debate, for example, would have been helpful.
- 7** Question 7 led a lot of candidates to talk about the Helots, but not to go much further. A number used examples from outside the period – such as Marathon or even Cimon and the helot revolt – and failed to look at issues within the period.

- 8 Question 8 led to a number of general accounts of Pericles' leadership, with all manner of views being attributed to Thucydides and Plutarch. A number of candidates took this as an opportunity to talk more generally about the two writers, but failed to focus on the issues in the question. The issues in his leadership were often poorly treated, although some managed to make good reference to his rhetorical abilities, and his policies in the early stages of the Archidamian war.
- 9 Question 9 produced some excellent responses, but all too often candidates failed to know the detail of the expedition. Many were confused about the names of the generals, and failed to understand the significance of each event. Some answers simply gave a narrative of the expedition and failed to tackle the issue of leadership. Very few managed to evaluate Thucydides' work with any degree of precision or incisiveness.
- 10 Question 10 was not popular, and in the main candidates' responses were weak. They failed to show a detailed knowledge of any particular play, choosing instead to talk generally about Aristophanes. The better answers used Thucydides to help them evaluate Aristophanes.

Section C: The Culture of Athens, 447-399 BC

As in the other sections, many candidates did not engage with the detail of the issues raised by the questions.

- 11 Question 11 led to some accounts of court procedure, in which some candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge of the system. However, too many simply mentioned the court briefly, and then moved off to a wider discussion to the power exercised by individuals in the Athenian system through the other organs of government. Sources were often a little thin in these answers, but some made excellent use of the *Wasps*.
- 12 Question 12 produced some good answers, but many candidates are still writing literary criticism of the plays rather than using them as historical sources.
- 13 Question 13 produced some good answers, but candidates still need to be reminded to consider what is in Thucydides and what is in Plutarch. Too many attribute views to Thucydides which are not his. Knowledge of the sculpture is still often rather sketchy, and candidates should be reminded that they are being asked to evaluate it as an historical source, not as a work of art.
- 14 Question 14 produced a range of responses. The best gave a good treatment of the relevant festivals, but too many wrote about festivals in general, rather than focusing in those where women were the key element. A number, for example, used plays such as the *Lysistrata* rather than making use of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, which would have been more appropriate.
- 15 Question 15 in the main was not that well handled in that candidates failed to look at the connection with rhetoric and the development of political discourse. Here again candidates should ensure that they make full use of the relevant sections of Thucydides and, of course, Aristophanes in addition to any other sources which they might choose.

2463 Source Based Study 2: Roman History

General Comments

Candidates, as in previous years, showed a good range of knowledge and understanding. The general evaluation paragraph was unrelated to the discussion and the sources used in weaker answers. The discussion also tended towards assertions rather than supported judgements in the less successful answers. Candidates' answers were generally organised but there were those who did not express their ideas in a coherent fashion.

There were many candidates who used 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 and the author's agenda are all likely to produce a more successful answer.

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

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Roman History 81-44 BC

- 1 Question 1 (Why did Sulla's reforms meet so much opposition?) naturally produced a number of answers which focused on either his reforms or a narrative of the years following 80 BC; while the better ones managed to link the two as the question asked. There were good discussions concerning the nature or extent of the opposition and the better answers focused on the reasons rather than on the facts of the opposition. Most were accurate on the reforms, if selective, although there were errors even in the better discussions. Good answers also distinguished types of opposition. Better answers also considered that the opposition was very limited in some ways. A range of sources was used by most. A number were inclined to name the author and offer a general statement which could come from any part of the author's works.
- 2 This question, about Cicero's letters and speeches, was either answered very well or very badly. As in the past, good answers had some examples from the works to use to support their views and good focus on the issues dividing politicians. This question required a detailed knowledge of the issues and the views of Cicero on them. Weaker answers gave generalisations on Cicero as evidence. Some were not clear about the issues and the way in which Cicero may provide an insight into these. The scope was limited and the evidence (even where the Document Study material was useful) was rarely used. Evaluation of the material lacked the use of other sources to make a comparison or contrast.
- 3 Question 3 asked how far it was a simplification to suggest that all politicians were motivated by personal ambition. There were a number who offered a detailed discussion of a selected group of politicians, usually two upon which the discussion was based. The career of Pompey was a popular approach. Better answers contrasted politicians such as Cicero and Cato with Pompey, Catiline, Sulla and Caesar. There were clearly a number of lines which could be taken and some took the opportunity to develop their own views with good supporting evidence. The best answers offered a balanced approach, or suggested that, despite the appearance of being concerned about the plebs, politicians were always working for themselves. This view may well have been informed by current events.

