

Examiners' report

A LEVEL

ANCIENT HISTORY

OCR Level 3 Advanced GCE in
Ancient History

H407

For first teaching in 2017

H407/23 Summer 2025 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper 23 series overview	4
Section A overview	5
Question 1*	5
Question 2*	6
Question 3	9
Section B overview	13
Question 4	13
Question 5*	14
Question 6*	16

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate responses is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from [Teach Cambridge](#).

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper 23 series overview

As in previous years, examiners have seen some excellent work across the unit with only a small number of responses showing a lack of the skills and knowledge to perform well.

Candidates, who performed well, developed a coherent analysis focused on the question by integrating the knowledge and evidence into an explanation. Better responses integrated knowledge and sources to form judgements. A good response sustains a series of judgements developed around the issues in the question. Statements or assertions unsupported by evidence and vaguely linked to the information do not provide convincing, well-supported judgements.

Very few responses did not deal with the issues; few seemed to be only vaguely aware of the prescribed sources. They were able to name an author or piece of evidence but little more.

There is still a tendency to provide generalised knowledge and assertions. Candidates do less well where assertion replaces argument. There should be an explanation of how and why the evidence is linked to the view and/or the issue in the question.

Better responses displayed secure knowledge and understanding of, at least, part of the period and the depth study. Errors were made and misconceptions arose given the constraints of an examination. Such errors are minor and do not affect the overall grading. Misattributions of evidence occur but do not generally damage the overall response. The vast majority of responses offered good or very good explanations at some point in the response but not consistently.

There were a few responses which included little or no source evidence. Most marks for the essays are for the use of sources and evidence. In the interpretation, support is needed to develop a substantiated argument regarding how convincing it is. A basic aim should be to support the response with evidence.

The quality of the evaluation of the evidence varies; some provide a lengthy, usually unrelated, paragraph on an author at the start or end of a response. Better responses integrate their assessment of the evidence within the explanation and judgements. It is focused on the specific piece of evidence, rather than a general view of the reliability of the author. Comparison of sources is present in better responses, where possible.

There were very few candidates who omitted a question or did not complete a response due to the time constraints.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
• had a secure knowledge of the chronology of the periods in both the Period and Depth study • provided knowledge of the sources and their differing contexts • gave specific sources relevant to the terms of the question. • provided evaluation that dealt with the value of the specific information in the source • prioritised the analysis over a narrative of the period • gave a clearly organised structure leading to a well organised and well-supported conclusion.	• gave inaccurate chronology and showed confusion over the order of events • provided lack of clarity on the context and relevance of information or sources used. • gave generalised factual knowledge • used assertions instead of developed judgements based on evidence • generalised source evidence, e.g. 'according to Plutarch'. • lacked clear structure leading to unclear reasoning and unfocused narrative.

Section A overview

Question 2 seemed slightly more popular than Question 1. Question 1 asked candidates to consider the ways in which Tiberius' reign provided a template for the Julio-Claudians who followed. Most had good detail on all the reigns. Better responses focused on specific elements rather than narratives of reigns. This was also true of Question 2 where focus on specific women seemed to provide better responses than a narrative through any and all women.

Question 3 was more thematic in asking about the reactions of various groups to the Julio-Claudian period. The responses were often good to very good; some less successful responses focused on Augustus alone. Candidates are now much more willing to examine the analysis and meaning in some detail.

Question 1*

1* To what extent did the reign of Tiberius set a pattern for the future direction of the principate?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[30]**

Most responses found areas with which they could compare Tiberius' reign with the reigns of the other emperors. These mostly, not exclusively, included the maiestas trials, the use of the Praetorians, specifically Sejanus, the lack of support socially and economically for the people of Rome, and the Imperial Cult. Better responses developed the idea of 'pattern' by dealing in detail with a few areas rather than the whole reign. Less successful responses focused on the general tenor of the reign in terms of cruelty and/or deviancy. Tiberius' retirement from Rome and, by implication, from dealing with administration featured in most responses. The relationships with the senate and ordinary people were generally linked to other aspects of his reign. Better responses examined the structure/role of the principate in relation to some of the above to determine how far Tiberius changed the principate for the future.

