

# Commentary on candidate 3 evidence (Field 1)

**Title: To what extent was the military leadership of Governor Agricola successful in the occupation of Northern Britain?**

**Word Count: 3911**

**Mark Awarded: 26/50**

Grade	Criteria	Comments
C	<b>Abstract/Introduction Clarity of structure, areas, issues and line of argument</b>	This comment is about the introduction without the inclusion of the abstract here. Reasonable context on Agricola. There is an attempt to engage in the debate with revisionist views stated but lacks the traditionalist view – only refers to Tacitus. Therefore, it does not present the main interpretations you would hope to see. A basic line of argument is evident.
C	<b>Structure – conclusion(s)</b>	The conclusion is weak and backs up a weak line of argument evident throughout the dissertation. Although it makes an overall judgement on the issue, it fails to qualitatively make judgements on points raised in the dissertation. There is also confusions evident suggesting Tacitus' account as being 'first-hand' when Tacitus never visited Britain.
C	<b>Degree of THOROUGHNESS (depth and breadth)</b>	There is basic coverage that lacks breadth, particularly on Agricola being successful, as the candidate only uses Tacitus with barely any mention of more current traditional Historians and evidence that support certain aspects of Agricola's governorship as being successful. It also lacks detailed exemplification of points made.
C	<b>Degree of relevance</b>	The knowledge and evidence used is mainly relevant, but there are also some irrelevancies evident, eg the section in the first part on seasons 1 and 2 in Wales and North England. Also referred to at a later point showing misunderstanding of the context that can be used as evidence for Northern Britain.
C	<b>Degree of ANALYSIS and EVALUATION</b>	The analysis is basic with some attempts to address the evaluative aims of the question. Analysis is not sustained, with some confusions evident, eg the part about Calgacus' speeches, and Tacitus' account as firsthand. Also, if anything the candidate argues more strongly, using supporting evidence and historians, that Agricola was not a successful leader, yet the final evaluations tag on that he was using Tacitus to support this.
C	<b>Consideration of Historical sources</b>	There is an awareness of Historians' views, particularly revisionist views, on the role of Agricola,

Grade	Criteria	Comments
	<b>/interpretations</b>	however, they are mainly used to illustrate knowledge points. As already stated, it is very thin on traditional historiography to support Tacitus' views.
C	<b>Consideration of primary evidence</b>	Use of Tacitus throughout who, although an 'armchair historian' who never visited Britain, was a contemporary of Agricola. There are also, archeological references, eg Gask frontier system, forts, coins.
C	<b>Footnoting and Bibliography</b>	A consistent system was used. The bibliography is enough but is not annotated to help the understanding of how the sources were used to compile the dissertation.
C	<b>Overall accuracy of approach</b>	Mainly accurate but a basic approach that led to more of a narrative, this is partly due to the decision to separate the dissertation into two sections with 'part 1' suggesting he was a successful leader (relying heavily on Tacitus) and 'part 2' countering this. The result was a more basic run through of the seasons and did not allow for counterviews on points made that could be developed into evaluation and potentially synthesis.