- 4 This question, on the murder of Caesar, was popular and generally well done, with a good range of information and sources. There was not always a balance in the discussion. Better responses covered both sides of the argument in their answers, although not always having the evidence to support their statements about the views taken by Romans. Most candidates came to some sort of judgement based upon the factual knowledge if not the sources. Some did narrate his career with occasional comments on how it affected people's view of him. Others generalised from little evidence from the sources. Only a few could provide accurate detail of his dictatorship and actions in Rome.
- 5 Question 5, on the role of the Senate in the breakdown of the Republic, produced some good answers showing a knowledge of the role of the Senate and examples of its failure to control the politicians during the period. Answers ranged from detailed narratives to well-argued discussions. Sources were less successfully used in this question as the answers covered the whole period to some extent. Good answers drew together some of the issues well making valid points about the weakness of the Senate. Equally arguments that it was not necessarily the Senate's fault were well supported with information.

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

- 6 Question 6, on the change in political activity during the period, was answered by a number of candidates. The candidates did not successfully address the idea of change nor sufficiently focus on political activity. Instead there was much about the change in Augustus' position and powers. While this was part of the focus, it was also necessary to discuss how the opportunities for advancement were altered, and how politicians changed the way they sought position and power. The role of the Senate was also relevant. Sources were well used for the most part, although the evaluation tended to be general. Equally little distinction was made between the contemporary sources and those authors writing much later. Some basic knowledge of the political structure helped candidates to identify changes in the way activity changed.
- 7 This question, on Augustus' use of religion as propaganda, was very popular. The majority addressed this use of religion in various ways although evidence for religious practice during the period was limited. The majority of candidates mentioned his role as pontifex maximus, and his building of temples. Good answers used the *Res Gestae* and archaeological sources to some extent but there was less use of festivals and the imperial cult or Lares. Most took the view that it was essentially propaganda; some argued that he was sincere and that it was part of his policy to revitalise Rome. In all, there were some good, thoughtful and informed answers to this question which went beyond the simple description of religion. Good answers made use of the poets in support of Augustus' use of religion and the better ones were aware of the wider context of the extracts used. Weaker answers lost focus on religion and discussed propaganda.
- 8 Question 8, which asked about the use of equestrians by Augustus, was well answered in the main although the spelling of 'equestrians' was variable. Better answers knew the range of roles given to equestrians and even some specific persons were mentioned; weaker ones did not and so could not make out a convincing case. The precise ways in which he used them was generally answered but the reasons were less well covered.
- 9 Question 9 asked candidates to consider how consistent a policy Augustus had for the frontiers. This was a popular choice, largely because it gave an opportunity to focus on the various incidents on the frontiers, most especially the Varian defeat. Better answers, however, specified campaigns in Germany and the North and included the Eastern frontier in their discussions. Some had a very vague idea of who the Parthians were and,

occasionally, Parthia became a province. It was important to deal with the issue of consistency and not simply provide a narrative of events.

- 10 Question 10, on Augustus' efforts to gain the support of the upper classes, was occasionally well done but some seemed unable to confine themselves to the upper classes or even to Rome itself. Some responses detailed Augustus' marriage laws and the laws on slaves and freedmen. It was not clear how this related to gaining their support. Better answers identified a number of ways from the use of magistracies and governorships to gifts and roles in the administration within Rome. Some considered his use of propaganda and avoidance of overt use of his powers. Tacitus *Annals* 1.1-2 was used in better answers and some Suetonius although there was confusion over when he was writing.

