

# Commentary on candidate evidence

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

## Candidate 1

Overall, the candidate was awarded **15 out of 30 marks**.

### Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **12 out of 20 marks**.

#### Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The candidate gave both a context (Athens and Warfare) and 'signposted' by stating that they would explore this in their essay through examining key aspects of the 'Odyssey'.

#### Knowledge

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The candidate argued that the selfishness of Odysseus in his conflict with the Cyclops was shown by revealing his name, and mentioned subsequent events of the Odyssey, although some additional detail could be added to explain this further. Although a quotation was used, the wording was a little unclear.

The candidate explained that Odysseus was unselfish in his initial contact with the Cyclops but does not explain what these actions are.

The candidate briefly discussed Odysseus' stay on Circe's island but without detail.

Overall, the key judgement was that the knowledge was **limited**, specifically, two events were briefly explained and other events named.

### **Analysis**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

As noted above, the candidate explained that the conflict with the Cyclops led to future events, although it was not well developed. The candidate also showed that Odysseus' desire for glory caused his selfish behaviour. The candidate tried to show that Odysseus' interaction with the Cyclops could be seen as unselfish, but was not credited with this, as there was no link to knowledge, which is a requisite to awarding marks.

The candidate explained the motivation for Odysseus staying on Circe's island was a selfish desire for pleasure. But they also showed that part of the reason he and his crew were trapped was not due to selfishness, but his crew scouting the island. This would qualify as a different interpretation.

### **Conclusion**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

The candidate made a straightforward summary of their findings.

## **Question 2**

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 10 marks**.

The candidate accurately described family connections as the way that Odysseus inherited power (**1 mark**). The candidate stated that Odysseus' men were punished for disobedience but provided no evidence (**0 marks**). The candidate gained **1 mark** for discussing the relationship between Odysseus and the gods, especially Athena.

The conclusion was a brief summary of the findings (**1 mark**).

## Candidate 2

Overall, the candidate was awarded **21 out of 30 marks**.

### Question 1(a)

The candidate was awarded **16 out of 20 marks**.

#### Introduction

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The candidate gave both context (women's behaviour was unacceptable to men) and 'signposted' by stating that they would explore this through discussing Antigone, Ismene and Eurydice.

#### Knowledge

The candidate was awarded **7 marks**.

The candidate dealt comprehensively and accurately with the three characters. There is very good use of quotation, and the knowledge is closely linked to the essay title.

#### Analysis

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate gave good explanations of why characters behaved as they did and outlined the consequences of their actions, for example, that Antigone's actions meant she would never have a fulfilling family life. There were two clear interpretations:

- firstly, whether Antigone was fated to suffer by being born into a cursed family or because the gods turned against her

- secondly, Antigone's burial of her brother was shocking, both because she challenged a powerful man's authority and because she went against the authority of a male figure within the family

## Conclusion

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

The candidate made a straightforward summary of their findings.

## Question 2

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 10 marks**.

The candidate was awarded marks as follows:

- in the first paragraph, no marks were awarded as the knowledge was not accurate – Creon did not lead the people in war
- in the second paragraph, **2 marks** were awarded – Antigone was a leader, had status and used this status to bury her brother
- in the third paragraph, **2 marks** were awarded – Antigone suffered death and emotional torture as she would have no family life
- in the fourth and fifth paragraphs, no marks were awarded as these points had been already made
- in the sixth paragraph, **1 mark** was awarded – Creon expected everyone to obey him

There was no conclusion attempted, and so no mark could be awarded.

## Candidate 3

Overall, the candidate was awarded **21 out of 30 marks**.

### Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **14 out of 20 marks**.

#### Introduction

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

There was no context beyond the text and essay title. Signposting was clear: the candidate outlined that they would examine four characters from the 'Iliad'.

#### Knowledge

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate dealt with the key conflicts involving the four characters in the 'Iliad'. The knowledge was accurate and relevant. However, it did not reach the criteria for the top band as it was not comprehensive. The coverage of Achilles was limited and undeveloped. Exemplification and reference to the text was limited.

#### Analysis

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

When discussing each character, the candidate showed both the motivations for and the consequences of their actions. This was tied tightly to the knowledge and essay title. The candidate gave two clear different interpretations which allowed the candidate to access the top band. It was not awarded more marks than 6 as the criteria of 'higher order' and 'flowing' were achieved only in a limited way.

## Conclusion

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

The candidate had attempted a balanced judgement which is a good way to achieve 2 marks. However, their judgements were not clear, for example, the use of 'sensible' is inappropriate.

## Question 2

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 10 marks**.

The candidate accurately described the inherited position and status of Hector (**1 mark**).

The candidate stated that Achilles was a good example of attaining power through achievements in warfare (**1 mark**).

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for stating that Zeus' authority was questioned.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for accurately stating that Agamemnon disrespected a religious figure by ignoring their plea. An additional **1 mark** was awarded for describing the consequence – the plague ravaged the fleet.

The conclusion was a brief but accurate summary of the candidate's findings and balancing which was accurate (**2 marks**).

## Candidate 4

Overall, the candidate was awarded **19 out of 30 marks**.

### Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **13 out of 20 marks**.

#### Introduction

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

The argument was outlined – characters in ‘Antigone’ are led by their egos to make rash decisions.

#### Knowledge

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The knowledge was accurate and relevant. It was based over the three characters of Antigone, Ismene and Creon, with mention of Haemon. The exemplification was slightly weak. There was some repetition – for example, the relationship between the sisters and the proclamation of Creon.

#### Analysis

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The candidate gave good explanation of the motivations and consequences of the actions of the three characters in their answer. Two differing opinions were given (one about the reasons why Antigone refused Ismene’s assistance, and another about her motivations for challenging Creon). However, the candidate was not placed in the 6-8 marks band because the other criteria such as ‘flowing’ were not met.

#### Conclusion

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The candidate gave a very detailed conclusion with valid judgements.

## Question 2

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 10 marks**.

The candidate accurately explained how Creon's authority led to the order of the execution of Antigone (**1 mark**).

The candidate stated that Creon became king due to his birth (**1 mark**).

The next paragraph repeated this information and was awarded no marks.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for stating that Creon was shocked that his son challenged him. No marks were awarded for the mention of execution as this had already been used, but the phrase 'tracked down' was accurate and a second mark was awarded (**1 mark**).

No marks were awarded for the next points. They were either repetitions (the execution) or irrelevant to the quotation (Creon's regret).

No further marks were awarded. Subsequent points were either repetitions of points already made, points irrelevant to the quotation used or unclear in meaning.

The conclusion was an accurate summary of the candidate's findings, and balancing which was accurate (**2 marks**).