Responses showed good understanding of the accessions of the emperors and how they compared. Good responses tried to identify if Tiberius set a pattern in dealing with the difficult moment. Most recognised Tiberius was the first to succeed and was copying Augustus. They noted the role of the Praetorians; there was discussion of removing 'rivals' early in the case of Tiberius, Gaius and Nero. Usually, candidates assessed the relations with the senators in connection with the early days.

Better responses dealt sensibly with the evidence for a variety of issues, the maiestas trials, the level of administration, the issue of 'popularity', the provision of 'bread and circus', the financial 'miserliness', the retreat to Capri, and his view of the Imperial Cult. Most recognised the sources were not favourable to Tiberius and assessed the evidence accordingly. This varied from the short assessment that we had to be careful with the evidence, to a more detailed, specific, evaluation of the evidence. Some took Suetonius' assessment of the number of deaths or Seneca's view as fact; others were more cautious with Tacitus' assessment of the trials. There was good material on the Imperial Cult for both Tiberius and Claudius. The assessment of financial and social administration was more balanced in better responses. Some used Tacitus assessment of good administration in Annals 4.

Very good comparisons were made between emperors; better responses were specific in their examples, and they covered more than one reign. Excellent responses linked all the emperors in different areas providing a coherent series of judgements on the issue of 'pattern'. Less successful

responses spent too long on Gaius leaving them time only to offer a sentence or two on Nero. These responses were often structured around a narrative of each reign. Gaius and Nero were limited at times to a single example, often the Fire of AD 64. Less successful responses focused only on Tiberius and Gaius.

The sources were at times confused, with Tacitus quoted for Gaius. Suetonius was frequently cited with the wrong emperor. There was a tendency with the sources to preface a narrative with 'According to Suetonius and Tacitus'. This would not work with Gaius and to some extent parts of the reigns are not covered by either Suetonius or Tacitus. More effective use included Cassius Dio, certainly on Claudius. There was also use of Pliny on aqueducts and Seneca on the trials. In general, sources were accurate and well-used in relation to the knowledge and understanding.

Misconception



Suetonius was not a senator; he was an equestrian; Suetonius and Seneca judgements on maiestas trials need evaluating concerning the extent and number of trials and executions.

Tacitus does not quote 'Tiberius to the Tiber'; it is quoted by Suetonius in the prescribed material.

Question 2*

2* 'The imperial women had very little influence during this period.'

How far do the sources support this view?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. **[30]**

Better responses dealt with both aspects of the question. The general view in the sources concerning women, and imperial women in particular, was developed as part of the assessment. Less successful responses simply took what the sources said as fact. Better responses evaluated what we are told of women when making their judgements. Less successful responses took the agreement of the sources to mean they are reliable. It did not help when the historical context of each source was either not known or incorrect. Cassius Dio was stated to be contemporary, along with Suetonius (who knew Nero). Tacitus was said to have written 'under the reign of Domitian'. He wrote after Domitian died.

The range of women discussed was quite wide, although most responses did not cover the full range. The common examples were Livia (variously named), Agrippina the Younger (a number of spellings), Messalina; others used less frequently were the Julias, Agrippina the Elder, Livilla, wife of Drusus, Poppaea and Octavia. Some mentioned Gaius' sisters, notably Drusilla. There was occasional use of Cleopatra who was not a member of the Imperial family and outside the period. The most common error was to confuse the names; some confusion with their husbands also occurred. However, there was a general accuracy and often very detailed material.

Better responses focused on the sources available, rather than on a narrative of alleged actions.

