



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

Classical Civilisation 1021

Athenian Imperialism

AS Unit 2D

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

INTRODUCTION

The information provided for each question is intended to be a guide to the kind of answers anticipated and is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. **All appropriate responses should be given credit.**

Where Greek and Latin terms appear in the Mark Scheme, they do so generally for the sake of brevity. Knowledge of such terms, other than those given in the specification, is **not** required. However, when determining the level of response for a particular answer, examiners should take into account any instances where the candidate uses Greek or Latin terms effectively to aid the clarity and precision of the argument.

Information in round brackets is not essential to score the mark.

DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

The following procedure must be adopted in marking by levels of response:

- read the answer as a whole
- work down through the descriptors to find the one which best fits
- determine the mark from the mark range associated with that level, judging whether the answer is nearer to the level above or to the one below.

Since answers will rarely match a descriptor in all respects, examiners must allow good performance in some aspects to compensate for shortcomings in other respects. Consequently, the level is determined by the 'best fit' rather than requiring every element of the descriptor to be matched. Examiners should aim to use the full range of levels and marks, taking into account the standard that can reasonably be expected of candidates after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course and in the time available in the examination.

Candidates are **not** necessarily required to respond to all the bullet points in order to reach Level 5 or Level 4, but they should cover a sufficient range of material to answer the central aspects of the question.

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

The Quality of Written Communication will be taken into account in all questions worth 10 or more marks. This will include the candidate's ability

- to communicate clearly, ensuring that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate
- to select and use an appropriate form and style of writing, and
- to organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 10 MARKS

| | | |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| Level 4 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accurate and relevant knowledge covering central aspects of the question • clear understanding of central aspects of the question • ability to put forward an argument which for the most part has an analytical and/or evaluative focus appropriate to the question and uses knowledge to support opinion • ability generally to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 9-10 |
| Level 3 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • some understanding of some aspects of the question • some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question • some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 6-8 |
| Level 2 | <p>Demonstrates either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them. | 3-5 |
| Level 1 | <p>Demonstrates either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it. | 1-2 |

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 5 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well chosen, accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question • coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question • ability to sustain an argument which • has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus, • responds to the precise terms of the question, • effectively links comment to detail, • has a clear structure • reaches a reasoned conclusion • is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and • makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 19-20 |
| Level 4 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generally adequate, accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question • understanding of many of the central aspects of the question • ability to develop an argument which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus, is broadly appropriate to the question, mainly supports comment with detail and has a discernible structure is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 14-18 |
| Level 3 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • some understanding of some aspects of the question • some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question • some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar • some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 9-13 |
| Level 2 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them • and sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 5-8 |
| Level 1 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either some patchy, accurate and relevant knowledge • or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it • and little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 1-4 |

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS

| | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 5 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well chosen, accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question • coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question • ability to sustain an argument which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus, responds to the precise terms of the question, effectively links comment to detail, has a clear structure reaches a reasoned conclusion is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 27-30 |
| Level 4 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generally adequate, accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question • understanding of many of the central aspects of the question • ability to develop an argument which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus, is broadly appropriate to the question, mainly supports comment with detail has a discernible structure is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 20-26 |
| Level 3 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • some understanding of some aspects of the question • some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question • some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar • some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. | 13-19 |
| Level 2 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them • and writes with sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 7-12 |
| Level 1 | <p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either some patchy, accurate and relevant knowledge • or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it • and little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 1-6 |

Mark Scheme
Unit 2D Athenian Imperialism

Section One

Option A

01 *In what circumstances was this decree made? Give two details.*

Two from: Athens has put down revolt by Erythraians (1) / in about 453 BC (1) / probably over payment of tribute (1) / and possibly seeking help from Persia (1)

(2 marks)

02 *Give three conditions, other than the oath, which the Athenians made when they established the council referred to in line 1.*

Three from: 120 councillors to serve (1) / no foreigners on council (1) / members must be aged at least 30 (1) / no one to serve twice within four years (1) / they were to call destruction on themselves if they broke the oath (1) / election must be arranged not less than 30 days before Council's expiry date (1) / Erythraians to supply corn (1) / garrison set up (1)

(3 marks)

03 *On the basis of this passage, how fair do you think the Athenians were in their dealings with the Erythraians?*

Discussion might include: it immediately sounds like an ultimatum ('the council is to swear'); it may be fair in that the 'best and most just counsel' is for the benefit of Erythrai and the allies, not just Athens; ditto the 'I will not revolt' which includes the allies, but may not be fair in refusing self-determination to the Erythraians; 'I will not receive any of the exiles' stops help to rebels which may be seen as fair; reference to the non-persuasion by those 'who flee to the Persians' seems to be in line with the original aims of the Delian League; the promise not to 'drive out any .. who have stayed without the agreement of the Athenians' is confusing, but clearly imposes Athenian law onto the local populace; the final section appears fair on the surface; not only will those who murder an Erythraian be exiled, but their money will go to the locals, not the Athenians or the alliance; 'if condemned' suggests a fair system of investigation: (but what if an Athenian were to murder an Erythraian?)

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

04 From the rest of this decree and other inscriptions you have read, how typical of the Athenians' treatment of their allies after 454 BC was their treatment of Erythrai?

You might include discussion of

- *the probable dates and circumstances of the decrees*
- *the rest of the decrees involving Erythrai*
- *decrees dealing with Miletus and Kolophon*
- *the arrangements for Khalkis*
- *the Kleinias Decree*
- *the Coinage Decree.*

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g.

- rest of Erythrai Decrees: reason for these measures (rebellion of an ally; likely date 453); other conditions: election of democratic council (going further than with a number of other allies); appointment of garrison commander (seen elsewhere e.g. Miletos); setting up of regulations in public place (as at Kolophon for example)
- Miletus: decree fragmentary but probably from 450; likely reason for intervention was failure to deliver tribute (or rebellion – some evidence from tribute lists); clear similarities to treatment of Erythrai: clearly a garrison was set up plus system of fines for defaulters; oath fragmentary but seems to be similar to Erythrai; similar tough treatment for two cities attempting to leave League?
- Kolophon: suggested was a defaulter on payment (also rebel? – no mention of garrison, so possibly not); later date than other two - probably between 449 and 446: oath clearer here than at Miletos and with similarities to Erythrai: no apparent reference to loyalty to allies (given later date, was Athens not bothering to hide total domination by now?); rather dramatic condition promising to 'love' the Athenian people; also promises required of positive affirmation of Athenian rule (as opposed to simple acquiescence); specific pro-democracy pledge required; similar setting up of terms in public to Erythrai
- Khalkis: probably just after Kolophon (446/5); seems to have been a major disturbance here (full rebellion?); appears on the surface more positive ('I will not expel Khalkidians from Khalkis ..') but was this just to protect pro-Athenians there? ('.. while the Khalkidians obey the Athenian people'; similarly the condition that judicial action against ex-magistrates should be referred to Athens was probably to prevent intimidation of pro-Athenian Khalkidians); by now oaths seem to have reached standard format (no reference to allies; more specific draconian measures for anyone not obeying); non-Khalkidians also to swear; usual public display of terms in Khalkis
- Kleinias Decree: (assumed 440s but not clear); suggests measures required to deal with tailing-off of tribute payment: named officials in allied states to take responsibility for collecting tribute and transporting to Athens; system of sealed tablets identifying amount enclosed; defaulters to be named on list and pursued; could be seen as fair to both parties (measures to prevent corrupt behavior by Athenians as well as false claims by allies); very detailed procedures (highly bureaucratic)
- Coinage Decree: (possibly 440s but could be at least 20 years later); may be seen as essentially negative measure (starts with long list of punishments for offenders – loss of property & rights); imposed Athenian coinage, weights and measures on the allies: loss of rights or sensible rationalization? Many allies did not mint own coinage at this time; usual public displaying of terms (credit for positive as well as negative points – e.g. offer to exchange foreign coinage).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Option B