Section C: Roman History AD 14-68

- 11 A number of candidates opted for Question 11, on the relative merits of Tacitus and Suetonius as historians of the period, with candidates very divided on whose account in which to place more trust. There were some well informed discussions with precise use of both authors. Good use was made of contrasting accounts in the two works giving an opportunity to examine the approaches of the authors in detail, and good contrasts were made between them. 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. Limited answers discussed one emperor or even only a few aspects of one emperor's reign.
- 12 Question 12 (Tiberius' principate) was also popular. As in Question 11, some candidates did not use the sources critically and tended to accept the views of Tacitus that it was a disastrous reign. Better answers detailed a range of actions by Tiberius and the success or failure of them; some used Tacitus comments on the good points of his reign; others provided good arguments that much in his reign was administered well. Good, balanced answers developed both sides of the argument with evidence to support the discussion; they pointed to his financial success, his relatively peaceful frontiers, his support for various disasters during his principate and so on. Much space was given to the treason issue, and again better answers gave detail of trials and reasons avoiding the hyperbole which they accused Tacitus of using.
- 13 Question 13 (on the success of Claudius in dealing with problems) was attempted by some; the knowledge of the problems was often limited to wives and freedmen. These answers ignored the plots against him, the problems in the North and the East and his personal situation, especially with the Senate. Weaker answers used the sources uncritically. There were a limited number of good answers which were aware of the range of reforms, measures taken to alleviate problems in Rome and in the Empire and his arrangements to develop the efficiency of the administration.
- 14 This question, on the extent to which the increase in the roles of equestrians lessened the role of the Senate, was less popular. Good answers showed an awareness of a range of roles of the equestrians and how they impacted upon the Senate's powers and roles, with the better answers providing specific examples of equestrians taking over senatorial tasks. There was good use of the material on at least two emperors. Good answers again attained a balance by showing that even when equestrians took over tasks, the senators still maintained a role, which was different from their traditional one. 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.

- 15** This asked candidates to consider the importance of imperial women. For some candidates the answer consisted of a narrative of what the women of the imperial family did and how they imposed themselves on the administration or the emperor himself. Usually Messalina and Agrippina the Younger were chosen; better answers extended the range to Livia and Poppaea, Agrippina the Elder and Octavia. Acte was not a member of the imperial family, however. Sources tended to be used uncritically in this question. Good answers noted the importance in the accession/succession issues for emperors and the use of the women in marriage alliances. Most made the point that the women were only important as long as the emperors wanted them to be, having no independent power, although a few argued the case.

A number of answers were less successful in constructing a convincing argument because of the tendency to speculate about the issues rather than base their judgements upon the evidence. These answers generalised rather than providing specific factual knowledge; candidates ought to avoid this.

There continue to be issues concerning accurate use of terminology and appropriate expressions. Candidates do not structure their answers in a way that makes their line of argument clear; there is less use of paragraphs and clearly defined sections. Mistakes in spelling and punctuation continue to affect clarity and understanding.

2464 Source Based Study 2: Roman World

General Comments

As has been the case in previous years, this paper saw no rubric errors or major time issues. That said, the range of quality both of writing and of secure knowledge seen in responses was very great indeed, and it has to be said that a significant number of candidates found it very hard to meet the challenge demanded at A2 of deploying relevant and accurate information in order to develop a focused discussion on the questions set, and then reaching a conclusion based on the discussion and material. There was a marked difference in the overall quality of responses from the same candidature in 2461, where they are given material to comment on as stimulus. In many instances, specific instruction in essay-writing would benefit candidates. This would not only include structuring an answer, but also teaching candidates how to make the fullest use of the material of which they are aware, 'mining' it to extract as much significance as possible, and then either supporting or contrasting it with a further piece. Analysis and comment tends in many instances to the sweeping assertion or shallow, naive judgment; confident and careful responses to questions were seen, but they were in the minority. It is also worth noting that it is extremely rare to find any attempts at planning or sketching out ideas – or even listing points which should later be incorporated. In one instance where this was seen, the body of the essay itself unfortunately omitted much material and was not focused on the question set.

Compared with previous years, there was a very even spread of attempts at answering the five questions; overall, the majority of responses were to Questions 1, 3, and 5; these had about the same number of attempts each, though there were also significant numbers of responses to Questions 2 and 4. The quality of writing was generally quite good, though it continues to be the case that 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 question produced some thoughtful and balanced responses, with good detail and use of sources. On the other hand, this first question required careful reading, and parts of it were missed by quite a lot of candidates. We wanted a discussion of the relative importance of client kings – what other factors led to the imposition of Roman rule? (warfare and conquest being the obvious alternative route – and Claudius' own position and need for a triumph were also important issues in the early stages). Second, the question asked for discussion of the establishment of Roman control – a concept which was open to challenge – and there was room for development in *up to AD 60*, a date chosen carefully to steer candidates away from the inclusion of Boudicca. Many candidates only talked about client kings and queens – which made it hard for them to assess 'relative importance' in a detailed way; others could only remember Prasutagus, and set him out as a key example of one who helped the Roman invasion (from East Anglia?), while many included Cartimandua, blithely continuing their narrative up to AD 69. Very few could see the importance of client kings outside these chosen few; the best responses included the practice of setting up relations with Britain as far back as Julius Caesar, noting British embassies in Augustus' *Res Gestae*, and then turning to Verika/Berikos and Cogi/Togidubnus.

- 2 As noted above there were more responses to this than has been the case in previous years, though it has to be said that very few of them were able to develop a secure narrative over the whole period covering the conquest of Wales; there was a tendency to focus on either Caratacus and the late 40s, or Mona/ Druids and 60-61; not much between, and little on the final settlement/ conquest of Wales. Some better-crafted and supported answers included both literary *and* archaeological evidence, making use of the establishment of Wroxeter, Caerleon, and forts leading up the heads of the valleys to show the determination of Rome to quell revolts in this area.
- 3 A wide range of answers was seen on this, probably the most popular (or at least the most frequently-answered) question, and many perceptive responses made good use of Tacitus' own material in *Annals* and *Histories*, as well as Suetonius and Dio, as a foil for the summary in *Agricola*. As a result they were amply rewarded across the three attainment objectives. It was good to see candidates make appropriate use of material which has clearly been thoroughly and carefully taught.
- 4 Not so often answered as other questions, this saw a range of responses across the range. Weaker responses failed on two basic counts: first, they frequently failed to make use of towns as evidence – citing specific examples, locating them in an accurate chronology, assessing levels of 'Romanisation' within them, placing them carefully from a geographical perspective (numerous in the south and east, though not all successful; established from a variety of causes – trade, colonies, former military settlements, civitas capitals); second, these candidates did not then address 'province as a whole' – contrasting the fortunes of the north and west, or rural areas in the south, up to c. 160. There was far too much unfocused and unconsidered waffle written without any material or factual support.
- 5 A good range of responses were seen to Question 5, which was (for a change) quite specifically worded so as to *include* the advance northwards begun before but ultimately credited by Tacitus to Agricola, and to *exclude* the period after the building of Hadrian's Wall. The best responses tackled most if not all of the period c. AD 69 – c. AD 125 very well, and high marks were obtained even for uneven responses but which focused on the main stages of the movement of the frontier. However – and this was a serious issue which I hope will be taken up in an equally serious way – there were a number of answers to this question which appear without much question to have been 'thrown' by the terms in it and which as a result caused major problems for candidates who, on the evidence of their responses, were so ill-prepared for the examination and insecure that, on seeing the dates in the question, they questioned their own knowledge and assumed that c. AD 69 must be the date of Hadrian's Wall (if not the Stanegate system) and c. 125 that of the Antonine Wall. Routine familiarity with basic facts and sources was at a premium in these responses, which could not be rewarded highly in any respect.

