

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 9 – source evaluation

The candidate was awarded **9 marks**.

The candidate makes four relevant points of analysis:

- ◆ Difference in their manners of speaking
- ◆ Difference on the nature of rulers
- ◆ Difference between motives of sophists and philosophers
- ◆ Socratic method / willingness to admit not knowing answers

These show a **wider understanding of the source** and do **respond to the question** which means the candidate's response can be considered to have achieved 6 marks.

The marker now considers if it can be awarded 7-8 marks. There is evaluation in all the points which shows a **full understanding**, thus 8 marks can be awarded.

The marker now considers whether 9-10 marks can be awarded.

The candidate did make some reference to wider reading and so was given another mark. There was not a great detail in the use of wider reading, so 9 marks were awarded for this answer, rather than 10.

Question 10 – source analysis

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate makes four relevant points of analysis:

- ◆ Assessment of usefulness to society
- ◆ Can possessing wisdom absolve one of cruelty?
- ◆ Judgement must be subjective
- ◆ Difficulty of deciding value when men are equally wise

These show a **wider understanding of the source** and do **respond to the question** which means the candidate's response can be considered to have achieved 6 marks.

The marker now considers if it can be awarded 7-8 marks. The response makes a good range of valid points but all a little superficially, and so does not show a

full understanding of the source, author or context. Thus, no further marks are awarded for this answer.

Question 11 – comparison of Classical sources

The candidate was awarded **13 marks**.

They discussed the following areas of comparison:

- ◆ The professional backgrounds of both writers
- ◆ The moral worth of rhetoric (persuasive speaking)
- ◆ use of rhetoric by military leaders
- ◆ rhetoric in leaders produces instability

This gains 4 marks.

The answer also has a conclusion, which draws the comparisons together into an overall judgement – that gains a further mark.

So, for comparison, this answer achieved 5/5 marks.

The candidate was judged to have supported their comparisons with 8 pieces of factual evidence drawn from the extracts and from their wider knowledge.

So, for evidence, this answer achieved 8/10

Thus, overall the answer was awarded 13 marks.

Question 12 – comparison with a modern source

The candidate was awarded **10 marks**.

This answer does not actually engage explicitly with the ideas in the source and so does not gain any marks for comparison.

However, the answer is broadly attempting to answer the question on how governments should be chosen and their conduct, so the quality of their points of evidence is sufficient to gain them 10 marks.

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 2

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 17 – source evaluation

The candidate was awarded **9 marks**.

The candidate makes four relevant points of evaluation:

- ◆ Discussion of Paris' responsibility in respect of divine intervention
- ◆ Heroes were behaving according to gods' wishes
- ◆ Atrocities during the sack of Troy
- ◆ Achilles responsibility for the death of Polyxena

These pieces of evaluation show a **full understanding of the source** and are clearly **responding to the question**, thus the answer has achieved 8 marks. The marker now considers whether it can be awarded 9-10 marks. The candidate has shown use of wider reading by bringing in reference to the *Iliad* in their answers. This answer comes very close to full marks, but the reference to wider reading is not quite extensive enough to merit full marks.

Question 18 – source analysis

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because four relevant points of analysis are made:

- ◆ Concern for the danger of protecting friends
- ◆ Preference for her husband to survive rather than have glorious death
- ◆ Highlights the importance of their aging
- ◆ Concern that the gods are intervening

These pieces of evaluation show a **wider understanding of the source** and are clearly **responding to the question**, thus the answer has achieved 6 marks. The points do not holistically point to a **full understanding** of the source, so no further marks are awarded.

Question 19 – comparison of Classical sources

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**.

The candidate discusses the following areas of comparison:

- ◆ Expectation to fight to the death
- ◆ Struggle / Suffering

- ◆ Differing treatment by the gods
- ◆ Influence as leaders

This gains 4 marks.

The answer has a conclusion which draws the comparisons together into an overall judgement — that gains a further mark.

So, for comparison, this answer achieved 5/5.

The candidate was judged to have supported their comparisons with 7 pieces of factual evidence drawn from the extracts and from their wider knowledge.

So, for evidence, this answer achieved 7/10.

Thus, overall the answer is awarded 12 marks.

Question 20 – comparison with a modern source

The candidate was awarded **10 marks**.

The answer contains several aspects for comparison:

- ◆ Selfishness / Helping others
- ◆ Heroes having strength to overcome problems
- ◆ Self-sacrifice
- ◆ Heroes can show fear

The conclusion draws the ideas into an answer to the question which earns one more mark.

So, for comparison, 5/5.

The answer contains six points of evidence from the text:

- ◆ Hector fights Achilles to save his city
- ◆ The gods chart out the Heroes' fates
- ◆ Achilles cannot cope when Agamemnon takes Briseis
- ◆ Patroclus' death brought Achilles back into fight
- ◆ Hector runs away from Achilles

So, for evidence, this answer achieved 5/10

Thus, overall the answer is awarded 10 marks.

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 3

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 17 – source evaluation

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because four relevant points of evaluation are made:

- ◆ Blaming Paris for destroying Troy — not protecting his people
- ◆ Greek killing of Polyxena is savage
- ◆ Disregard for nobility of the Trojans
- ◆ Atrocity committed on Cassandra

These pieces of evaluation show a **wider understanding of the source** and are clearly **responding to the question**, thus the answer has achieved 6 marks. Holistically there is not enough detail to justify awarding more for **full understanding** in any point.

Question 18 – source analysis

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because four relevant points of analysis are made:

- ◆ Fears there may be unforeseen challenges to overcome
- ◆ Absence of hero from home is more significant than heroism
- ◆ Duty to raise family is more important than glory
- ◆ Significance of aging is uncommon in heroic thinking

These pieces of evaluation show a **wider understanding of the source** and are clearly **responding to the question**; thus the answer has achieved 6 marks. Holistically there is not enough detail to justify awarding more for **full understanding** in any point.

Question 19 – comparison of Classical sources

The candidate was awarded **8 marks**.

This answer makes comparisons very confidently and is able to achieve all four marks for identifying suitable areas of comparisons:

- ◆ Persistence
- ◆ Overcoming hardships
- ◆ Relation with the gods
- ◆ Leadership

However, there is very little reference to the actual events of the *Odyssey* or *Aeneid* to provide evidence to support the comparisons.

Question 20 – comparison with a modern source

The candidate is awarded **2 marks**.

The answer contains several aspects for comparison, but **only one** of these is actually rooted in an accurate knowledge of the Iliad:

- ◆ Paris shows courage fighting the duel with Menelaus

So, for comparison, 1/5 marks were awarded.

The others either do not show knowledge of any event in the text or show a misunderstanding of motivations – for example, claiming Hector sacrificed himself in order to save the life of others is a complete misunderstanding. But, showing accurate knowledge of this event gained the candidate 1 mark for evidence.

So, for evidence, 1/10 marks were awarded.