05 Why did the Athenians make an expedition against Melos in 416/5 BC?

One from: Melos had refused to join the Athenian Empire (1) / had claimed to be neutral (1) / was allied to Sparta (1) / declared itself an enemy of Athens (1)

(1 mark)

06 What was the Melians' response to the Athenian speeches? Give two details.

Two from: they refused (to join the Athenian Empire) (1) / asked to be allowed to remain neutral (1) / offered to make a treaty **or** be friends with Athens (1) / put their trust in the gods (1) / and Sparta (1) / said they would save themselves (1)

(2 marks)

07 How did the Athenians treat Melos after capturing the city? Give two details.

Two from: forced an (unconditional) surrender (1) / killed all men (1) / of military age (1) / enslaved / sold (all women and children) (1) / made their city an Athenian colony (1) / by sending 500 new inhabitants (1)

(2 marks)

08 How reasonable are the Athenians' arguments and tone in the passage?

Discussion might include: calm tone throughout as if being reasonable, but is this in line with the words being spoken? They do the Melians the credit of speaking plainly ('no fine phrases'); they are honest, not pretending to attack because of 'injuries you have done us', dismissing such tactics as 'a great mass of words'; 'nobody would believe' may be seen as worthy of comment – did the Athenians at this time care what anyone else believed? The Athenians are out to show that they cannot be won over by clever words: the Melians may not 'have joined Sparta in the war' or 'done us any harm', but the message seems to be that we can't take a chance that you might do; 'we recommend' sounds reasonable but may be seen as a threat; call on the Melians to acknowledge the weakness of their position; 'practical people' is a further threat – there will be no emotion if called on to destroy Melos; 'equality of power'; a reminder that there is no equality here; 'the strong' are the Athenians, 'the weak' the Melians; 'the power to do' = destroy you; 'what (you) have to accept' = do as you are told.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

- 09 ***‘The Athenians’ view of themselves changed between the build-up to the Peloponnesian war and the Melian Dialogue.’ From your reading of the speeches in Thucydides, how far do you agree?***

You might include discussion of

- ***the Debate at Sparta in 432 BC***
- ***Pericles’ speech in 430 BC***
- ***the Mytilenian Debate in 427 BC.***
- ***the rest of the Athenian speeches in the Melian Dialogue of 416/5 BC.***

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g.

- Debate at Sparta called because of accusations made by Corinth that Athens’ imperial aims were threatening the stability of Greece; Athens in response refused to address this (‘not a court of law’) but restated without modesty her leading role in the Persian Wars; contrasting the efforts of the hosts Sparta at that time with their own (‘you feared for yourselves ...we helped to save not only ourselves but you also’); then a restatement of Athenian virtues (‘courage, resolution and .. ability’), followed by the key points: ‘we did not gain this empire by force’ (ie. while Sparta couldn’t be bothered, Athens defended Greece); you Spartans have built a similar empire in the Peloponnese - don’t talk to us of ‘right or wrong’; we don’t trust your intentions towards our empire; we won’t give it up (it is ‘a rule that the weak should be subject to the strong’); we are very kind to our allies but they take advantage of this (‘they cease to feel grateful’ when *small* problems arise); our allies would fare much worse under you! Don’t make war on us – you’ll be sorry; reminder that their treaty required arbitration to sort differences
- Pericles was speaking in tough times at Athens - 430; war had started with Sparta; not going well; great plague; speech is essentially a restatement of Athens being best and needing to maintain this: criticized Athenians for backtracking on war; stressed importance of patriotism; war was forced on Athens unwillingly; sea power has made Athens what she is; you must not ‘fall below the standards of your fathers’ – he follows with the key point: you should feel ‘an actual sense of your superiority’; we have ‘real reasons for knowing that (we) are better placed than (our) opponents’; he speaks of ‘imperial dignity’ - ‘your Empire is now like a tyranny’ but it remains a ‘great aim’; concludes with restatement of approval of gods; credit for other views implicit in need for such a strong speech
- Mytilenian Debate (427) suggests later divergence of opinion within Athens: Cleon represents traditional view above, Diodotus a move for change; war was indecisive; revolt of Mytilene posed problem of how to respond: **Cleon**: Athens is a ‘tyranny’ with ‘subjects who do not like it’; gentle treatment will backfire; ‘very worst thing’ is to ‘pass measures and then not to abide by them’; too many clever talkers are weakening the Athenian position; need for quick action, not weak delay; blames Mytilene for rebelling – calls it ‘calculated aggression’; accuses Mytilenians of ‘arrogance’; calls for the ‘punishment .. their crime deserves’; points out all other allies are watching – need to ‘make an example of them to your other allies **Diodotus**: avoid haste and anger; asks for ‘fair argument’; like Cleon, only interested in this from Athenian viewpoint & need for the ‘right decisions for ourselves’; rejects Cleon’s ‘deterrence’ argument; examples of why it doesn’t work (human nature); argues for the ‘possibility of repentance’; no future rebels will surrender if they see their destruction is inevitable’; they should take ‘tremendous care’ of their allies; just condemn the few guilty as an example; credit for examining the relevance of these two arguments to the title
- Melian Dialogue: similarity to earlier approach in Debate at Sparta (can’t be bothered to discuss right and wrong; Athens is strong, Melos weak; similar warning – join us and survive, lose and we destroy you; evidence that the Cleon view prevailed (despite

