

Section A: Relations between Greek states and between Greek and non-Greek states, 492–404 BC

*Question 1	'Fighting was the only way for states to solve conflicts.' To what extent do the sources support this view of the relationships between Greek states and between Greek and non-Greek states in this period? [30 marks]		
Assessment Objectives	<p>AO3 = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • historical events and historical periods studied • how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. <p>AO2 = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements.</p> <p>AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</p>		
Additional guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content, any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.		
Level	Marks	Level descriptor	Indicative content
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>Candidates should question the idea of 'the only way', and look at the extent to which the sources support the view suggested. They may well consider that conflicts dominated the history of the period, but they will also be expected to explore other ways of solving conflicts other than fighting. Candidates will be expected to cover the time period, looking at continuity and change, and similarities and</p>

Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<p>differences in how states solved conflicts. Some candidates may differentiate between how states reacted to conflict and how they attempted to prevent the likelihood, or reduce the impact of conflict.</p> <p>Answers are likely to include some information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific examples of Greek states which medised when sent demands for earth and water and those that did not. • the Hellenic League. • details of the internal conflicts (and co-operation) from this period: the on-running conflict between Athens and her allies and Sparta and her allies. • the various peace treaties made during this period: the Peace of Callias?, the 30 Years' Peace, Peace of Nicias and the 50 Year Peace between Sparta and Argos. • Candidates may also include details of the political developments during the period, including a consideration of the development of the Athenian Empire. • Candidates may also include the use of <i>proxenoi</i> and cleruchies during this period; the use of tribune.
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	<p>Supporting source details may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herodotus on the conflict with Persia and the different approaches states took to the Persian invasions: 6.42-49, 6.94-117, 7.131-133, 7.138, 7.151-2, 7.174-175, 7.207, 8.143-144, 9.2 • Thucydides: 1.33, 1.35, 1.40-1, 1.44, 1.55-56, 1.89-118, 1.139-140, 2.8, 4.19-20, 4.117, 5.13-5, 5.25-26, 7.18, 7.27-28, 8.6, 8.17-18, 8.29, 8.37, 8.52, 8.81 • Diodoros 12.2.1-2, 12.4.4-6, Harpokration s.v.
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	<p><i>Attikois grammasin</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Xenophon 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1 Plutarch: <i>Aristeides</i> 24, <i>Cimon</i> 11-13, <i>Pericles</i> 23, 28 <p>Analysis of the sources might focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment of the Persian / Spartan developments due to limited Persian / Spartan sources and the agendas and contexts of Greek sources. limitations of evidence in Thucydides for 479-431 BC; limitations of Herodotus and Thucydides and reliance on later authors for the period; the differences in their information and viewpoints. the lack of information after 411 BC compared with earlier.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN

*Question 2	How far did the changes in relations between Greek and non-Greek states depend upon the strengths and abilities of the leaders of the states during this period? [30 marks]		
Assessment Objectives	<p>AO3 = 15 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • historical events and historical periods studied • how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. <p>AO2 = 10 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements.</p> <p>AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</p>		
Additional guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.		
Level	Marks	Level descriptor	Indicative content
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>Candidates may look at the role of individuals and their actions in affecting changes in relations; they may consider the extent of change and continuity in the relations over part or all of the period and the causes for this; they may look at the nature of the evidence which emphasises the role of individuals.</p>

Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<p>Answers are likely to include some information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leaders during the Persian wars: Hippias, Miltiades, Themistokles, Leonidas, Pausanias, Aristides, Darius, Xerxes, Mardonius, Artabanus and their roles in events which affected relations. • leaders in Greece post 479: Kimon, Perikles, Spartan kings and Ephors (Pausanias, Pleistoanax, Archidamus, Sthenelaidas) and their roles in the changing relations between Sparta and Athens, and Persia, and other Greek states (e.g. the allies of each state). • the outbreak of wars between Athens and her allies and Sparta and her allies in 461 BC and 431 BC; the roles of individuals in these: Kimon, Perikles, Archidamus, Sthenelaidas. • the changing relations during these wars; the leaders and the influence upon them: e.g. Perikles, Kleon, Nicias, Brasidas, Alkibiades, Agis, Lysander, Gylippus, Theramenes, Kleophon.
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a good explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	<p>Supporting source details may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herodotus <i>Histories</i> Darius and Xerxes: 6.42–49, 94–96, 7.1, 5–10h; 8.100–103; Greeks: 6. 107, 109, 7.143–5. • Thucydides <i>The Peloponnesian War</i> 1.86–118;

Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence, the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	<p>122–3; 139–40; 2.11; 2.63, 2.65; 3.37; 4.80–81, 108, 117; 5.13–17; 5.43; 6.90–91; 7.18, 27–28; 8.6, 8.52.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xenophon <i>Hellenica</i> 1.4–6; 2.1. • Plutarch <i>Perikles</i> 28; 30–31; <i>Kimon</i> 11–12; <i>Aristeides</i> 23. • Aristophanes <i>Peace</i> 61–71, 619–622, 639–648; <i>Akharnians</i> 524–539. • Diodorus 11.46–7, 50; 12.38.2. • Persian inscriptions: Bisitun; Xerxes' inscription. <p>Analysis of the sources might focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the methodology, agendas and contexts of the Greek and Persian sources and how these affect the value of the information. • the limitation of the evidence for Persian kings and their aims, strengths and abilities mostly from a Greek viewpoint. • the limitations of the evidence for the events and issues of the period in Herodotus and Thucydides and reliance on later authors which emphasise individuals and their abilities. • problems of evidence for internal Spartan politics and individuals, and the lack of Spartan material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) • The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN

Question 3		How convincing do you find J. M. Cook's interpretation of Xerxes' expedition against the Greeks in 480–79 BC?		[20 marks]
Assessment Objectives		AO4 = 15 marks = Analyse and evaluate, in context, modern historians' interpretations of the historical events and topics studied. AO1 = 5 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.		
Additional guidance		<p>The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</p> <p>Please note that interpretations can be evaluated in the context of the wider historical debate connected with the issue or of the historical context about which the historian was writing. There is no expectation that the interpretation will be evaluated in the context of the methods or approach used by the historian, or how the interpretation may have been affected by the time in which they were writing, though credit can be given for this approach to evaluation if done in a way which is relevant to the question.</p> <p>A learner's knowledge and understanding of the historical period, including the ancient sources may be credited, but only where it is presented in a way which is relevant and intrinsically linked to the analysis/evaluation/use of the interpretation, it should not be credited in isolation.</p>		
Level	Marks	Level descriptor	Indicative content	
Level 5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response has a very through and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and fully substantiated evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) 	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with a conclusion either agreeing or disagreeing with the modern historians' interpretation, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>Answers should evaluate both the interpretation locating it within the wider historical debate about the issue and using their own knowledge of the ancient sources and events and periods to reach a judgement about how convincing they find the argument.</p> <p>In locating the interpretation within the wider historical debate, candidates might:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the difficulty of assessing the issue given the limitations of the Persian sources and their views and aims/intentions. assess the problems in reconstructing specific events such as battles and strategy in the ancient world. 	
Level 4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response has a through and sustained analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a convincing and well supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) 		

Level 3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response has a good analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the emphasis on the role of individuals in the outcome of the expedition on both sides in the sources. <p>In evaluating the interpretation, answers might argue that this view is not convincing, pointing towards the following information / ancient sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the resources on both sides and the evidence in the sources and in modern assessments in terms of numbers of men and equipment, ships and supplies. Persian knowledge of Greece and the opposition gained from Greeks in the Empire – Ionians; exiles and Persians (Demaratus, Hippias, Artabanus (Herodotus 7.1-2; 7-10; 7.49-50, 102). the extent to which Xerxes' preparations and strategy contributed to success or failure on the expedition (Herodotus 7.49-50. the extent to which the Greeks won through their own resources, strategies / tactics and generals, rather than 'were fortunate' (Herodotus 7.143-5, 174-5, 207, 219-222; 8.62-63).
Level 2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response has some analysis of the interpretation, in context, to produce a partially supported evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1) 	<p>In evaluating the interpretation, answers might argue that this view is convincing, drawing on the following information / ancient sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the limited sources for the Persian side and the presentation in the evidence favouring the Greeks and their cause. the modern assessment of the size of resources on both sides and the advantages for the Greeks in terrain. the success of Xerxes' until Salamis. the effects on the outcome of events out of the control of both sides, introducing an element of luck, good or bad (Herodotus 7.207). The importance of Greek unity or lack of it – Spartan reluctance at times (Herodotus 8.3; 49-50, 56, 62, 74).
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response has a basic analysis of the interpretation, with parts of the answer just describing the interpretation. Response produces a very basic evaluation in relation to the question. (AO4) The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1) 	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