Livia's influence was developed through Tacitus for the most part; the issue of the murder of Augustus with figs is in Cassius Dio, although Tacitus hints at the idea briefly. Most responses focused on the succession and her role in Tiberius' reign. Better responses evaluated what is said about her role rather than accepting it as fact. Many responses used Seneca's account of Cinna, with some assessment of

how accurate it could be. It is also in a longer version in Cassius Dio. Her role in the accession, and how she orchestrated the accession, with the death of Agrippa Postumus, was mostly treated well, using all the sources. Very good responses made an immediate parallel with Agrippina and Nero (including Tacitus' parallel death of a rival in the opening of *Annals* 13).

Most responses made good work of Agrippina the Younger and Nero using the sources and comparing accounts. They dealt with her arranging Nero as heir, the sidelining of Britannicus, and the orchestrating of the accession. Better responses were more detailed on her role during the reign. They developed the decline of her influence. Less successful responses simply assumed she was in control for 5 years and that she lost influence when killed, but this showed she was influential. The work on Messalina tended to believe the account in Cassius Dio (sometimes attributed to Suetonius) of her influence over Claudius and the administration. Better responses were more critical and identified that Claudius was more in charge than the sources suggested. All knew of her plot and death, although her husband had a variety of names.

Arguments that women had little influence used the Julias (exiled), Agrippina the Elder (starved to death), and Octavia and Poppaea (both killed by Nero). Some very good responses knew more about these and could develop sound judgements on their influence. An example was Tacitus' view of Poppaea's role in the murder of Agrippina and death of Octavia.

Most candidates had good material, used in detail, to form coherent explanations, differing only in their assessments of the evidence.

Exemplar 1

~~Aditus~~ Suetonius' negative portrayal of imperial women carries over to Claudius, describing him as a servant to his wives and freedmen and completely influenced by them. This can be seen through Messalina's (third wife) portrayal as promiscuous and bigamous which supposedly was the reason for her execution and Agrippina the younger, who pushed Nero as heir, similar to Livia. This once again could be a case of the imperial women being described as having great influence over the princeps in order to paint them as weak as a way to criticise them.

So rather than the imperial women being particularly influential and ~~and~~ cunning, it's more of the Princeps being so weak that they let a woman manipulate them.

This paragraph, Exemplar 1, illustrates good practice and some underdevelopment of ideas.

It has a clear statement of Suetonius' view of Claudius' wives, largely correct even if paraphrased. It provides a good example but lacks some details of Messalina's 'plot' and death. The reference to Agrippina and comparison with Livia is succinct but apposite, leading to a sound judgement on possible influence. This introduces a key element in the question in terms of the trustworthiness of the evidence. This develops the idea that the sources are using the stories of women to characterise the emperors. This is answering the second part of the question. However, it needs developing further with a more detailed evaluation of what the sources say. The paragraph lacks precise source material on Messalina and Agrippina with which to frame the analysis. Therefore, it does not reach the higher level of source evaluation and convincing judgements.

Question 3

3 Read the interpretation below.

The people most bitter about imperial rule were the aristocrats, who had lost the political power that had always belonged to their ancestors. The average Roman had never held more than a token share of this power and could not, therefore, grieve too deeply when the monarchy of the emperor replaced the aristocracy of the Senate. In fact, many Romans welcomed this new system of government because it brought peace, stability, and therefore prosperity. In the republican period, the fate of the common man was frequently dependent on magistrates who changed every year and who were willing to sacrifice the welfare of other people to achieve their own political and financial ambitions. In the imperial period, affairs of state were conducted by bureaucrats, not politicians; by men who had served in one office for a long time and who had no illusions of securing for themselves supreme control over the Roman world.

J-A Shelton, *As the Romans Did* (adapted)

How convincing do you find Shelton's interpretation that the majority benefitted from the Julio-Claudian system of government because it brought 'peace, stability, and therefore prosperity'?