Diodotus winning the immediate vote) – credit for discussing reasons; Athenian faith in gods echoes Pericles' certainty about Athenian superiority; credit for using material in 220 only if directed specifically to the title

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Section Two

Option C

- 10 ***How important was the revolt of Naxos and how important were other factors in the transformation of the Delian League into an Athenian Empire between 479 and 454 BC? Give the reasons for your views and refer to the books of Thucydides you have read.***

You might include discussion of

- ***reasons for the original terms of the Delian League***
- ***the League's activities before the revolt of Naxos***
- ***Athenian treatment of Naxos compared to other rebel cities***
- ***Athens' relationship with Sparta during these years***
- ***the effects of events in Egypt.***

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g.

- the need for a united Greek response to the threats from the invading Persians; early attempts to include Sparta in the mix; failings of Spartan Pausanias as leader; clamour for Athenian leadership; formation of League; stated intention to ravage the territory of the Persians; tribute agreed to fund this with treasury at Delos to stress panhellenic nature of the league
- early ventures of the league: siege of **Eion**: 476; occupied by Persians; Cimon Greek leader (pro League); Persian settlers sold as slaves; secondary (?) issue of gold mines; capture of **Scyros**: 472; no direct Persian connection; Greek inhabitants (Dolopians) but many pirates causing trouble; Athenian issue of bones of Theseus; Athenian cleruchy established; credit for relevant judgement on importance of episode; subjugation of **Carystus**: 472; result of refusal to join league so not a member but near Persia so fear in leaving neutral? Probable start of disquiet among some members
- Naxos & other rebels: 469; **Naxos** revolted but vital ship-building member of League; asked to secede; refused; besieged and defeated; autonomy removed from Naxos; 'first case when .. constitution broken' (Thucydides) but could be argued Naxos breaking rules by failing to carry out agreed role; credit for assessing importance of this moment; next major rebellion **Thasos**: 465; wealthy city (mines); one of largest contributors; dispute over Athenian claim to mines; Thasos seceded; was besieged; beaten (despite offer of help from Sparta); lost independence; credit for assessing turning point compared to Naxos; worth considering events of 468 in between Naxos & Thasos - battle of **Eurymedon**: Cimon leading League against Persian fleet; crushing Greek victory; spoils used for rebuilding Athenian walls; effective end of Persian threat
- growing Spartan jealousy & anxiety after Eurymedon; after seeking (and gaining) Athenian help against helots of **Laconia**, Sparta rejected it (c 460); with change of leadership in Athens (Cimon to Pericles), cooperation between the two ceased; move of **Megara** from Spartan to Athenian alliance (460) increased tension; after Egyptian campaign Sparta saw Athenian threat now clearly an imperial power; steady drift to war from 454 onwards; credit for assessing importance of changing relations with Sparta compared to Naxos turning point

