



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2010**

**Classical Civilisation**

**CIV2F**

**The Second Punic War**

**Unit 2F**

**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](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 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.

## 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**

<b>Level 4</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• accurate and relevant knowledge covering central aspects of the question</li><li>• clear understanding of central aspects of the question</li><li>• 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</li><li>• ability generally to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li></ul>	<b>9-10</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li><li>• some understanding of some aspects of the question</li><li>• some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question</li><li>• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li></ul>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Demonstrates <b>either</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li></ul> <b>or</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them.</li></ul>	<b>3-5</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	Demonstrates <b>either</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge</li></ul> <b>or</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it.</li></ul>	<b>1-2</b>

## LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

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

---

**LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS**

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

**Mark Scheme**  
**Unit 2F      The Second Punic War**

**SECTION ONE**

**Option A**

**01    *What events led to Hannibal arriving at the Ticinus? Give two details.***

**Two from:** left Spain with an army (1) / (crossed the) Alps (1) / unopposed **or** before the Romans were aware (1) / taking advantage of disarray of Gauls (1)

(2 marks)

**02    *Who won the battle at the Ticinus?***

The Carthaginians (1) **or** Hannibal (1)

(1 mark)

**03    *Give two details of the battle.***

**Two from:** Romans advanced to see what situation was (1) / came upon Carthaginians unexpectedly (1) / Scipio's spearman caused confusion *or* broke ranks (1) / Scipio wounded (1) / younger Scipio saved his father (1) / Romans retreated (1) / and escaped next day (1)

(2 marks)

**04    *How effectively in this passage does Livy portray Publius Cornelius Scipio's character?***

Discussion might include: attempting to win round hesitant troops in rather distant, defensive manner: e.g. *on the defensive* ('I was not afraid ...' as if answering troops' doubts; 'had I wished' pointing out he is boss; 'with all possible speed' as if rejecting criticism; use of rhetorical questions 'does it look ...'; 'is it not more likely ...' as challenge to doubters); but *not prepared to pander to troops' worries* ('...exaggerating the facts merely to encourage you', puts them in their place); *suggestion of resentment* ('Spain, my own allotted *sphere*'; 'I should have had an easier ...', pointing out this should not be his job); *attempt to portray himself as decisive* ('had news of Hannibal, and landed ... I seized it and won', quick phrases showing action); *also attempt to show self-confidence* ('I have deliberately planted myself ...', answering implied criticism that he would rather avoid Hannibal); *admiration of Hannibal* (comparison to Hasdrubal; 'terrible foe', not great way to give men pep talk?)

Credit any other reasonable points.

(10 marks)

- 05 ***'I should have had an easier campaign on my hands, with Hasdrubal instead of Hannibal as my antagonist' (lines 5-6). Judging from the books of Livy you have read, how good a general do you think Hasdrubal was?***

***You might include discussion of***

- ***the achievements of Hasdrubal in Spain in 218 BC***
- ***Hasdrubal's leadership at the Ebro in 217 BC***
- ***Hasdrubal's importance in Italy in 216 BC***
- ***his achievements in the later part of the war***
- ***Hasdrubal's reputation and qualities as indicated by Livy.***

Arguments suggesting Hasdrubal was *not* a good general might include:

- contrast with Livy's regular praising of Hannibal; no such early praise of Hasdrubal who is basically invisible in early chapters
- possibility status as Hannibal's brother more responsible for position than any particular abilities of his own
- Hasdrubal much less a force in Spain than his brother in Italy; often away from scene when Romans successful; Hannibal always focus of events in Italy
- Hasdrubal played no part in the march into Italy or the Carthaginian triumphs there before Cannae; legendary achievement by Hannibal suggesting personal qualities not attributed to his brother
- under his leadership Carthaginians were routed at the Ebro in 217, partly negating Hannibal's achievements in Italy
- later in 217 C Scipio twice defeated Hasdrubal armies in battles in Spain; no sign he had what it takes to 'beat the odds' as his brother did
- Hasdrubal was killed in Italy in 207 by the army of Scipio Africanus, in what was a heavy defeat for Carthage; no further help to Hannibal who fought to the end earning respect of Scipio A.