2465 Thematic Study 2: Greek History

General Comments

The standard of work in response to the questions on this paper was variable, although there were few very poor answers. In the main, candidates lost marks by failing to make adequate use of sources in their first answer, and then failing to deal with the historical issues required in the second. In the latter many candidates turned to a general narrative about the sources, and failed to connect this, or their evaluation of the sources, with the issues in the question.

Comments on Individual Questions

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

Very few candidates took this option, but those who did mostly demonstrated an excellent knowledge of the events and the sources. They had a firm grasp of a wide range of information about the tyrants. The only common weakness was a lack of evaluation of some sources on the part of some candidates.

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

This section was very popular, with a considerable number of candidates showing real enthusiasm for Sparta. The range in the quality of answers was also considerable. At the bottom end, candidates just showed a basic knowledge of the various elements of Spartan society, but made very little reference to the relevant sources. At the top end, candidates made thorough use of a considerable range of sources, including Tyrtæus and Alcman. This was impressive.

- 5** Question 5 often led to answers which were a simple recall of the functions and nature of helots in the Spartan system. Very few focused on their 'political importance', whilst another weakness of answers was the lack of sources. Some candidates made use of Herodotus and Thucydides, but few went beyond general statements about Sparta.
- 6** Question 6 was not as popular as 5, but produced some good responses. A number of candidates showed a reasonable knowledge of the conflict with Persia, but did not move on to the later developments in relations between states. Candidates should be reminded of the need to look at the development across the period. Some went beyond 400 BC, which again did not help their cause.

Both Questions 7 and 8 tended to lead to general discussions about the sources for Spartan history, which did not focus on the elements in the question.

- 7** Question 7 was not that popular, and tended to lead to general descriptions of the Assembly at best, although some candidates did manage to look at the role of the Assembly in relation to other elements to Spartan government.
- 8** Question 8 was better handled, but there was still a tendency to talk only about the sources. Most candidates covered a range of events from the period, and many made good use of both Herodotus and Thucydides.

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

Section C was perhaps a little less popular than in previous years. In general candidates' answers suffered from a lack of engagement with the issues outlined in the question, and precise detail about the Athenian system. There were numerous general treatments of the sources in questions 11 and 12, whilst in 9 and 10 many candidates failed to include sources.

- 9 Question 9 led some candidates to deal with a range of issues relating to the different elements of the Athenian system. Too many, however, still wrote a narrative of the development of the system, often giving considerable detail from before the period (especially on Solon). This may have some validity as background, but cannot be included at the expense of relevant detail. Very few candidates managed to think specifically about the idea of the individual citizen, and how the systems might have empowered the individual.
- 10 Question 10 generally was not well handled. Some candidates made good use of the *Old Oligarch* but very few were able to connect the development of the navy with the developments for ordinary Athenians. This suggests that candidates need to think more carefully about their answers, and ensure that they link the different elements of their work.
- 11 Question 11 was answered well by some candidates who made good use of both Aristophanes and Thucydides, as well as contrasting their views with both the *Old Oligarch* and Plato. The best answers focused on views of democracy, whilst weaker ones tended to deal more generally with the sources.
- 12 Question 12 led to a considerable number of general evaluations of the sources, rather than focussing on the issues in hand. Many candidates talked generally about the presentation of political leaders, and failed to note the words 'means by which.... influenced...' in the question. Candidates should again be reminded of the need to focus on the issues raised by the question

2466 Thematic Study 2: Roman History

All questions were attempted by candidates. There were, as in previous years, some very good answers showing detailed knowledge of the topics and the sources. Despite constant messages, there remained the steady number of candidates who used no sources in the first question. Better answers were able to cover the period as whole and draw together the various aspects of the themes.

