

# Commentary on candidate evidence

## Candidate 1

### Question 1(b)

Introduction: The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they fulfilled both criteria of giving a context (the accession of Creon and the decision about the burial) and giving an outline, although this could have been made more explicit (eg by using phrasing such as 'firstly...', 'secondly...').

Analysis and evaluation: The candidate was awarded **6 marks**. The candidate was judged to have reached the top criteria by giving two differing interpretations of the actions of Creon (there is a distinction between the law of the state and the law of the gods and the candidate explains that the Creon's refusal to change his mind can be seen as acceptable at the time, but in the light of the consequences unwise). It met the other criteria of clear and logical arguments and linking parts well.

Knowledge: The candidate was awarded **7 marks**. The candidate was again judged to have reached the top criteria. The use of quotation was particularly impressive, which was used to explain key aspects of the play, and the knowledge was tied closely to the argument.

Conclusion: The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. There was an overall judgement made but it was undeveloped.

The candidate was awarded **16 marks** overall for this essay.

### Question 2

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because of the following judgements.

First paragraph: The candidate gained **1 mark**. Although lengthy, the candidate did not contextualise the point and only gave one example. The candidate ended with comments which were generally about life in Greece, but not related to a text.

Second paragraph: The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. Again, the candidate tended to concentrate on Classical society, but did give the example of Antigone's marriage. Contextualisation was judged as occurring at the end of the paragraph with the comments about marriage today.

Third paragraph: The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. The candidate discussed child bearing giving the example of Medea. Again, the candidate spent a lot of time discussing the Classical aspect, and this was awarded no marks. The contextualisation was finally awarded in the final sentence.

Fourth paragraph: The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. Here the candidate discussed freedom in relation to women, and using Medea gives two examples of this, which would be enough without the contextualisation which is made at the end.

Fifth paragraph: The fact that the chorus was all male was not judged as relevant.

Conclusion: This was awarded **1 mark**. The conclusion was general but undeveloped.

The candidate was awarded overall **8 marks** for this response.

## Candidate 2

### Question 1(a)

Introduction: The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. It was judged that there was no meaningful context set. The candidate gained the mark for achieving the third bullet point under 'signposting'.

Analysis and evaluation: The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. The candidate was judged as reaching the middle criteria. The candidate clearly gave a general view that some factors were controlled by fate and others by freewill and so gave one differing interpretation. Their arguments were generally clear. However, the candidate's arguments regarding what actions were determined by fate and freewill were generally arbitrary and no overall theme or argument emerged – a better approach was given by candidates who based their argument round the oracle within the play or by breaking down fate into aspects such as blood-guilt or the humbling of the powerful.

Knowledge: The candidate was awarded **5 marks**. The candidate was judged as reaching the 5-6 criteria. There was clearly good detail and knowledge of the play, although there was no use of quotations to justify points. The inclusion of the play *Antigone* was justified as it showed the use of fate as a curse, but this was not really developed, and became a summary of the play.

Conclusion: The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. There was an overall balanced judgement given with justification from the main body of the essay.

The candidate was awarded **12 marks** overall for this essay.

### Question 2

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because of the following judgements.

First quotation – marriage. This was awarded no marks as in fact the play makes no reference to the circumstances of the marriage of Jocasta and Oedipus being a forced or arranged marriage.

Second quotation – equality and rights. The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for the comparison with Oedipus' daughters.

Third quotation – tradition roles. The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. The candidate gave examples using *Antigone* both supporting the point (her desire to challenge Creon) and contrasting (her desire to bury her brother). Note that the candidate here was awarded 2 marks although they gave no context. So long as the references to the text are detailed enough as here, a context is not required.

Fourth quotation – role as a mother. The candidate was awarded no marks. The references to Jocasta as a mother are not justified in the context of the play, and the references to *Antigone* were vague and repeated from an earlier point about rejecting a traditional role.

The conclusion was very good. It gave balance and produced evidence to support the statements. It was awarded **2 marks**.

Overall the candidate was awarded **5 marks** for this response.

## Candidate 3

### Question 1(b)

Introduction: The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. There was detailed context, but the candidate only mentions the plays they would use and this was not judged as signposting.

Analysis and evaluation: The candidate was awarded **5 marks**. The candidate was judged to have reached the top criteria. The candidate explains that Oedipus could overall be interpreted as both helping his people and causing conflict. There were points where the candidate comes close to a second contrast (Oedipus can be both kind and considerate, and on the other hand, arrogant and violent) but this is not explicitly made. The candidate also made good use of phrases such as 'furthermore', 'therefore' and 'however' to strengthen their arguments. Another route to improve the mark further might have been to link Lysistrata and Oedipus in a comparison or contrast in the main body instead of having two distinct parts to the essay.

Knowledge: The candidate was awarded **7 marks**. The candidate was judged to have reached the top criteria. There was clearly very good detail and knowledge of the play; although there were no quotations, the detail of specific episodes was good.

Conclusion: The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. There was an overall balanced judgement given with justification from the main body of the essay, referring to the two texts used.

The candidate was awarded **15 marks** overall for this essay.

### Question 2

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because of the following judgements.

First quotation – free expression. Clear context was given and the decision to bury the body of her brother was awarded **2 marks**.

Second quotation – marriage. A clear context was given and the example of Lysistrata gained **2 marks**.

Third quotation – opportunities and rights. Again, a context was given and the decision of Antigone to bury her brother gains **2 marks**. Note that although the same example was given for the first quotation and normally this would not be given credit again, the candidate has argued that in the first quotation the burial can be judged as an expression of freedom, and here as an issue of gender conflict.

Fourth quotation – equality. A clear context and the use of Ismene as a contrast to this gained **2 marks**.

The conclusion was very good. It gave balance and produced evidence to support the statements. It was awarded **2 marks**.

Overall the candidate was awarded **10 marks** for this response.