You must use your knowledge of the historical period and the ancient sources you have studied to analyse and evaluate Shelton's interpretation. **[20]**

Candidates have become much more attuned to the requirements of this question. There are fewer generalised assessments of the extract and many more detailed examinations of the specific issues. In some responses, there are still passages that discuss at length the value of the sources. This may be relevant in assessing the specific information used to support the candidate's analysis. However, lines of generalised evaluation of an author are not rewarded in Question 3. There are marks for knowledge and understanding, and for evaluating the interpretation.

Most responses focused almost entirely on the phrase in the question, assessing the three issues. Very good responses introduced the other points in the interpretation within the overall assessment.

The issue of the reaction of the 'aristocrats' produced mixed responses, both agreement and disagreement. Some argued that, as Cassius Dio says, the senate willingly handed over power. They also pointed to the joy at Gaius' accession and, partially, at Nero's. Others argued the willingness was forced (again as Cassius Dio says) and the joy short-lived; the existence of plots also supported this view. However, there were well-supported, coherent assessments on both sides.

There were equally well-argued and well-supported evaluations of the reactions of the ordinary Romans. Some responses were underdeveloped in citing one unstable event in the period as evidence that there was little stability. The event was either the fire of AD 64 or Gaius' assassination, the latter a short-lived disruption at best. The various wars on the frontiers were cited as lack of peace, while others argued there was no Civil War until AD 69.

The point about the merits of magistrates or bureaucrats in charge was successfully assessed. However, some candidates did not read the passage carefully; Shelton is referring to bureaucrats, when speaking of those who had no illusions of power not the emperors. Some argued that it was unconvincing because emperors did seek power. Other responses pointed to Sejanus as a counter argument. Some took issue with freedmen under Claudius. Most candidates agreed that the administration was better in the Imperial period. As always, there were generalisations on the improvement of lives, because of 'bread and circuses' without citing evidence that lives were better.

Misconception



The reference to Juvenal's 'bread and circuses' rarely includes the context: in Satire 10 Juvenal is complaining that the people, who have given up their votes, abdicated their duties and abilities to reward with honours and commands, now only want bread and circuses. It is a critique of the Imperial system and the ordinary people, just as Tacitus claims people were 'seduced' by Augustus.

Exemplar 2

Shelton's interpretation that the majority benefitted from the Julio-Claudian government is largely a convincing one. Indeed his claim that the "people most bitter about imperial rule were the aristocrats" is convincing as we are told by Suetonius and ^{Tacitus} Dio of the increasing discontent of the aristocracy. In Tacitus' *Annals* Tiberius' reign is characterised by the aristocrats' plight and discontent as the praetorian guards and prefect Sejanus come to power, highlighting their discontent with the Julio-Claudian imperial system.

Moreover, it is important to note that our sources are overwhelmingly aristocratic and, whilst his works the details of the lives of the poor and marginalised groups hardly to be understood,

it does provide further evidence to back Shelton's claim. There is, in much of our extant literature a particular focus on the plight of the elite and the loss of power in the Senate. Indeed much of Tacitus' Annals holds a great deal of often thinly veiled bitterness towards the Julio-Claudian dynasty and the treatment of the elite, particularly the humiliation of them under Gaius, the abuse suffered in the maiestas trials and his loss of power, as the system of centralised power to the emperor.

However, Shelton's claim that their bitterness was due to a loss of power "political power which had belonged to their ancestors" ~~was~~ is perhaps less convincing. Whilst it is true that the Senate lost much of their legislative power, it is also true that with a new system of government, many did have the opportunity to grow their status.

Augustus himself in the Res Gestae notes his reforms to the Senate, but ~~phrases them~~ ^{they were} as reforms, not the ~~also~~ total destruction of the Senatorial elite, a fact which Shelton perhaps fails to consider. Under Augustus many members of the Senate, and other elite ranks, particularly the equestrians, saw great rise in status. Augustus' building programme provi-

The paragraph in Exemplar 2 illustrates the focus of a precise element of the passage and a balance of argument for and against its view.

It begins by quoting accurately from the passage. There is evidence from the sources to support the statement, with a specific example of the reasons for aristocratic discontent. The issue of how accurate the evidence is for the view is introduced as part of the evaluation of the passage, not as added information on the source. The nature of the sources, it is argued, makes judgement on the reactions of various groups difficult to assess. The candidate develops the view that the sources create the impression of a bitterness, supporting it with a further precise example. Once this aspect is established, the response develops an alternative view. It argues that Shelton has overstated the bitterness. It suggests that loss of power was replaced by increased status and roles for the elite, using a reference to *Res Gestae* (which could be more detailed or specific). There could be more specific information, and it tends to generalise. However, there is coherent evaluation showing a very good understanding of the issues and the thrust of the extract.

Section B overview

Question 6 was more popular than Question 5. Question 6, however, did lead some candidates into a narrative of incidents (in some cases one incident) rather than an analysis of 'how far'. Both questions produced good responses, many very detailed. Most responses offered a wide range of sources. There was much more use of the material evidence. There were some who chose to answer the Depth study questions first. They clearly had more knowledge and confidence in this area. However, they spent too long on these questions. This left them short of time for the Period study questions. Most candidates covered the period sufficiently well; the majority who attempted Question 5 kept to the shorter period in the question.

Question 4

4 Read the sources below.

Arch of Claudius

Tiberius Clau[dius Cai]sar Augu[stus Germani]cus, son of Drusus, *pontifex maximus*, in his eleventh year of tribunician power, consul five times, hailed as im[perator 22 (or 23) times, father] of his country; erected by the Senate and people of Rome because [he received the submission] of eleven British kings, [conquered without] any loss, and because he first brought barbarian tribes [beyond Ocean] into the dom[inion of the Roman people].

5

ILS 216 [AD 51]

Mendip lead pig

Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus, *pontifex maximus*, in his ninth year of tribunician power, sixteen times acclaimed *imperator*, from the British (*mines*).

RIB 2.1.2404.1 [AD 49]

How useful are these sources for our understanding of the benefits Claudius gained from invading Britain in AD 43?

[12]

Almost all the candidates found material to comment on in the two sources. Very few did not mention the importance of the lead being exploited and the economic benefit to be gained. Many supplemented this with reference to authors who had claimed Britain was rich in minerals. These included Strabo, Tacitus *Agricola* (not the *Annals*) and Julius Caesar. Mela was often referenced. He claims gems and pearls but not minerals. The titles on the Pig were interpreted to show the benefits which included a military reputation.

The Arch generally provided more material to discuss. The reference to 'imperator' was interpreted to mean Claudius gained a military status which he had not had before. Responses generally stressed the need for emperors to have a military background or success. They supported this with Gaius' attempt to invade and Nero's lack of effort, that caused unpopularity. Better responses also considered this gave

him authority over the army. They highlighted the failed plot of Scribonianus as a sign that he needed to prove himself to the army.

The reference to the 'Senate and people of Rome' suggested to some that, after a shaky start, this established his reputation with the public. Responses developed this aspect in terms of legitimising his rule.

The references to '11 kings, expanding beyond the ocean, and without loss' showed Claudius' military ability, as well adding to the Empire, which was similar to Augustus. There was a benefit in being seen as his equivalent, if not better than Caesar who failed to conquer Britain.

Responses often referred to Suetonius' comment that he needed a real triumph, not a paper one. This supported the interpretation that the main benefit was getting the right image as emperor. By this Claudius gained recognition and overcame the impression as a weak emperor accidentally chosen.

Finally, most responses recognised the two sources as essentially propaganda which served to promote the image Claudius wanted. Responses usually challenged the idea of 'without loss' in this area.