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 is addressed.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: The Growth and Government of the Roman Empire.

- 1 Question 1 focused on the extent to which Romans had concern for the people they conquered or were interested only in wealth and power during the period. There was some confusion over dates in some cases but most answers were sufficiently detailed to offer reasonable discussions on the issues; the better ones identified a range of individuals and their actions. Better answers also identified the range of motives these individuals had for their actions and did not see the question in too simple a way. Weaker answers focused on a very limited period or examples. There was some good detail of the source material, although it was usually concerning Verres and Cicero himself. It was a frequent view that there are no other sources which deal with provincial government than Cicero's Letters from Cilicia. In one specific way this is true but it is not true that we have no other source which tells us about the behaviour of Romans in provinces.
- 2 Question 2, on the extent to which the political activity of individuals determined the policy in the Empire, was generally well done by candidates. Some candidates were unable to detail the ways in which individuals other than Pompey or Caesar affected policy. Good answers emphasised the changes of policy and how they reflected political changes in Rome. Pompey, Caesar, Cicero, the Gracchi, Marius, Sulla and Octavian were all used as examples at times, although few used a range in their answers. Again the sources were often limited to Cicero Verrines and the *Letters* from Cilicia. Weaker answers lost focus on the issue of activity by individuals and groups.
- 3 This question, on Cicero's letters and the advantages and disadvantages, 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, better answers went beyond the evidence in Cicero to refer to Pompey or Caesar, and so were more able to discuss the usefulness of the *Letters* for the period as a whole. This was an essential part of the question, largely ignored by a good number of candidates. A comment that they only refer to one year and so do not help us is not really answering the question.

- 4 This question asked candidates to assess how useful the Letters are with regard to the quality of governors. The same issue arose in that it is very difficult to discuss how far they help towards understanding the rest of the period and its governors if no other governor is mentioned and no other source used for information on how governors did their job. There was almost total concentration upon Appius and Cicero. Verres, also, is not the only governor ever prosecuted.

Section B: The City of Rome

All questions were answered in this section. 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 This question focused on the amenities provided by the emperors and how far they improved these during the period. Answers, as often in this section, made a great deal of Augustus' efforts, usually illustrated from *Res Gestae*. Tiberius did nothing; Claudius provided Ostia and Nero a bathhouse; Vespasian gave Romans the Colosseum and Trajan presented them with a Forum and a column. It was not clear whether this last item was an amenity or not. There was a focus on the corn supply and building. Some discussed the provision of a fire-brigade and the water supply. It was assumed that the emperors improved the conditions in Rome as a result. Some answers were very detailed on whatever the emperors did but they failed to develop an argument about the issues.
- 6 There was considerable detail in answers to this question, on changes in religious beliefs and practices. However, candidates generally did not provide evidence for the worship of various cults which they claimed were growing in popularity in Rome. Answers often speculated on the popularity of these cults from very little specific detail. Better answers discussed the traditional religion and festivals of the Romans and showed that they were still being practised, as the question asked. Archaeological evidence of places of worship and of the presence of cult followers needed to be provided to argue for a growth in their practice in Rome during this period. Some of the material related to the next century or later.
- 7 This question, on Juvenal's *Satire* 3 and the social and moral decline in Rome, was popular and provided some very detailed answers from the *Satire*. Some candidates seemed to have trouble with the idea of social and moral decline bringing the terrible state of the buildings into their answers. Better answers indicated Umbricius' opinions were not necessarily Juvenal's or even commonly held ones. Detail of the range of social and moral comments in Juvenal's work were in the better answers and most gave some information from the poem, although were unable to relate it to other parts of the period than Juvenal's.
- 8 There was much the same problem here, on the reliability and usefulness of the texts for the views of Romans during this period, where answers found difficulty in relating the text to the issues, and offering information covering more of the period. There was a loss of focus on the issue of the views being 'representative of other Romans'. Few could cite evidence from other parts of the period to compare with Horace or Juvenal in their views of Rome. 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