- disastrous Athenian defeat in **Egypt** (454) despite Spartans refusing to join Persia against Athens while her forces occupied there; allied treasury moved from Delos to Athens for 'security'; end of League meetings; generally accepted end of League and confirmation of empire; credit for assessing importance relative to Naxos.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Option D

- 11 ***'Over-confidence in their own abilities was the main reason why the Athenians failed in the Sicilian expedition.'***

To what extent do you agree? Give the reasons for your views and refer to the parts of Thucydides Book 6 you have read.

You might include discussion of

- Athenian motives in undertaking the Sicilian expedition***
- support for the expedition in Athens***
- Athenian leadership of the expedition***
- the attitudes of Athens' allies, in Sicily and elsewhere***
- the involvement of Sparta in the campaign.***

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g.

- motives: ostensibly longstanding alliance between Athens and Egesta; Egestans sought support from Athens in struggle with Syracuse over Leontini; possible other motives: Athens used to building Empire; saw chance to extend in a new direction and show example to waverers in alliance; Sicily an island rich in resources; chance to put one over on Sparta who had interests there; credit for incorporating supporting evidence from Debate at Camarina (Athenian duplicity, arrogance etc.)
- support at home: Thucydides stresses ignorance of Athenians regarding size of task they were undertaking; initial struggle in Athens over how to respond to Egestans; dangerous split in Assembly: Nicias spoke against (but was chosen as co-leader); Alcibiades (and majority of speakers) was in favour; selected as co-leader he was prosecuted and recalled from Sicily early in the campaign; Nicias' request for reinforcements after early problems at Syracuse was granted, but did not have desired effect; his request for recall refused leaving troops under a demoralised leader
- leadership issues: early recall of Alcibiades left strategy in hands of uncommitted Nicias; hesitant approach, arrogant approach to allies (e.g. Euphemus' words at Camarina); poor tactics at Syracuse (Nicias ill); disastrous defeat of reinforcements at Battle of Great Harbour as Nicias dithered on land; total annihilation of Athenian forces followed
- cumulative effect of decline in League support for Athens (since moving of treasury in 454 and effects of war with Sparta) outside Sicily ensured allies waited and watched, rather than supporting actively; treatment of allies in Sicily during campaign was arrogant yet ineffectual (again credit for evidence from Camarina and comment by Thucydides); sense allies in Greece looking to Sparta as liberators rather than enemy
- renaissance of Spartan power under Gylippus key factor; recent Athenian actions made Sparta only too ready to intervene; excellent dynamic leadership from Gylippus far out – manoeuvring Nicias; strength of Syracuse as Spartan ally far outweighed Athenian support from Egesta etc.; Syracusan sea power instrumental in Athenian defeat; Athenian driving of Alcibiades into Spartan hands another key factor; he worked with Gylippus to good effect.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Assessment Objectives Grid
Unit 2D Athenian Imperialism

Section 1

Either
Option A

| | AO1 | AO2 | TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| 01 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 02 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 03 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 04 | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| TOTAL | 18 | 17 | 35 |

Or
Option B

| | AO1 | AO2 | TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| 05 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 06 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 07 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 08 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 09 | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| TOTAL | 18 | 17 | 35 |

Section Two

Either
Option C

| | AO1 | AO2 | TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| 10 | 12 | 18 | 30 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 18 | 30 |

Or
Option D

| | AO1 | AO2 | TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| 11 | 12 | 18 | 30 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 18 | 30 |

OVERALL

| | AO1 | AO2 | TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| TOTAL | 30 | 35 | 65 |
| % | 46% | 54% | 100% |

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion