

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 **27 out of 50 marks**.

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 8 marks**.

Source content

The first comment was awarded no marks. All of the key vocabulary was derived from the source. There was no additional information provided beyond the source content. The second point was also a paraphrase and the final sentence was not explained well enough.

Provenance

The comments about philosophers, intelligence and communication were correct and awarded **1 mark**. Ideally this would have been linked to a specific statement in the source, but the comments as expressed were valid.

The second comment was not awarded a mark. It was a generic comment about the period of time the source was written. If the candidate had stated that the author might have owned enslaved people or witnessed enslavement this would have been credited.

Omitted/developed points

The comment about enslaved people in public ownership and their jobs, including the 'police' was awarded **1 mark** as it was a well-developed point, linked to an example.

The comments about the range of jobs were awarded **1 mark** as they discussed other jobs. The comment about free time, although valid, was not developed and therefore not credited with a mark.

The comments about punishments were awarded **1 mark** as they were developed with examples of different types of punishment.

The comments about freedom were awarded **1 mark** as they were developed by the candidate's knowledge that freeing enslaved people was rare.

Question 2

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

The point about the separation of boys and girls reflecting different experiences in education in Athens was awarded **1 mark**.

The next point was awarded **1 mark**. The point made has an overlap with the point made above, but references to 'fighting' and 'weaving' were enough to gain a mark.

The third point was awarded **1 mark**, as the candidate showed good understanding of the arrangements for marriage.

The fourth point made was awarded **1 mark** as the candidate had correctly identified that the comments in the source about women looking after the family reflected the life of women in Athens.

The conclusion was awarded **2 marks**. The candidate gave a detailed summary of their answer, giving two reasons why they had reached this conclusion, albeit the content of the main body is limited.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 12 marks**.

First aspect – taxation

The candidate demonstrated knowledge that league membership involved paying taxes, where the funds were stored, that the payment was on an annual basis and the lack of control that members, other than Athens, had over the use of the funds. The knowledge was judged as limited and was awarded **1 mark**. This judgement was based on the lack of exemplification and additional detail (for example ‘used when needed’ is unclear, and ‘if they wished to continue to be part of the league’ indicated misunderstanding of the nature of the League).

1 mark was awarded for straightforward analysis – taxes had a negative impact as they were a financial burden on members.

Second aspect – protection

There was knowledge that the League afforded protection against the Persians, through a navy. This was judged as limited and was awarded **1 mark**.

1 mark was awarded for straightforward analysis – this gave members peace of mind.

Third aspect – manpower

There was knowledge that each state provided men, but the candidate seemed to think that members contributed men to the land forces of Athens. No marks were awarded as it was not exemplified or explained.

Fourth aspect – conclusion or effective fighting force

The candidate discussed aspects already covered, except for the point that taxation was used to build ships. This was judged as limited knowledge (**1 mark**) linking two pieces of knowledge already discussed.

Question 7

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 8 marks**.

Source A

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for stating that there were many people in the Senate and **1 mark** for the developed point that there were many views.

Source B

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for showing Aediles organised festivals and lavish events, and **1 mark** for stating that the intention of this was to increase the political support amongst the Roman citizens for the office holder.

Source C

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for showing the importance of being a Roman citizen.

The conclusion was awarded no marks, as the candidate did not show any further knowledge of the government of the Roman Republic.

Question 8(a)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 12 marks**.

First aspect – jobs

The candidate identified some jobs completed by enslaved people in public and private ownership. This was judged as limited and was awarded **1 mark** for knowledge. The judgements about skilled and unskilled work, and about work demands were unsupported by any accurate knowledge or examples and so were not credited.

Second aspect – skilled enslaved people

The candidate identified skilled jobs such as teachers and translators. The candidate indicated that skilled enslaved people could be either public or private slaves. This was awarded **1 mark** for a reasoned evaluative comment.

Third aspect – sources of slaves related to private and public ownership

The candidate described different ways people were enslaved, and how this might have determined if they would be privately or publicly owned. This was awarded **1 mark** as having some accuracy. The fact that an enslaved person could not decide for themselves where they would serve is valid and was awarded **1 mark** for evaluation.

Fourth aspect – treatment

The candidate gave some limited information about the difference between the treatment of publicly and privately owned enslaved people (**1 mark**). There was an evaluative comment that enslaved people in private ownership were more likely to be well treated (**1 mark**).

Candidate 2

Overall, the candidate was awarded **42 out of 50 marks**.

Question 4

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 8 marks**.

Provenance

The comment about the nature of comedy as a source was valid and awarded **1 mark**.

The comment about the writer experiencing the cults was accurate and awarded **1 mark**.

Source content

The first comment about purification was accurate and awarded **1 mark**.

The second point about Asclepius appearing in dreams and offering cures was awarded **1 mark**.

Omitted/developed points

The comment about priests administering cures was awarded **1 mark**.

The comments about the snakes and their significance in shedding their skins were awarded **1 mark**.

The comment about the divine nature of Asclepius was awarded **1 mark**.

Question 5

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

The comments about undertakers organising the disposal of the dead compared to the family was awarded **1 mark**.

The comments about the body being washed, perfumed and put in a shroud was awarded **1 mark**.

The point about the placing of the coins on the body was awarded **1 mark**, and the purpose of this was awarded an additional **1 mark**.

The points about the Greek traditions of death were very detailed and were awarded **2 marks**.

The point about the number of days of mourning was awarded **1 mark**.

The point about the Genesia was awarded **1 mark**.

Further points made by the candidate were valid, but the candidate reached the maximum possible marks available.

The conclusion was awarded **2 marks**. The candidate gave a detailed and balanced conclusion which reflects the information they provided in the body of their answer.