- 9 In this question, concerning the different policies of emperors towards the defence of the frontiers, better answers focused on the policies and not on a narrative of events. Some narratives dealt with only part of the period. Accounts of the actions of each emperor with little analysis of policy, or consistency between emperors, were quite frequent. More interesting discussions looked at the different motives which emperors had for different parts of the Empire. Weaker answers divided emperors into expansionist and non-expansionist.
- 10 This question, on how far revolts showed the failure to integrate peoples into the Empire, was more successfully attempted. A wide range of examples was employed by the better answers (with some detail of sources including inscriptions, coin etc). These also distinguished between the reasons for the revolts, with Boudicca a popular choice. However, most mentioned other revolts in both the West and the East. As always, dating the revolts was a problem for some, as well as spelling the names. The range of information across the period for evidence of integration was limited in most answers. Better answers developed a more balanced answer with evidence showing that the Romans did try to Romanise the provincials at least among the elites. Tacitus *Agricola* 21 was almost universally used, with some general understanding of its value as evidence. Some answers did not deal with the issue of integration well.
- 11 This focused on the value of the Letters of Pliny and Trajan as evidence for financial mismanagement. Better answers used more than the *Letters*. Other factual knowledge of mismanagement was usefully employed by some but most focused almost exclusively on the evidence from Pliny. The aspect of usefulness was addressed in a paragraph about the fact that they apply only to this short period of time. Better answers did try to make comparisons with the affairs of other provinces to see if what Pliny says was true there. This information was used to show the limitations of the Letters.
- 12 The final question, on the evidence of the Letters for the effectiveness of Trajan as emperor, answers varied considerably, from the highly detailed specific use of the evidence to the rather superficial assessment of Trajan. Again, better answers widened their material to include other emperors in order to make some comparison. Weaker answers did not mention Letter numbers or identify what Trajan said in reply; some made general comments on the subjects in the *Letters* without naming the place or the specific detail. However, those with secure knowledge performed well when describing Trajan's concerns and answers to Pliny. Better answers interpreted the replies to show Trajan's management of the Empire. 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 and emperors.

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. Candidates needed at times to focus on the wording of the questions and what the intention was within individual questions. There were some excellent answers in terms of factual content which were undermined by the failure to refer to sources.

Most candidates presented organised and structured parts to their answers; however, the coherence of some was not clear and there was a lack of planning in the approach to many answers. There was a continued decline in the use of the paragraph which makes it difficult to follow the train of thought at times.

2467 Thematic Study 2: Roman World

General comments

In this, its last year but one, this paper finally presented no rubric problems for any candidates. Overall, there were fairly equal numbers of attempts at each of Questions 1 and 2, while in Section B the most popular question was Question 4.

Compared with last year there seemed to be less accurate use made of inscriptions in weaker responses, while there were sources quite well deployed in the answers to questions in Section A. Taken as a whole, the responses were of a similar standard to those seen last year, while the questions were of a similar level. As in 2464, failure to address all parts of the question was the main issue for weaker responses, and there was a similar lack of evidence of planning or systematic forethought as in 2464. I wonder if this might account for the number of unbalanced or unfocused responses noted. Above all, it seems in some questions (particularly Question 1) that candidates could deploy information but could not combine it or contrast it to see links between (in this instance) villas and the economy. It poses the question whether some candidates know what is meant by terms used in the specification such as 'economy' and 'administration'.

With reference to the use of sources, some 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; we are not playing the "authorities' game" like medieval pedants! The quality of writing was generally very good, though some candidates need to be encouraged to write in a more appropriate register for an examination essay and to avoid slang.