Question 5*

5* How far can we trust the ancient accounts of the conquest of Britain AD 43–84?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. [36]

Most responses concentrated on Tacitus, primarily *Agricola*. Many took a chronological approach, starting with the invasion and the reasons for it. There was good knowledge of Cassius Dio on the initial period. Better responses analysed the reasons using both Cassius Dio and information from evidence in Britain, mostly the Verica coin and the mention of him in the text. More successful discussion included Suetonius' point about needing a triumph. Some added the economic prospects, using the Mendip Pig as evidence of a speedy exploitation of resources. The judgements on this area were often very good and fully supported with evidence concerning trustworthiness.

The progress of the conquest was generally well-supported with Cassius Dio initially, then Tacitus *Annals* after Plautius. Less successful responses used only the *Agricola* which is less detailed. Responses highlighted some points in Cassius Dio, mostly why Plautius waited for Claudius. They questioned the excuse that he was afraid to move forward. This was judged to be unlikely. Better responses used detailed examples for analysis of reliability, especially the use of names and particular incidents. It was not uncommon for responses to include Tacitus with Cassius Dio. Responses claimed one account corroborated the other. Unfortunately, we do not have Tacitus' account of the initial stages.

Views differed on the extent to which we can trust Tacitus' account of the pre-Boudicca period. Some responses were critical of Tacitus' portrayal of Scapula. He was said to be unfair in his description of the battle with Caratacus; he was also too critical of his treatment of the Iceni over arms, too slow to deal with the Silures and lucky to get Caratacus given to him. Responses argued it was all to denigrate governors so that *Agricola* would look better. This may be true of the *Agricola* but the account is written much later in the *Annals*.

The Boudicca revolt was given the full treatment. Some responses stopped at this point, although the question asked for AD 43–84. Cassius Dio and Tacitus were compared especially on the reasons. Some responses asked why the 'rape' did not appear in *Agricola*. Her speech there focuses on slavery, taxes,

and general violence and greed. Responses developed judgements that Cassius Dio's issue of loans and taxes was more likely to produce widespread revolt than a local mistreatment. Opinions on who to trust tended to favour Cassius Dio. This was balanced by Dio's mention of only two towns and rather large figures. One point in Tacitus' favour was that Agricola was present during the revolt. Responses all criticised the speeches as fiction. Better responses compared Tacitus' version to the ones in *Agricola* given by Boudicca and later Calgacus. Similarities and differences were analysed suggesting again less trust in the accounts. The two authors differ on how she died, leading to further doubts.

Responses which dealt with post AD 60 found good material in the account of Cartimandua's marital problems in the *Histories*. There were also some references made to the brief information on Cerialis and Frontinus. Better responses were more informed on the issue of Cerialis' advance into territory Tacitus claims for Agricola. They used archaeological material which shows his advance well into Brigantian territory. The issue of the existence of Calgacus and/or the battle at Mons Graupius was dealt with in depth. Some with great detail and enthusiasm. None could deny the existence of thousands of nails as proof at least of Agricola's fort in the north of Scotland.

Tacitus' account of other governors especially in the *Agricola* was often dismissed as unfair and untrustworthy. This was due to his bias towards Agricola. Equally his portraits of British leaders were criticised as stereotypical 'noble savages' and not trustworthy. The claims in *Agricola* 21 of romanisation were cited but largely unevaluated. Few provided any specific examples. The Forum at Verulamium rarely appeared.

Several responses reached the highest levels by focusing on specific passages or elements of the sources and examined them in detail. They used supporting evidence where possible. Less successful ones narrated much of what the sources said with only a few efforts to analyse.

Misconception



Tacitus does not have a full account of the invasion in AD 43; these books are missing; he does give a very short mention in the *Agricola*.

It is important that the information Tacitus gives about Britain in his three works – *Agricola*, *Histories* and *Annals* are clearly distinguished from each other. Candidates seem to be unsure of when they were written *Agricola* AD 98; *Histories* AD 105; *Annals* AD 117. It is often stated that he wrote 'under Domitian' (meaning while he was alive).

Question 6*

6* How far did Roman treatment of the Britons cause discontent?

You must use and analyse the ancient sources you have studied as well as your own knowledge to support your answer. [36]

Better responses dealt with 'how far' by analysing the treatment and relating it to the extent of discontent. Less successful responses provided narratives of 'discontent' and mistreatment. Most responses sought to provide a balance between good and bad treatment. Good responses assessed the levels of discontent throughout the period. However, many stopped at AD 60, and assumed little, if any, discontent after that date.

Examples of mistreatment were largely focused on Boudicca. Better responses also dealt with the invasion and Caratacus' resistance. More detailed responses dealt with the first Iceni revolt and Scapula's role in fomenting discontent. Well-informed responses had detail on the difficulties Scapula had with the Silures and Ordovices. The early Brigantian disturbance was also noted by some. Higher level responses noted that most of this discontent was down to being invaded as much as treatment. Evidence for this (though doubtful) was Caratacus' speech to Claudius.

In contrast, many responses pointed to Cogidubnus and Fishbourne, as well as Cartimandua, for alternative reactions to the Romans. The Chichester dedication and Tacitus' reference to Cogidubnus proved useful evidence. Tacitus' account of Cartimandua handing over Caratacus served as useful evidence of a lack of discontent (at least among elites). Some discussed the general 'benefits' of Roman civilisation in agriculture, trade, industry and so on. They tended to generalise with limited specific evidence to suggest people in general were contented with the Romans.

Boudicca dominated some responses. In general, the accounts were analysed very well. Responses evaluated the differences in treatment between Cassius Dio and Tacitus sensibly. Better responses assessed the merits of the economic causes against the abuse of Boudicca and her daughters. Many argued that the loans and taxes were more likely to produce discontent. Better responses evaluated the various speeches for treatment, including the later one by Calgacus. Good responses noted similarities and differences in their complaints of bad treatment. It was also evident that discontent did not end with Boudicca as some suggested.

The marital problems of Cartimandua and Venutius led to Roman involvement. Responses assessed this as internal, not the result of Roman treatment. Venutius was seen as resisting Roman occupation. For some, this indicated Romans were partly responsible. Some responses mentioned the attack on the Druids as a cause of discontent but not linked to any revolt as such. The continued campaigns of Cerialis and Frontinus against the Silures, Ordovices and Brigantes are not well covered in the sources. There are still signs of resistance even when Agricola arrives. These aspects were rarely covered.

Some responses used the Vindolanda tablets as a sign of relative peace. Very few indicated the dates of these. They were linked to Hadrian's Wall. Some responses developed the view that there must still be discontent in the north for it to be built. They quoted *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* and the coin of Hadrian indicating a possible success over the British. Well-informed responses referenced the Titus Pontius inscription as evidence of a disturbance.

Exemplar 3

Another factor that caused discontent was the conduct of the Romans. The Silures were part of early resistance to Roman rule, originally ~~as~~ supporting Caractacus they carried out a large scale rebellion over several years after the governor, Scapula commented how he wanted to destroy the entire tribe. Tacitus states that eventually Scapula "worn out by the burden of his anxieties, died." This quote means that the rebellion was such a threat that Scapula's anxiety eventually killed him.

Tacitus may be a reliable source for this as as a senator he may have access to the records of the governor transfer and the reason behind it.

However, as his father in law Agricola was a Roman governor he may have been attempting to create a more flattering portrayal of him in comparison to Scapula, especially as he is writing in the memory of Agricola's death. This piece of evidence demonstrates how Roman actions caused discontent as the Silures were driven to keep fighting as they feared the Romans would kill them all if they didn't this led to a major rebellion that lasted a couple of years and the death of a Roman governor. Another example is the treatment of the Trinovantes by the veterans in Colchester the veterans cruel treatment towards the Trinovantes consisted of things like taking their lands and other acts this led to wide spread —

- discontent and resentment culminating in the Trinovantes starting Boudicca revolt. If the veterans ~~hadn't~~ hadn't treated the Trinovantes poorly it is likely that without this treatment the Trinovantes would have gone along peacefully with Roman rule like many other tribes had. Both these examples demonstrate ~~was~~ how discontent was caused by the Roman's treatment of the Britons as without Scapula's comment and the veterans' cruelty peace between each tribe could have been created and maintained.

The Exemplar 3 response starts well, with detail of the Silures resistance, stated to be over several years. The response rightly mentions the Tacitean claim that Scapula wished to destroy the tribe. This supports the view that harsh treatment led to discontent. Added to this evidence is the fact that, according to Tacitus, Scapula died worn out by the strength of the resistance. The response interprets this to mean it was a great threat. So far, the response has made a convincing or plausible analysis using relevant and largely detailed evidence. Evaluation of Tacitus' claims suggests they are trustworthy since Tacitus could have seen documents relating to the events. Conversely, he may be unreliable given his bias towards Agricola. The problem is that *Annals* is written sometime after Agricola's death and the biography/eulogy and does not cover Agricola (ending technically in AD 68). While the comment may be valid for the *Agricola* it is speculative at best for the *Annals*. The response is using a generalised evaluation which is not specifically tied to the evidence being used. It gives the impression that the candidate thinks the information on Scapula is from the earlier book.

The response then almost contradicts itself by stating the revolt lasted a couple of years (having said several years). It did last more than a couple of years. Support for the conclusion on treatment continues with the case of the Trinovantes and Colchester. This lacks some detail but is basically accurate. However, it states they started the Boudicca revolt. The speculation that there would not be a revolt but for the treatment is unsupported. There is no mention of the issues surrounding the veterans and the Temple of Claudius.

The passage has good elements but is kept from the higher levels by some misunderstanding and some lack of detail with an occasional error.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Access to Scripts

We've made it easier for Exams Officers to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts'. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular professional development courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the exam paper builder platform for a range of our qualifications. [Find out more](#).

Free for all OCR centres with an Interchange account, it allows unlimited users per centre. We require an [Interchange](#) username to verify your centre's users for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account, please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username.

Once you have an Interchange username, use the form on [this page](#) to sign up for ExamBuilder, or ask an existing user at your centre to create an ExamBuilder account for you.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals (examined units only).

[Find out more](#).

Tell us what you think

Your feedback plays an important role in how we develop, market, support and resource qualifications now and into the future. We want you and your students to enjoy and get the best out of our qualifications and resources, but to do that we need your honest opinions to tell us whether we're on the right track or not.

You can email your thoughts to resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk or visit our [feedback page](#) to learn more about how you can help us improve our resources.



Designing and testing in [collaboration with you](#) and your students



Helping young people develop an [ethical view of the world](#)



Equality, diversity, inclusion and belonging (EDIB) are [part of everything we do](#)

Contact the team at:

☎ 01223 553998

🖥 ocr.org.uk

To stay up to date with all the relevant news about our qualifications, register for email updates at ocr.org.uk/updates

Visit our Online Support Centre at support.ocr.org.uk



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

OCR is a Company Limited by Guarantee and an exempt charity. Registered in England. Registered office: The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number: 3484466.

We operate academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers.

We are committed to providing a fully accessible experience across all our products, platforms, and websites. Find out more about our [accessibility standards](#).

© OCR 2025. All rights reserved. We retain the copyright on all our publications. However, our registered centres are permitted to copy and distribute our material for their own internal use, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the publication. Find out more about our [copyright policies](#).

We update our publications regularly so please check you have the most up-to-date version.

We cannot be held responsible for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and do not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

When we update our specifications, you'll see a new version number and a summary of the changes. While we do our best to reflect these changes in all associated resources on [Teach Cambridge](#), if you notice any discrepancies, please refer to the latest specification on our website and [let us know](#).

Our resources do not represent any teaching method we expect you to use. We cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in our resources.