Section B: The Rise of Macedon, c. 359–323 BC

Question 4		How useful is this passage for our understanding of how the Macedonian Empire was governed?		[12 marks]
Assessment Objectives		<p>AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p>AO3 = 6 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced.</p>		
Additional guidance		The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.		
Level	Marks	Level descriptor	Indicative content	
Level 6	11–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach substantiated, well-developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3) 	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either way as to the source's usefulness to understanding the issue in question providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p>	
Level 5	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) Response uses a good range of fully appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is thoroughly analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3) 	<p>Candidates may discuss the following information in relation to contents of the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That control of territory was, in some cases, returned to defeated leaders – in this case Porus – and the reasons for this policy in this case. Alexander's adoption of the existing system of satrapies. The passages regarding his return from the east make it clear that using natives to govern satrapies was a widespread policy (Arrian 7.4). The contexts in which Alexander distributed control of other territories. 	
Level 4	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of historical features and characteristics that are fully relevant to the question. (AO1) Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient 		

		sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to reach developed judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Native Macedonians may still have been viewed as more reliable and so were handed larger territories. • The context of Alexander's decision to marry Roxane and the link that provided with her father Oxyartes. Discussion of the Susa marriages might be rewarded if the argument is firmly linked to the 'governance' of the empire. • Thoughtful discussion on the quality and accuracy of the evidence provided by the source should also be rewarded if relevant.
Level 3	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of historical features and characteristics that are relevant to the question. (AO1) • Response uses a reasonable range of appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3) 	
Level 2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. (AO1) • Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way to make some basic judgements about how the way the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question. (AO3) 	
Level 1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. (AO1) • Response uses a few appropriate examples from the set of ancient sources. The set of sources is analysed and evaluated in a basic way but judgements about how the context in which the sources were produced impacts on them and their usefulness for the issue in the question are either not present or are not linked to analysis and are merely assertions. (AO3) 	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

*Question 5		'Philip's primary aim was the conquest of Greece.' How far do you agree with this view?		[36 marks]
Assessment Objectives		<p>AO3 = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> historical events and historical periods studied how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. <p>AO2 = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements.</p> <p>AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</p>		
Additional guidance		The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.		
Level	Marks	Level descriptor	Indicative content	
Level 6	31–36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>Candidates might address the issue of significance when analysing Philip's actions. Greater significance might be attributed to certain actions over others thus rendering possible a judgement on Philip's intentions. Answers may also discuss how Philip's aims may have changed over time and whether the conquest of Greece was always his primary aim. Some students might challenge the premise of the question, arguing that he never conquered Greece.</p>	
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed and judgements. (AO2) 	<p>Answers should include information on Philip's priorities and actions at various times during his rule. There are many possible ways of addressing the issue of Philip's aims. It is possible that candidates might offer information relating to the following:</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philip's actions and priorities at the outset of his rule, including the contexts in which he became regent and later king. Philip's interventions in Thessaly. Philip's role in the Third Sacred War. Peace-making after the Third Sacred War and the extent to which Philip pursued the goal of a 'common peace'. Philip's actions in the Chersonese and at Perinthus and Byzantium. The nature of the post-Chaeronea settlement.
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	<p>Supporting source details may include the following. However, much of the evidence can be used to address the issue of Philip's aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diodorus: An overview of Philip's actions. Inferences as to his aims can be drawn from virtually any passage. Justin: 8.1 might be used profitably to argue that Philip's primary aim was the conquest of Greece. Demosthenes: Might be used to support the case that Philip had long-held ambitions regarding Greece. The Third Philippic 9–10 could be used here. In contrast, however, other information he supplies could be used to argue otherwise. <p>Analysis of the sources might focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of to what extent it is possible to understand Philip's aims using the available evidence. In doing this candidates may analyse the similarities and differences of interpretation between and within different ancient sources. The reader is left to infer Philip's aims from the often basic outline of his actions. Discussion of the strengths of the sources should be
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1) <p><i>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and 	

		<p>periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	<p>rewarded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is much scope for discussion on the utility of Demosthenes' interpretations given the contexts in which his works were delivered. Relevant analysis and evaluation of Justin and Diodorus in terms of their methods and the sources they used.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN

*Question 6		To what extent do you agree that many others would have supported Cleitus' criticisms of Alexander?	[36 marks]
Assessment Objectives		<p>AO3 = 18 marks = Use, analyse and evaluate ancient sources within their historical context to make judgements and reach conclusions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • historical events and historical periods studied • how the portrayal of events by ancient writers/sources relates to the historical contexts in which they were written/produced. <p>AO2 = 12 marks = Analyse and evaluate historical events and historical periods to arrive at substantiated judgements</p> <p>AO1 = 6 marks = Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the historical periods studied.</p> <p>Please note that while the descriptors for AO2 and AO3 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources & historical events and historical periods may be combined in responses.</p>	
Additional guidance		The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.	
Level	Marks	Level descriptor	Indicative content
Level 6	31–36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses an excellent range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are very thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach very logically reasoned and well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated, very convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an excellent explanation that convincingly and very thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained, and well-developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates an excellent range of accurate and very detailed knowledge and a very sophisticated depth of understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.</i></p>	<p>No set answer is expected. It is possible to reach the highest marks with conclusion(s) either agreeing, disagreeing, or anywhere between providing the response has addressed the issue of extent. Responses should be marked in-line with the level descriptors.</p> <p>Discussion of the term 'many others' should be expected. Distinctions can be drawn between different groups and how they might have viewed Cleitus' criticisms. The issue of whether Cleitus' criticisms resulted from his own situation and history, and thus were not necessarily widely held views, should be addressed. Candidates may also look at the issue of change over time and whether support for his criticisms may have changed in different circumstances. Candidates may discuss how significant certain events and developments were in shaping people's views of Alexander. In doing so they may also discuss issues of similarity</p>
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a very good range of fully appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are thoroughly analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, well-developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw fully substantiated 	

		<p>and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response has a very good explanation that convincingly and thoroughly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated, sustained and developed and judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a very good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information is relevant and in the most part substantiated.</i></p>	<p>and difference between Alexander's early aims and his later behaviour. Some candidates might differentiate between Cleitus' criticisms, arguing that some would have been more significant than others in attracting support.</p> <p>It is possible that candidates may offer some of the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The various criticisms offered by Cleitus. • An understanding of the role of the Macedonian King in terms of the expectations of his people. • Alexander's adoption of Persian custom and dress. • Alexander's views and actions regarding the issue of his own divinity. • The course of the campaign including his military successes, visit to the oracle of Ammon at Siwa, destruction of Persepolis, the chases of Darius and Bessus, the 'conspiracy' of Philotas, and the problems his army encountered after crossing the Hindu Kush. • Alexander's character. • Information specifically relating to Cleitus, such as his actions at the Granicus and that he was to be left behind as the satrap of Bactria. • Some candidates may argue that support for his concerns grew after his death and during the campaign in the Indus valley — this can be rewarded if it is explicitly related to the issue in the question. <p>Supporting source details may include the following:</p>
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a good range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned, developed judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw substantiated and convincing conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has a good explanation that convincingly and fully analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach substantiated and developed judgements. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a good range of accurate and detailed knowledge and a well-developed understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. (AO1) <p><i>There is a line of reasoning with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p>	
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a range of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach logically reasoned judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw supported, plausible conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that convincingly analyses and appraises historical events and periods in order to reach supported judgements, though these are not consistently developed. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a reasonable range of accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and a reasonable understanding of relevant historical features 	

		<p>and characteristics. There is a consistent focus on the question through most of the answer. (AO1)</p> <p><i>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrian and Plutarch: any relevant sections, especially those pertaining to the information set out above.
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses some appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated, to reach judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced, and to draw some supported conclusions about the historical issue in the question. (AO3) • The response has an explanation that analyses and appraises historical events and periods, and this is linked appropriately to judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made fully explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates a limited range of accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though this may lack detail. The question is generally addressed, but the response loses focus in places. (AO1) <p><i>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p>	<p>Analysis of the sources might focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may discuss the limitations of the evidence and thus the difficulty in judging whether it does or doesn't support the statement; the evidence can be interpreted to reach different conclusions. • Issues regarding the aims and methods of Arrian and Plutarch are also very relevant, as is the nature and utility of the sources they used and how the information was transmitted to them. • The strengths of Arrian and Plutarch may be discussed in connection with our ability to understand how far the sources can support the statement.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response uses a limited selection of appropriate examples from the ancient sources. The sources are analysed and evaluated in a basic way, and this is linked to some basic, generalised judgements about how the way they portray events relates to the context in which they were produced. There are some basic conclusions about the historical issue in the question, though these may only be implicitly linked with the analysis and evaluation of the sources. (AO3) • The response has some explanation which analyses and appraises historical events and periods in places, and this is linked appropriately to some of the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements is not made explicit. (AO2) • The response demonstrates some limited knowledge and understanding of relevant historical features and characteristics, though lacking detail and in places inaccurate. The question is only partially addressed. (AO1) <p><i>Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.</i></p>	
	0	No response or no response worthy of credit	

Assessment Objective Grid

	Distribution of marks for each Assessment Objective			
Section A	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4
Questions 1 & 2	5	10	15	–
Question 3	5	–	–	15
Section B	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4
Question 4	6	–	6	–
Questions 5 & 6	6	12	18	–
TOTAL	22 (22.5%)	22 (22.5%)	39 (40%)	15 (15%)

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN