

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each element of the project–dissertation.

Candidate 1

This commentary will show the marks awarded for the following elements as they are fully assessed by considering a single aspect holistically.

- ◆ A Justify an appropriate complex classical studies issue for research
- ◆ F Synthesise evidence to develop a sustained and coherent line of argument

For the following elements we have selected single examples of points which would contribute to the overall mark for these criteria. We have indicated, using the wording from the marking instructions, how points are given a weighting regarding the overall approach to marking:

- ◆ B Research the issue using a wide range of sources of information
- ◆ C Analyse the issue
- ◆ D Compare the classical world and later times
- ◆ E Evaluate the classical world

A Justifying an appropriate complex classical issue for research

Page 1 of the candidate's response

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

In the introduction the candidate:

- ◆ states the purpose of the research clearly and unambiguously
- ◆ explains the value of this research by discussing the rise of feminist approaches in academia
- ◆ indicates suitable complexity by highlighting the extent of the levels of interpretation in the analysis of classical drama
- ◆ gives a sensible methodology for the research, looking at the dramatists, Homer and different visual arts

Thus, **4 marks** are achieved.

Two further marks are available for giving a rationale for why this particular title was chosen to address the topic and also indicating a systematic approach. **1 mark** was awarded for this, rather than two, as both of these things were done, but neither particularly clearly.

It should be noted that the quote from Thucydides, presented as a sort of epigraph is wasted. This quote would be a very fertile source of marks had it been analysed or evaluated. However, in this position it gains no marks.

B Research the issue using a wide range of sources of information

Page 2 of the candidate's response

At the top of the page, we find some excellent source use. A quote is inserted with some comment on what it shows: the candidate is indicating why and how they are using this quote. This is an ideal example of what it meant by 'using relevant primary source effectively'.

There is also a good comment on the usefulness of the source in footnote 2 (though we prefer that elements of the argument should be in the main text rather than footnotes: these should be used for references only). This is a very innovative example of 'valuable comment about the usefulness or limitations of ... primary source(s).'

Page 3 of the candidate's response

Midway down the page, we find a good example of 'using relevant secondary sources effectively.' The candidate introduces their point clearly and then refers to the secondary source for corroboration or support.

In these examples it should be clear that, though the candidate does offer references in the body of the text, these are not done consistently. The candidate does not achieve any marks for:

- ◆ consistently and accurately reference their sources throughout
- ◆ using a conventional or recognised referencing system for their bibliography and references.

C Analyse the issue

Page 2 of the candidate's response

The bottom paragraph on this page is a good example of a solid analytical point which is well developed. The candidate discusses an interpretation of a clearly defined portion of the text and then draws some analytical relevance in relation to classical Athenian society itself. This intertwining of the literary and social analysis is an ideal example of a well-developed analytical point.

The candidate does not enter a dialogue with any secondary source in their analytical points so no marks were gained for:

- ◆ some of their analytical points effectively respond to issues or opinions in secondary sources.

D Compare the classical world and later times

Page 3 of the candidate's response

The bottom paragraph in this page is a good example of a comparison. This comparison 'clearly explain[s] which classical and later aspects are being compared.' And the detailed reference to US politics and also to the TV show *The Good Wife* is a good example of meeting the following criteria:

- ◆ their comparisons engage effectively with sources of information which justify statements or opinions about later times.

E Evaluate the classical world

Page 6 of the candidate's response

The first paragraph about Helen, presents a good example of a 'relevant point of evaluation.' However, it is not supported well enough with other evidence to count as well-developed.

Page 7 of the candidate's response

The second paragraph discussing Helen here shows much better development and would be counted as a point that 'include[s] well-developed value judgements.'

The candidate does not enter a dialogue with any secondary source in their evaluation points, so no marks were gained for:

- ◆ some of their points of evaluation effectively respond to issues or opinions in secondary sources.

F Synthesise evidence to develop a sustained and coherent line of argument

The candidate was awarded **8 marks**.

The judgement for this criterion requires assessing the full argument from the title and introduction through to the conclusion. The candidate's approach is systematic and does not deviate significantly:

- ◆ The candidate's line of argument is fully coherent.
- ◆ It is structured appropriately to address the question or title.

Thus, it achieved 6 marks.

When an argument is considered to reach this standard, we assess the quality of the conclusion which stems from it. In this example there is 'a conclusion which shows reasoning' and it is 'based upon most of the points in the argument.' On that basis, 8 marks were awarded overall.

However, the conclusion did not engage 'effectively with alternative viewpoints or interpretations of the evidence in their investigation' so no further marks could be awarded for this criterion.