Comments on Individual Questions

The Romanisation of Britain AD43-415

- 1 This was a fairly challenging question, requiring adequate knowledge of 'economic activity' and how it changed over the occupation period, as well as the 'development of villas'. The mark-scheme has some suggestions of how the phenomenon of the luxury villa may be seen as reflecting additional wealth seen in the 4th century. There was a wide range of responses – at the highest end, careful deployment and reference to key examples (Chedworth and Bignor being the most frequently cited) was linked to economic activity including mineral processing and metalworking as well as agriculture. Further down the levels in the grids one found confusion about the names of villas (Lockleys and Lullingstone being the most obvious ones to be falsely attributed), Fishbourne was forced into the argument, and there was often little or no detail about 'economic activity', just assertion that there was some. Specific knowledge is at a premium in answers to questions such as these.
- 2 This question also raises a number of issues regarding the information recalled by candidates (and perhaps conveyed); there was on the whole good recall of fine examples of Roman art, but very often a sweeping assertion that anything with swirls or curves in it must by definition be 'Celtic'. That said, it was heartening to read some thoughtful responses which discussed regional and chronological differences between artistic styles and discussed evidence in detail.

- 3 The requirement here was to discuss what we can learn from inscriptions in towns. 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). It needs stating that it is not necessary to refer to a massive range of sources – a well-chosen selection discussed and evaluated in detail is a better way of providing a platform for analysis of the issue. Weaker responses either discussed towns without inscriptions in detail, or cited sources which were not from towns. This limits the awarding of marks (see grids and the mark-scheme).
- 4 'Impact of the army' drew a majority of responses in Section B, and there was a wide range of responses submitted. As in Question 3 the main challenge was to make use of inscriptions and these were used well by some and ignored by others. Many answers limited their comments to the conquest period and the first century AD, and did not explore all the roles of the army (see mark scheme for some suggestions, by no means exhaustive). In addition, this question (like a similar one last year) raises a number of issues regarding the information recalled by candidates (and perhaps conveyed in books and video resources, and by re-enactment societies): despite the impression often given about the Roman army, it did not number more than c. 55,000 troops of all kinds, 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 a 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 Romanisation to the 'impact of the army' in an uncritical way (mosaics?) and failed to address 'extent' in any meaningful way.

2468 Individual Study: Greek history

2469 Individual Study: Roman History

2470 Individual Study: Roman World

General Comments

The candidates generally performed well in the coursework assignments. This year there was a wider range in the standard of work presented. Most were marked within tolerance, but some centres were inclined to over mark 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.

There was a wider range of essay titles this year, most of which enabled candidates to fulfil the Assessment Objectives. 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 original sources as factual evidence does not move candidates to the higher levels in AO3. Some centres which chose one or a limited range of titles produced work which was uncannily similar in approach and construction, perhaps indicating a heavy guidance in the preparation of the pieces.

Although this is the last year of coursework, and each year advice has been given on choosing titles, still some centres ignored this advice and entered titles which were not on topics from the source based study. Titles which are based on thematic or document studies are unacceptable. This information is contained on page 23 (4.2.1) of the specification which is available on the OCR website.

Some candidates also omitted to provide a word count and/or bibliography of all material used; ancient sources, modern commentaries, websites and site/museum visits.

Although some centres and candidates present problems, they are the minority. The majority of pieces entered showed candidates had researched well, presented a good argument and their work was competently assessed.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Ancient History (3809 7809)
June 2009 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2450	Raw	100	78	68	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2451	Raw	100	76	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2452	Raw	100	79	69	59	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2453	Raw	100	75	65	56	47	38	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2454	Raw	100	76	67	58	49	40	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	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2457	Raw	100	76	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2458	Raw	100	77	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2459	Raw	100	70	62	54	46	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2460	Raw	100	76	67	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2461	Raw	100	78	68	58	49	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2462	Raw	100	70	61	52	44	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2463	Raw	100	76	66	57	48	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2464	Raw	100	71	62	54	46	38	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2465	Raw	100	75	66	57	48	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2466	Raw	100	75	66	57	49	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2467	Raw	100	70	62	54	46	38	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	45.8	69.3	88.0	99.5	100.0	194
7809	20.5	51.2	77.2	92.7	98.3	100.0	816

1010 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