Arguments suggesting that Hasdrubal was a good general might include:

- Hannibal trusted him enough to put in charge of Spain in 218 BC, where he had some success
- Rome respected Hasdrubal in Spain, attacking Hanno early at Cissis as (Livy says) frightened of result if they let Hasdrubal join him
- Hasdrubal dealt decisively with the sailors of C Scipio's fleet at Tarraco, then sensibly withdrew
- Hannibal had no hesitation in sending for his brother's aid in Italy
- Hasdrubal successfully led the left wing of the Carthaginian army at Cannae
- His death in battle with Scipio Africanus left Hannibal without his support in the crucial later stages of the war

Other points to consider may be:

- lack of information on Hasdrubal; Livy does not give us personal insights as he does with Hannibal
- Livy's pro-Roman feelings and inclination to employ Hannibal to help illustrate Roman failings and virtues (thus excluding other Carthaginians).

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

**Option B**

**06 What was Scipio's 'proposal' (line 2)? Give three details.**

**Three from:** Raise and army (1) / Scipio proposed an end to the policy of containing Hannibal in Italy (1) / but should pour troops into Africa (1) / under his leadership (1) / ravage Carthage (1) / transfer the scene of the war there **or** force Hannibal to retreat there (1) / use Spain as a base (1)

(3 marks)

**07 What did Fabius do next to try to prevent Scipio from carrying out his proposal? Give two details.**

**Two from:** spoke against Scipio in Senate (1) / and assembly (1) / tried to persuade Scipio's colleague **or** fellow consul (1) not to let Scipio take charge of the army (1) restricted number of troops Scipio was allowed to take (1) / forced Scipio to raise money for campaign from his own resources / stopped senate from funding him (1)

(2 marks)

**08 To what extent does Plutarch in this passage present a balanced account of Fabius' motives and behaviour in opposing Scipio?**

Discussion might include: *comments re Fabius' motives from start* ('did ... utmost to spread doubts'); personal criticism of Scipio ('hot-headed young man'); suggestion of going beyond fair criticism ('didn't hesitate to say or do anything'); admits success in 'convincing the senate' but more stress on beliefs of people (suggestion of 'jealousy' and lack of self-confidence in Fabius – 'might be condemned as lazy & cowardly ...'); *more balance in second paragraph*: acknowledgment of Fabius' 'instinctive caution and prudence'; also that he was 'genuinely alarmed'; risks he was against acknowledged as 'great'; **but** ends clearly criticizing motives (charging Fabius with 'violent and extreme' attitude & 'personal rivalry and ambition'); relevance of Plutarch writing with hindsight.

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

**09 To what extent do you consider Fabius Maximus was 'lazy and cowardly' (line 9)? Refer to both Livy and Plutarch in your answer.**

**You might include discussion of**

- **his character as described by Plutarch and Livy**
- **Fabius' visit to Carthage as envoy in 218 BC**
- **his behaviour and actions as Dictator after Lake Trasimene in 217 BC**
- **the way he acted and the measures he adopted after Cannae in 216 BC**
- **his attitude in the later stages of the war.**

Points for discussion in judging the fairness of the quotation might include:

- Fabius' character as described by Plutarch: 'extraordinary caution'; apparently 'dull and stupid'; 'apparent lack of energy'; how events (e.g. his victory over Ligurians) support / disprove these
- Fabius' character as described by Livy: omits early negatives of Plutarch: speaks positively of 'caution' & 'unshakeable perseverance' (22); tactical