Question 6(b)

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 12 marks**.

First aspect – woman's role in society

The knowledge was judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. The knowledge about both priestesses and the peplos was accurate, but general in nature. No analysis marks were awarded.

Second aspect – Skira

The knowledge was judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. **1 mark** was awarded for straightforward analysis that the Skira was linked to women's role in the fertility of crops.

Third aspect – Thesmophoria

The knowledge was judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. **1 mark** was awarded for straightforward analysis – although it is similar to the point above, it is valid and adds some more information about blame and women miscarrying.

Question 9

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 8 marks**.

Source A

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for correctly identifying the cult of Mithras as coming from Persia, and **1 mark** for connecting the cult with soldiers. A further **1 mark** was awarded for describing the slaying of the bull.

Source B

No marks were awarded as the information which the candidate used was derived entirely from the source.

Source C

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for accurately describing the fact that the cult of Bacchus was particularly associated with the lower classes and **1 mark** was awarded for associating the cult with ecstatic worship.

Points of omission/developed knowledge

The following marks were awarded:

- **1 mark** for describing Isis as a goddess of healing and the link with Osiris.
- **1 mark** for stating that the Roman elite distrusted the cult of Bacchus due to the status of women.
- **1 mark** for describing the restrictions placed upon the cult of Bacchus.

At this point the candidate reached maximum marks, although the points made about Cybele are accurate.

Question 10(a)

The candidate was awarded **9 out of 12 marks**.

First aspect – Judaism

The knowledge was judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. **1 evaluation mark** was awarded for accurately describing the change in attitude of the Romans.

Second aspect – Christianity

The knowledge was judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. The information provided about the punishment of Christians did not form a large part of the consideration of this mark as there is little evidence for this. **1 mark** for evaluation was awarded for showing that the way the Romans viewed Jesus contributed to their view of all Christians.

Third aspect – Druidism

The knowledge was judged as very good and was awarded **3 marks**. This mark was awarded as the comments about the Romans eliminating Druids are treated as knowledge, although it could be seen as analysis.

Candidate 3

Overall, the candidate was awarded **34 out of 50 marks**.

Question 4

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 8 marks**.

Source content

The first comment about cleansing was accurate and awarded **1 mark**.

The second point about the contractual nature of offerings was awarded **1 mark**.

Omitted/developed points

The comments about votive offerings were correct and were awarded **1 mark**. The additional details that the offerings were made of clay and depicted body parts such as eyes were awarded another **1 mark**.

The comment about the snakes released into the room was awarded **1 mark**.

The comment about the herbal medicine/dogs licking was awarded **1 mark**.

Provenance

The comment that Aristophanes might have visited the cult was valid and awarded **1 mark**.

The comment about the nature of comedy was also awarded **1 mark**.

The comment about the time difference was valid, but there are no more marks to be awarded for provenance.

Question 5

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 10 marks**.

The comments about undertakers dealing with the disposal of the dead compared to the family were awarded **1 mark**. Further details about the eldest female's responsibility and the washing were awarded another **1 mark**.

The point about the placing of the coins on the body was awarded **1 mark**, and the purpose of this was awarded an additional **1 mark**.

The points about the marking on the door were unclear and were not awarded a mark.

The comment about the bowl of water was valid and was awarded **1 mark**.

The point about the use of oil and flowers was awarded **1 mark**.

The next two points were not credited. They were either not well explained or were paraphrasing of the source content with no additional detail.

The description of libations was valid and relevant, and was awarded **1 mark**.

The final point before the conclusion was not credited, as it was vague.

The conclusion was awarded **1 mark**. There was an overall valid conclusion, but not developed, and the final comment was not reflected in the main body of the answer.

Question 6(a)

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 12 marks**.

First aspect – sacrifice

The knowledge was judged as good and awarded **2 marks** although the comment about sacrifice being a humbling is not well made.

Second aspect – festivals

The knowledge was judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. Two festivals are described with good detail supplied.

Third aspect – offerings

The knowledge was judged as good in the description of votive offerings and libations and was awarded **2 marks**. The description of blood sacrifices has already been partially covered in the first aspect. **1 mark** for analysis was awarded for the purpose behind offerings.

Fourth aspect – prayer

The knowledge is judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. This takes the candidate to the maximum mark for knowledge. If the candidate needed more marks, the aspect on temples would gain 1 mark (limited knowledge), and 2 marks for cults (good knowledge).

Sixth aspect – Cults

The candidate made an analytical comment about the reason that some Greeks joined cults and was awarded **1 mark** for analysis.

Question 7

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 8 marks**.

Source B

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for discussing career progression in the Roman Republic. No marks were awarded about the office of censor as it is a verbose paraphrase of the source, giving no new information.

Source C

The candidate was not awarded any marks for the comments here as they show no knowledge outside the source.

Points of omission/developed knowledge

1 mark was awarded for describing the status of patricians, and another **1 mark** awarded for additional accurate detail.

1 mark was awarded for describing the importance of age in the Senate.

1 mark was awarded for describing that there were different kinds of assemblies and their role in Roman elections.

This takes the candidate to the maximum mark for omissions, but the comment on the difficulties of voting is accurate.

Question 8(b) (Note: the candidate has written 8(a))

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 12 marks**.

The opening paragraph was judged as an introduction and gained no marks as these points are dealt with in the next two paragraphs.

First aspect – financial aspects of governorship

The knowledge was judged as good and was awarded **2 marks**. The final comment on how finance impacted on the people was awarded **1 mark** for evaluation.

Second aspect – land

None of the comments were judged as accurate and no marks were awarded.