

# Commentary on candidate evidence

## Candidate 1

### A. Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The introduction fulfilled both criteria for each individual mark – context and ‘signposting’.

### B. Comparing and contrasting the Greek and/or Roman worlds with the modern world, in terms of religious, political, social, moral or cultural life

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The comparison with cobalt mining in the DRC was awarded **2 marks** as a detailed comparison. It was fully developed with a similarity and a difference.

The comparison on policing and jury service was awarded **2 marks** as a detailed comparison. Again, the candidate gave a similarity and a difference, and although the difference that police officers are not forced into their role may seem a little simplistic, it is valid as this has not been made before.

The comparison with women in the USA and voting rights was valid and was awarded **1 mark**. The final comment was not validated by any point or example however, the maximum of 1 mark for this point had already been achieved regardless.

### C. Drawing on in-depth knowledge and understanding to explain fully and analyse the issue

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate met all criteria in the 5-6 band. They did not meet the criteria of ‘carefully nuanced’ (there were some inaccuracies and weak expressions), nor was the range of material/exemplification judged as meeting the top criteria. However, it was clearly closer to the 7-8 band than the 3-4 band, and so was awarded **6 marks**.

## D. Analysis and evaluating

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The three-source criteria was met. There was no explicit discussion of change and continuity. An assignment on slavery will make implicit contrasts with free people and between work experiences of enslaved people, but this was not enough to qualify for anything above the 5-6 band (possible valid examples which would allow access to the higher bands might be differences between genders or time periods). The candidate met all the criteria for the 5-6 band and so was awarded the higher mark.

## E. Reaching a reasoned and well-structured conclusion on the issue

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

It was judged that the candidate met the criteria for the first mark – they had made a judgement. But there was no evidence of weighing and balancing, and so the candidate could not access any more marks.

## Candidate 2

### A. Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The introduction fulfilled both criteria for each individual mark – context and ‘signposting’

### B. Comparing and contrasting the Greek and/or Roman worlds with the modern world, in terms of religious, political, social, moral or cultural life

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The comparison on Groundhog Day was judged as ‘detailed’, giving a comparison of the use of animals in divination. **2 marks** were awarded.

The comparison on dreams was valid and awarded **1 mark**. It was a straightforward, but undeveloped comparison. There was a comparison between a Roman interpretation about the source of dreams and a modern view.

The comparison on astrology was ‘detailed’. Although it just met the criteria, the comments about a small community blindly following were seen as a development therefore, **2 marks** were awarded.

### **C. Drawing on in-depth knowledge and understanding to explain fully and analyse the issue**

The candidate was awarded **7 marks**.

The candidate fell into the 7-8 band. They met all criteria for this band. The discussion of augury was not judged as developed as it could have been, and so it was judged as being at the lower mark available in this band.

### **D. Analysis and evaluating**

The candidate was awarded **10 marks**.

The three-source criteria was achieved. The assignment was judged as having different interpretations – access to divination dependent on wealth (and a consequence of this on religion), the different interpretations of the source of dreams and the origin and adoption of the haruspex from the Etruscans. The candidates made relative judgements about different aspects – eg Sybilline books more respected than dreams, with supporting evidence. They provided good arguments, but this was the one area where the candidate did not quite make the criteria about the range of arguments to justify inclusion in the top band (although the conclusion did actually make reference to other points, they were not discussed in the main body), hence it was placed in the 9-10 band, but at the higher mark.

### **E. Reaching a reasoned and well-structured conclusion on the issue**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The candidate fulfilled the criteria for the first mark, and there was weighing and balancing of points discussed in the main body (eg wealth). However, the candidate tried to balance points not made in the main body and therefore, the full 3 marks were not awarded.

## **Candidate 3**

### **A. Introduction**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The introduction fulfilled both criteria for each individual mark – context and ‘signposting’.

## **B. Comparing and contrasting the Greek and/or Roman worlds with the modern world, in terms of religious, political, social, moral or cultural life**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The comparison with modern forms of prayer was detailed and awarded **2 marks**. It discussed both personal and public prayer in detail.

The comparison with modern song lyrics was detailed. The candidate made two points which were linked to their discussion (modern performers would discuss their own relationships as Sappho did, but there can be disapproval of this).

The comparison with child marriage is valid and was awarded **1 mark**. The basic point was that child marriage/arranged marriages is not practised in most countries but does in places occur.

## **C. Drawing on in-depth knowledge and understanding to explain fully and analyse the issue**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The candidate discussed three aspects of Sappho's poetry using a few lines of her poetry. This was linked to knowledge about religion and society in Classical Greece. The assignment was judged as falling into the 5-6 band. The knowledge was accurate but general – for example about the marriage of girls. In some places (for example the mention of cult) there might be some confusion – did the candidate mean mystery cults?

The candidate was closer to the 3-4 band than the 7-8 band, and so was awarded **5 marks**.

## **D. Analysis and evaluating**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The three-source criteria was met. There was a brief reference about different experience of women in festivals, but it was a 'glancing' reference with no detail. The candidate gave the impression of believing Sappho lived in the 5th century BC, and there was only general reference to location, and nothing explicit about social class distinctions. There was little evidence of key arguments.

It would be harsh to place this assignment in the bottom band, but it just reached the 5-6 criteria due to the points noted above, and so it was awarded **5 marks**.

## **E. Reaching a reasoned and well-structured conclusion on the issue**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

It was judged that the candidate met the criteria for the first mark – they have made a judgement. But there was no evidence of weighing and balancing, and so the candidate could not access any more marks.