

# Commentary on candidate evidence

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

## Candidate 1

The candidate was awarded **16 out of 30 marks**.

### A. Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have given context/justification – there were ranges of views within Ancient Greece about the afterlife. The overall structure was given (although not in the order that the candidate discusses). The candidate has stated an overall argument ‘the good being rewarded, and the bad being punished’, which was awarded **1 mark** as per the final bullet point of the marking instructions.

### 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 **1 out of 5 marks** because they provided only one clear modern comparison – Christianity and heaven and hell. The remark about philosophers’ views and ‘crossovers’ was not awarded a mark as it is unclear what the candidate is discussing.

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

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 8 marks** because they were judged as falling within the 5-6 marks band:

- there was some exemplification (for example, Democritus as well as Plato)
- it was wide-ranging and relevant (for example, the Underworld)

However, it did not reach the criteria for the higher band as it was weaker in 'amplification'.

## **D. Analysis and evaluating**

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 12 marks** because they were judged as falling in the 5-6 marks band. The candidate states that there are a range of views about the afterlife, and noted that Plato had a range of views about the soul. The comments about Orphism were poorly expressed.

The assignment was not judged as wide-ranging in its arguments, nor was it a consistent, flowing analysis, and so could not be awarded more marks. There were no different interpretations of the views of the afterlife.

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

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** because they made a conclusion that provided an overall judgement, referring back to the argument outlined in the introduction.

## Candidate 2

The candidate was awarded **12 out of 30 marks**.

### A. Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks**. It is not completely clear if the candidate has an introduction. However, in order to maximise the marks and attainment outcome for the candidate, the first paragraph was judged as an introduction, which was assessed as providing both context and signposting the argument made about the play 'Antigone'.

### 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 **1 out of 5 marks** because they provided only one clear modern comparison, which was about the #metoo movement.

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

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 8 marks** because they were judged as falling in the 3-4 marks band.

The candidate discusses two plays, and the expression is clear. The candidate identified some key ideas about 'Antigone', and briefly discussed 'Lysistrata', with one quotation. There is limited detail.

## **D. Analysis and evaluating**

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 12 marks** because the assignment met all of the first four points for the 5-6 band marks. The candidate discussed the different actions of Antigone and Lysistrata, and the subsequent suffering of both. This fulfilled the final criteria for this band.

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

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 3 marks** because no conclusion was made.

## Candidate 3

The candidate was awarded **28 out of 30 marks**.

### A. Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because there is good discussion of the theme of fate within Greek society. The candidate states that the line of argument is based around oracles in the play 'Oedipus'.

### 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 out of 5 marks** because of the following comparisons:

- the novel, 'Never Let Me Go' (**1 mark**)
- atheism/Islam (**2 marks**) (two different modern views)
- criminology (**2 marks**) (detailed)

The remarks on Karma would have been awarded 1 mark, but the candidate has already been awarded the maximum number of marks available.

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

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 8 marks** because they were judged as falling in the top marks band.

The candidate gave a very detailed and accurate account of the text. The use of quotations was effective. There was good use of the text 'Hippolytus' and discussion

of the Greek belief in the three fates. This meets the marking criteria of 'amplification'. There were no irrelevances, nor inaccuracies.

## D. Analysis and evaluating

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 12 marks**. The candidate clearly met the criteria of different interpretations. For example:

- the circumstances of Oedipus' survival can be interpreted as caused by both fate and free will
- the death of Laius can be interpreted as caused by both fate and free will

Range of experiences was less evident, but there was one point clearly made:

- Oedipus' comes to understand he cannot escape his fate.

Overall, the weakness of range of experiences indicates that the 9-10 marks band was appropriate, and the higher mark within the band was awarded.

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

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because firstly, the candidate achieved the criteria for the first mark in the first two sentences of the conclusion, and secondly, gained another mark for balancing and weighing the evidence about fate and free will. A third mark was awarded for the consequence of this – the curse cannot be evaded.

## Candidate 4

The candidate was awarded **19 out of 30 marks**.

### A. Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they provided a valid context about the importance of religion shaping Greek society and stated that they will discuss three aspects of this.

### 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 **4 out of 5 marks** because of the following three comparisons.

- the Olympic games (**1 mark**)
- oracles compared with fortune tellers – issues and ambiguity (**2 marks**)
- comparison with places of worship (**1 mark**)

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

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 8 marks** because they were judged as falling in the 5-6 marks band. The candidate gave general knowledge of key aspects of Greek religion, however, the knowledge was limited and underdeveloped.

## D. Analysis and evaluating

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 12 marks** because the assignment met all of the first four points for the 5-6 marks band. There were no examples of different interpretations.

Different experiences were discussed:

- who could access the oracle at Delphi, although this was contradictory
- men were involved in some activities
- access to the Parthenon was limited

However, all of these were brief and the analytical comments were limited and underdeveloped. It did not flow into an overall analysis.

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

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because firstly, they provided a conclusion which is linked to the argument given in the introduction (**1 mark**) and secondly, the relationship between the well-being of men and worship of the gods is shown clearly (**1 mark**).

## Candidate 5

The candidate was awarded **22 out of 30 marks**.

### A. Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because firstly, a valid context about Rome functioning as an oligarchy was provided, and secondly the candidate states that they will discuss three aspects of this.

### 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 **3 out of 5 marks** because three valid but limited comparisons were made:

- cabinet ministers compared with the *cursus honorum* (1 mark)
- constituencies compared with assemblies (1 mark)
- parliament compared with the Senate (1 mark)

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

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 8 marks** because they were judged as falling in the 5-6 marks band. The candidate gave a very detailed factual account of the aspects of the Roman constitution they wished to discuss. However, the knowledge was sometimes not tied to analysis or argument, nor the title. Exemplification was weak.

## D. Analysis and evaluating

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 12 marks** because of the following criteria:

### Different interpretations

- why people gave up progressing in politics
- the Tribune of the Plebs mitigated the lack of power for the poor elsewhere in the constitution

### Different experiences

- wealth
- age

However, there is very little nuance, for example, those who held power were not just wealthy, they were a tiny elite, and there is little development of the nature of the corruption in Roman politics.

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

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks**. They provided a conclusion which was linked to the argument given in the introduction (**1 mark**). They were awarded a further **1 mark** as they provided a key reason for this, and another **1 mark** as they gave a more detailed example of weighing and balancing the evidence.