Ancient History 2019 v1.2

IA3 mid-level annotated sample response

October 2018

Investigation — historical essay based on research (25%)

This sample has been compiled by the QCAA to assist and support teachers to match evidence in student responses to the characteristics described in the instrument-specific marking guide (ISMG).

Assessment objectives

This assessment instrument is used to determine student achievement in the following objectives:

1. comprehend terms, concepts and issues in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in the Ancient World

2. devise historical questions and conduct research in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in a particular period in the Ancient World

3. analyse evidence from historical sources to show understanding in relation to a topic focused on the nature of power and how it was exercised in the Ancient World

4. synthesise evidence from historical sources to form a historical argument in relation to a topic focused on a powerful individual, group or society in the Ancient World

5. evaluate evidence from historical sources to make judgments in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in the Ancient World

6. create a historical essay based on research that communicates meaning to suit purpose in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in the Ancient World.

Instrument-specific marking guide (ISMG)

Criterion: Comprehending

Assessment objective

1. comprehend terms, concepts and issues in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in the Ancient World

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
• thorough and mostly accurate use of terms placed into historical contexts • detailed explanation of issues related to the key inquiry question • informed understanding of the relationship between concepts and a variety of ideas developed in response to the key inquiry question.	3–4
• appropriate use of terms placed into historical contexts • adequate explanation of issues related to the key inquiry question • reasonable understanding of the relationship between concepts and the key inquiry question.	2
• partial, fragmented or mostly inaccurate use of a term or terms • rudimentary explanation of an issue or issues • superficial understanding of the link between a concept or concepts and the key inquiry question or topic.	1
• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Devising and conducting

Assessment objective

2. devise historical questions and conduct research in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in a particular period in the Ancient World

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
• discerning use of historical questions by creating a nuanced key inquiry question • detailed use of historical research by using evidence from primary and secondary sources that demonstrate application of the key inquiry question and hypothesis • selection of evidence from primary and secondary sources that offer different perspectives.	3
• appropriate use of historical questions by creating a key inquiry question • adequate use of historical research by using evidence from primary or secondary sources that demonstrate application of the key inquiry question or hypothesis • selection of evidence from primary or secondary sources that offer perspectives.	2
• partial or fragmented use of historical questions by creating a key inquiry question that is irrelevant, non-historical or vague • rudimentary use of historical research by using evidence from a source that relates to the key inquiry question or non-historical statements • selection of a source or sources that offer a perspective.	1
• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Analysing

Assessment objective

3. analyse evidence from historical sources to show understanding in relation to a topic focused on the nature of power and how it was exercised in the Ancient World

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
• discerning use of the features of evidence from primary and secondary sources • detailed examination of the features of evidence from sources • informed explanation about how evidence from primary and secondary sources contributes to the development of the key inquiry question and hypothesis.	3–4
• appropriate use of the features of evidence from sources • adequate examination of the features of evidence from sources • reasonable explanation about how evidence from sources contributes to the development of the key inquiry question or hypothesis.	2
• partial or fragmented identification of a feature of evidence from a source or sources • rudimentary examination of a feature of evidence from a source or sources • superficial explanation about how evidence from a source or sources relate to the key inquiry question, hypothesis or the topic.	1
• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Synthesising

Assessment objective

4. synthesise evidence from historical sources to form a historical argument in relation to a topic focused on a powerful individual, group or society in the Ancient World

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
• combination of information from sources to justify insightful decisions • combination of information from sources to support a sophisticated historical argument • these combinations use evidence from primary and secondary sources.	3–4
• combination of information from sources to justify reasonable decisions • combination of information from sources to support a basic historical argument • these combinations use evidence from primary or secondary sources.	2
• combination of information from a source or sources relates to a partial or fragmented decision • combination of information from a source or sources relates to a superficial or rudimentary historical argument or a non-historical argument • these combinations use evidence from a source.	1
• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Evaluating

Assessment objective

5. evaluate evidence from historical sources to make judgments in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in the Ancient World