- wisdom (put into mouth of Hannibal in 22); positive assessment at death (30)
- his attitude as part of embassy sent to Carthage before 2<sup>nd</sup> Punic War started: although not young delivered message in brave and effective manner; uncowed by situation - veteran fighter of First Punic War
  - his choice as Dictator after disaster at Lake Trasimene – suggests respect of Senate for both his views and character (Plutarch – suitable for ‘spirit & dignity of character’); regarded moral laxity as reason for defeat (opposite of laziness in his case?); initially raised forces and moved to face Hannibal; then confrontation with Minucius re Fabius’ delaying tactics; split in Senate led to promotion of Minucius in opposition to Fabius; Fabius unmoved – stuck to guns and went on to rescue Minucius; great popularity of Fabius with people after this; Senate still split; attempt by Hannibal (in Plutarch) to cast doubt on integrity of Fabius; appointment of pro-action Consul Varro; strong warning against action by Fabius ignored; disaster at Cannae 216
  - decisive action by Fabius after Cannae to head off panic in Rome; Senate supported him; Fabius continued to advocate containment policy despite continuing opposition from some factions; failure of Hannibal to build on Cannae played into Fabius’ hands; Fabius’ sympathetic treatment of disgruntled allies (character picture in Plutarch – story of Lucanian and girl)
  - Fabius’ action in 209 recapturing Tarentum; brutal victory of Fabius leading to questioning of his morals; Fabius then in turn accusing Scipio of immoral behaviour over events at Locri; relevance of passage set above; reasons for support in Senate for Fabius; continuing anti-Scipio arguments right up to his own death in 202
  - while most arguments may try to argue negatively about Fabius in the latter years, credit for analyzing whether these faults came from being ‘lazy or cowardly’ or from elsewhere; also for spotting variations in the Livy & Plutarch accounts e.g. failure of Livy to relate anti-Scipio actions of Fabius.

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

*(20 marks)*

## SECTION TWO

### Option C

- 10 ***To what extent was the Roman Senate in control of the conduct of the Second Punic War and to what extent did it merely react to events? Refer to the books of Livy and Plutarch you have read.***

***You might include discussion of***

- ***the Senate's position and actions in declaring war in 218 BC***
- ***the effectiveness with which the Senate responded to Hannibal's invasion between 218 and 216 BC***
- ***the way it supported its generals and leaders in the attempts to defend Rome after Cannae***
- ***the degree of support it showed Scipio Africanus from 205 BC***
- ***the part it played in the eventual Roman victory.***

Points for discussion in assessing influence of Senate on proceedings might include:

- the actions of the Senate when confronted by the Carthaginian attack on Saguntum; the failure of the Carthaginians to respond to the Senate's ambassadors; response of this to prepare for war but send second delegation (led by Fabius Maximus) to offer last chance to avoid it
- by instructions of Senate envoys told to isolate Carthaginians from Spanish allies; little success; outwitted by quick movements of Hannibal; Senate reacted by sending C Scipio with warships to Spain; Hannibal again too quick; C Scipio taken by surprise at Ticinus; division between Consuls re how to proceed from here; little sign of effective policy from Senate; resulting defeat at Trebia; sensible move from Senate to send G Scipio to open new front in Spain; regular offerings to gods by Senate; Flaminius – uneasy relationship with Senate & fellow consul; disaster at Trasimene; appointment of Fabius Maximus as Dictator; support from Senate in moral crusade; stresses caused by Fabius' containment policy; splits in Senate after apparent success of Minucius; change of heart after Minucius' rescue by Fabius; further stresses with annual changes to Consul affecting army leadership; ditto with election of Varro in 216; greatest disaster at Cannae
- Senate impotent after Cannae (lack of information); Fabius again took charge – back in favour; moral effect of refusal to ransom hostages; luck as Hannibal refrained from direct attack; Fabius in ascendancy from 216; he saw that allies tempted to revolt were dealt with sensitively; his containment policy continued to hold good until successes of Scipio in Spain brought about division in Senate
- further stresses in Senate by 205 re Scipio's suggestion to build on aggressively-won victories in Spain; conflict between pro-Fabius and pro-Scipio factions; Locri situation damaged Scipio; Senate pro-Fabius policies caused Scipio great problems in getting to Africa; early victories of Scipio in Africa caused change of heart; tension as Fabius demanded Scipio's recall; his own self-confidence and continuing victories (despite continuing splits in Senate) saw Scipio through; death of Fabius Maximus in 203 strengthened influence of pro-Scipio senators
- general support (despite apprehension) in Senate for Scipio at Zama; continuing issues in Senate after victory (appointment of Dictator); rise of anti-Scipio feelings; **but** Scipio
- eventually tasked with leading peace delegation.

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

### Option D

- 11 **To what extent does Livy's presentation of Hannibal show a bias against him as a non-Roman? Refer to the books of Livy you have read.**

**You might include discussion of Livy's accounts of**

- **Hannibal's origins and rise to power up to 218 BC**
- **his leadership in reaching Italy in 218-7 BC**
- **his achievements in 217 and 216 BC up to Cannae**
- **his reactions to the challenges of Fabius Maximus after Cannae and of Scipio Africanus in 204 BC**
- **his meeting with Scipio before Zama and subsequent actions.**

Points for discussion in analysing the degree of bias might include:

- his assessment of Hannibal's qualities as a young man – list of totally positive attributes; stress on bond between Hannibal and his troops; his decisiveness at Saguntum contrasted to indecision in Roman Senate re response; support for Hannibal in Carthaginian Senate stressed by their refusal to surrender him;
- positive tones of Hannibal's quoted 218 speech to men before starting invasion of Italy (xxi, 21); mix of care for men, proper religious observance, tactical vision etc.; speed of action in moving towards Italy, getting Gauls on board etc. – contrast of Livy's regular accounts of Romans being taken by surprise; inspirational tone of Hannibal's speech to his men before reaching Alps (xxi, 30); length and positive nature of report of response to travails crossing Alps
- clear respect (even awe?) reflected in Roman responses to Hannibal's exploits (e.g. speech of Scipio before the Ticinus); contrast between disunity of Roman leadership and single-mindedness of Hannibal in report on the Trebia; ditto Lake Trasimene (contrast between fastidious preparations of Hannibal and lack of such by Flaminius); decent behaviour of Hannibal to defeated soldiers
- emphasis post-Transimene on stresses between Fabius Maximus and other Romans setting up Hannibal's opportunity at Cannae; suggestion however that Fabius might be his match; praise for Hannibal's attempts to discredit Fabius; stress on Roman moral/military failings at Cannae but portrayal throughout of Hannibal directing matters; conversation between Hannibal and Maharbal re how to follow up victory; Hannibal's speech to losing Romans (xxii, 58) and Roman response to his ransom offer
- change of stress in favour of Roman hero (Scipio) from xxix; main focus on Hannibal seems to be his absence from main field of conflict; outwitting of Hannibal (after late arrival of) at Locri; absence of Hannibal allows Scipio to sort out Masinissa & Syphax (Livy hardly mentioning Hannibal at this point)
- continuing absence of Hannibal initially in xxx; reappearance when Carthage under threat; request for meeting with Scipio (negative comments from Livy on his reasons); very long speech of Hannibal at meeting (plus reply from Scipio); respect for both from Livy?; positive report of Hannibal's marshalling of forces at Zama, despite defeat; disappearance from scene before capitulation of Carthage
- credit for reference to Livian agenda to aggrandise Hannibal in order to increase greatly Roman prestige at his eventual downfall.

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

*(30 marks)*

**Assessment Objectives Grid**  
**Unit 2F      The Second Punic War**

**SECTION ONE**

Either  
 Option A

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01</b>	2	0	2
<b>02</b>	1	0	1
<b>03</b>	2	0	2
<b>04</b>	5	5	10
<b>05</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

Or  
 Option B

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>06</b>	3	0	3
<b>07</b>	2	0	2
<b>08</b>	5	5	10
<b>09</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**SECTION TWO**

Either  
 Option C

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>10</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

Or  
 Option D

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>11</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**OVERALL**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100%</b>