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
• discerning judgments about usefulness and reliability • these judgments use evidence from primary and secondary sources and/or refer to different perspectives • these judgments are well-reasoned and corroborated.	5–6
• adequate judgments about usefulness and/or reliability • these judgments use evidence from sources and/or refer to perspectives • these judgments are appropriate and corroborated.	3–4
• partial or fragmented statement/s about usefulness and/or reliability • these statements use evidence from a source and/or refer to a perspective • these statements are inconsistent, superficial or vague.	1–2
• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Creating and communicating

Assessment objective

6. create a historical essay based on research that communicates meaning to suit purpose in relation to a topic focused on people, power and authority in the Ancient World

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
• succinct, with ideas related to the key inquiry question and hypothesis conveyed logically • features of a historical essay based on research and ethical scholarship are consistently demonstrated • minimal errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	3–4
• conveys ideas related to the key inquiry question and/or hypothesis • features of a historical essay based on research and ethical scholarship are demonstrated • some errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	2
• conveys ideas that are frequently unrelated to the key inquiry question • features of a historical essay based on research are inconsistently demonstrated • frequent errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation impede the communication of ideas.	1
• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Task

Context

You have been investigating the ancient society of Rome in the important historical period of the Punic Wars. Your studies have had particular emphasis on the nature and exercise of power and authority in Rome, and how it was challenged in times of conflict.

Task

Investigate an aspect of the Punic Wars and create a historical essay based on research (1500–2000 words). Consider the focus of this unit on people, power and authority.

- Your investigation must reflect the application of key issues raised in our depth study. Individuals and systems from both Rome and Carthage are viable aspects for study.

- Your historical essay must be based on research, and requires sustained analysis, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from historical sources to fully support the hypothesis.

Sample response

Criterion	Marks allocated	Result
Comprehending Assessment objective 1	4	2
Devising and conducting Assessment objective 2	3	2
Analysing Assessment objective 3	4	2
Synthesising Assessment objective 4	4	2
Evaluating Assessment objective 5	6	4
Creating and communicating Assessment objective 6	4	2
Total	**25**	**14**

The annotations show the match to the instrument-specific marking guide (ISMG) performance-level descriptors.

Devising and conducting [2]

appropriate use of historical questions by creating a key inquiry question

Historical questions assessing the development, successes and difficulties of the Roman navy (body paragraphs) are investigated to answer the key inquiry question about the importance of the Roman navy to victory in the First Punic War.

Creating and communicating [2]

features of a historical essay based on research and ethical scholarship are demonstrated

For example, the introduction sets the context, states the hypothesis and outlines the argument.

Comprehending [2]

thorough and mostly accurate use of terms placed into historical contexts

For example, the first two paragraphs show accurate use of the terms 'Punic War', 'Carthaginians' and 'Mamertine Incident'.

adequate explanation of issues related to the key inquiry question

For example, this part of the response explains the issue of naval power, but does not provide details about the competing strategic interests of Rome and Carthage.

How important was the Roman navy to the victory in the First Punic War?

> **adequate use of historical research by using evidence from primary or secondary sources that demonstrate application of the key inquiry question or hypothesis**
>
> Throughout the response, the quality and quantity of research is acceptable, using one key ancient source and several modern secondary sources.
>
> All the evidence located is relevant to the key inquiry question about the importance of the Roman navy in the First Punic War.
>
> **selection of evidence from primary or secondary sources that offer perspectives**
>
> The response presents the perspective of one ancient historian and some modern secondary sources.

The First Punic War was a 23 year war between Rome and Carthage between 264 BCE and 261 BCE. The Romans at the time wanting to have control of Sicily but Carthage had the power there and was in control of the sea in that area. The war was a clash of the two main powers in the region, Rome finally won and Sicily became Rome's first overseas province. It is called the Punic Wars because this is from the name the Romans used for them. Bradley explain that the Carthaginians originally came from Phoenica and the Latin word for Phoencian was *Punicus* (Bradley, 1990). The Roman navy was very important to the victory in the First Punic War. The Romans put a lot of money and effort into building up a navy that could win over the Carthaginians. The Romans were able to defeat the Carthaginian navy in some very important battles. When the Roman fleet was destroyed they were able to find the money to build a new one. The Romans had the money to outlast the Carthaginians so the navy was not the only reason for victory but it was very important.

Carthage was a great sea power based in North Africa near where the modern city of Tunis is. The location provided access to the Mediterranean Sea but was a protected anchorage and easy to defend (Hunt). The Carthaginians were a trading power in the region. Rome had control of the Italian peninsula at this time (Roebuck 1966). The map (see appendix) shows where the Carthaginians controlled and the location of Messana (close to Italy) and the city of Syracuse. The First Punic War started with the Mamertine incident, when the Mamertines who had taken over Messana were threatened by Syracuse and asked first the Carthaginians and then the Romans for help (Mark, 2018, Bradley, 1990). The Roman senate couldn't decide so whether to get involved, so they allowed the people in the assembly to vote. When Rome sent a force to Messana to help, the Carthaginians were asked to leave and felt betrayed by the Mamertines (Mark, 2018, Bradley, 1990). What started as a local dispute in Messana led to the outbreak of war between Rome and Carthage over who would have control of Sicily.

> **Comprehending [2]**
>
> **reasonable understanding of the relationship between concepts and the key inquiry question**
>
> For example, the paragraph above demonstrates a reasonable understanding of cause and effect, and significance, by suggesting how a local dispute can lead to a larger conflict. However, it does not demonstrate an understanding of factors such as the Roman assembly's reasons for voting to accept the Mamertines into their alliance, or possible Carthaginian ambitions.

Annotations	Response
Evaluating [4] **adequate judgments about usefulness and/or reliability** For example, this part of the response makes a determination that Polybius is reliable (with some explanation). **these judgments use evidence from sources and/or refer to perspectives** For example, this part of the response describes Polybius's methods (citing Walbank), but does not explain Polybius's perspective on Rome. **Analysing [2]** **appropriate use of the features of evidence from sources** This part of the response identifies the origin of most evidence quoted and cited. The response makes use of explicit meanings of evidence in sources throughout, but seldom identifies other features of evidence (e.g. motive, audience, perspective, context, implicit meanings). **Evaluating [4]** **these judgments are appropriate and corroborated** This part of the response notes that the evidence from Polybius is corroborated by a military historian, strengthening the reliability of the information. **Analysing [2]** **adequate examination of the features of evidence from sources** This part of the response examines the explicit meanings of evidence from Polybius by paraphrasing and quoting.	The main ancient source we have for the Punic Wars is Polybius who was the Greek historian. He is a very reliable source through his detailed books "The Histories". There were 40 books but I-V are extant and the rest are fragments found in other books (Walbank, 2018. Today historians base a lot of their work on the "Histories" of Polybius where he wrote about main events in Roman history. Book I talks about the First Punic War. Polybius method of doing history is like modern historical methods. Polybius regarded oral sources and the questioning of witnesses as the most important part of a historian's task. Polybius saw his task as a historian was to collate documents, know relevant geographical features, and understand politics. He travelled widely in the region and consulted many Greek and Roman writers but he didn't name them (Walbank, 2018). There is not much available from the Carthaginians as they were the defeated ones and were destroyed at the end of the Third Punic War in146 BCE. Bradley is a very reliable textbook writer and also provides detailed information on the Punic Wars. Roebuck from Northwestern University is a very reliable secondary source and text book writer about the ancient world. These are some of the main sources on the First Punic War. The Romans realised they needed a good navy to defeat Carthage. Carthage had a skilled and experienced navy and Rome decided to apply themselves to building their own strong navy to drive them out of Sicily "not content with having saved the Mamertines … conceived the idea that it was possible to expel the Carthaginians entirely from the island" (Polybius I, 20) Polybius tells us how the Romans new little about naval ships and got their design for a fleet almost by accident: "It was, then, because they saw that the war they had undertaken lingered to a weary length, that they first thought of getting a fleet built, consisting of a hundred quinqueremes and twenty triremes. But one part of their undertaking caused them much difficulty. Their shipbuilders were entirely unacquainted with the construction of quinqueremes" (Polybius I, 20). He explained that one of the Carthaginian ships was used as a model: "a decked vessel of theirs charged so furiously that it ran aground, and falling into the hands of the Romans served them as a model on which they constructed their whole fleet" (Polybius I,20). This is corroborated by a historian on military history who wrote that the quinquereme was now the standard warship for the Romans and Carthaginians having good speed and power (De Santis, 2017). Polybius also explains how they trained the Roman rowers on shore while they were building. To counteract their lack of manoeuvring and ramming experience the Romans developed the corvus – a moveable bridge to allow them to board the enemys ship (Bradley, 1990). Polybius explained how it was built and how it was used. "And as soon as the "crows" were fixed in the planks of the decks and grappled the ships together, if the ships were alongside of each other, the men leaped on board anywhere along the side, but if they were prow to prow, they used the "crow" itself for boarding, and advanced over it two abreast." (Polybius 1.22). Therefore the Romans were able to build a war fleet very quickly and in 260BCE the Roman navy of about 140 ships was put to sea (Roebuck, 1966).

Synthesising [2]

combination of information from sources to justify reasonable decisions

This paragraph combines information from sources including Polybius (quoted), and Bradley and Roebuck (indirect references), to justify a decision that these two naval victories are evidence of the importance of Rome's navy in the First Punic War.

Evaluation [4]

these judgments use evidence from sources and/or refer to perspectives

Synthesising [2]

combination of information from sources to support a basic historical argument

The argument is basic (naval victories meant the navy was important) because it makes no account of other factors, such as the strategic importance of these victories, Roman capacity to keep supplying funds and crews, or the nature of land battles.

these combinations use evidence from primary or secondary sources

Throughout the response, evidence is drawn mostly from Polybius and Bradley.

The Roman navy had some successful battles at Mylae and Cape Economus. The battle of Mylae in 260 BCE was the first major Roman naval victory, Polybius explains how the Carthaginians underestimated the Romans and were surprise by the corvus (Bradley, 1990 and Polybius). Polybius shows that Carthage were unsuspecting, "No sooner did the Carthaginians sight him than with joy and alacrity they put to sea with a hundred and thirty sail, feeling supreme contempt for the Roman ignorance of seamanship. Accordingly they all sailed with their prows directed straight at their enemy: they did not think the engagement worth even the trouble of ranging their ships in any order (Polybius, I, 23). When the corvus was used to attach to board the Carthaginian ships he says "the enemy boarded by means of the "crows," and engaged them on their decks; and in the end some of the Carthaginians were cut down, while others surrendered in bewildered terror" (Polybius, I, 23). Polybius was born in c200 BCE (Walbank, 2018) so he must have talked to people about it or read documents to record this detail of the battle which occurred 60 years before he was born. Another big naval victory for Rome was at Cape Economus in 256 which Bradley states was a decisive naval victory in the First Punic War (Bradley, 1990). The Romans were sailing to north Africa when they won this battle off the south coast of Sicily, and they were able to land on Carthaginian territory (Roebuck, 1966). These two battles are examples of how important the Roman navy and their tactics such as the corvus were to the First Punic War.

Creating and communicating

conveys ideas related to the key inquiry question and/or hypothesis

The essay remains focused on the role of the navy in the First Punic War and sometimes links back to the hypothesis.

features of a historical essay based on research and ethical scholarship are demonstrated

The response includes body paragraphs with topic sentences.

The response acknowledges sources of evidence, although it shows some lapses in referencing conventions.

some errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation

For example, spelling and punctuation errors are evident throughout the response, including the first two sentences below.

However, the Romans also suffered terrible naval disasters and defeats loosing numerous ships. The Romans were trying to gain a foothold in North Africa to attack Carthage, this campaign was not successful and a fleet bringing Roman survivors back was destroyed in a terrible storm in 255 BCE. Out of more than 350 ships, only 80 survived (Bradley). Polybius doesn't just blame bad luck "No greater catastrophe is to be found in all history as befalling a fleet at one time. And for this Fortune was not so much to blame as the commanders themselves. They had been warned again and again by the pilots not to steer along the southern coast of Sicily facing the Libyan sea, because it was exposed and yielded no safe anchorage." (Polybius, 1, 37). Although it was a devastating loss, the Romans decided to build another fleet "These were finished in three months, an almost incredibly short time" (Polybius, 1, 38). Another storm in 255 caused the loss of 150 ships returning from Africa (Bradley, 1990). The Romans also has a large naval defeat at Drepana in 249 BCE (Bradley, 1990).

Analysing [2] **reasonable explanation about how evidence from sources contributes to the development of the key inquiry question or hypothesis** For example, this part of the response appropriately explains how evidence that wealthy Romans were asked to contribute to building a new fleet contributes to the development of the hypothesis. **Creating and communicating [2]** **features of a historical essay based on research and ethical scholarship are demonstrated** For example, the conclusion draws together the main ideas and arguments, although it also introduces a new point about land warfare.	Unable to defeat the Carthaginians without a strong navy, the Romans were able to raise the funds to rebuild the Roman navy. Bradley explains that the Roman treasurey didn't have the money so they had to get the wealthy Roman citizens to pay for the construction of 200 warships, which they did. This is corroborated by Polybius account that the government couldn't afford to pay – "The treasury was empty, and would not supply the funds necessary for the undertaking, which were, however, obtained by the patriotism and generosity of the leading citizens. They undertook to supply a quinquereme fully fitted out, on" (Polybius I, 59). With the new fleet the Romans were finally able to defeat the Carthaginians decisively in a naval battle near the Aegates Islands (Roebuck; Bradley, 1990). The Carthaginians were not able to keep going against the Romans and Hamilcar negotiated a peace settlement. The Peace settlement at the end of the First Punic War in 241 BCE meant that Rome was in full control of Sicily, Carthage was left in control of Africa (Roebuck, 1966). Joshua Mark asserts that by the end of the First Punic War the Romans were in control of the sea and Carthage was a defeated power. The Romans realised they had to build a navy to defeat the Carthaginians. They developed the corvus so that they could fight like a land war, they suffered great losses of ships but were able to keep rebuilding their fleet. Although there was a lot of land fighting in Sicily and north Africa as well, they could not of achieved victory without building and re-building the navy to take on Carthage as a sea power. Therefore the Roman navy was very important to victory in the First Punic War. However, the struggle against Carthage would continue for many more years in the Second and Third Punic Wars. **Reference List** Bradley, Pamela (1990) Ancient Rome, Edward Arnold Australia, Kew East De Santis, Marc (2017) The Quinquereme in the Carthaginian and Roman Navy, Warfare History Network, https://warfarehistorynetwork.com/daily/military-history/the-quinquereme-in-the-carthaginian-roman-navy/ Hunt, Patrick n.d. https://www.britannica.com/place/Carthage-ancient-city-Tunisia Hennessy, Dianne (ed) (1990) "Studies in Ancient Rome", Nelson, South Melbourne. Mark Joshua, Mark (2018), Punic Wars, Ancient History Encylopedia, https://www.ancient.eu/Punic_Wars/ Polybius, The Histories of Polybius, (translator Evelyn Shirley Shuckburgh), Project Gutenberg http://www.gutenberg.org/files/44125/44125-h/44125-h.htm Roebuck, Carl (1966), *The World of Ancient Times*, Charles, Scribner's Sons, New York. Walbank, Frank (2018), 'Polybius Greek Historian', Encyclopaedia Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Polybius