



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**CLASSICAL STUDIES**

**9274/31**

Paper 3 Classical History – Sources & Evidence

**October/November 2021**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of 7 printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Essays: Generic Marking Descriptors for Papers 3 and 4**

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the ‘best fit’, not a ‘perfect fit’ in applying the levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.

Level/marks	Descriptors
<p>Level 5</p> <p>50–40</p>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED AT THIS LEVEL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strongly focussed analysis that answers the question convincingly;</li> <li>• sustained argument with a strong sense of direction, strong and substantiated conclusions;</li> <li>• give full expression to material relevant to both AOs;</li> <li>• towards the bottom may be a little unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued;</li> <li>• wide range of citation of relevant information, handled with confidence to support analysis and argument;</li> <li>• excellent exploration of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<p>Level 4</p> <p>39–30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a determined response to the question with clear analysis across most of the answer;</li> <li>• argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour, strong conclusions adequately substantiated;</li> <li>• covers both AOs;</li> <li>• good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument, description is avoided;</li> <li>• good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<p>Level 3</p> <p>29–20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• engages well with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality;</li> <li>• tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description;</li> <li>• the requirements of both AOs are addressed, but without any real display of flair or thinking;</li> <li>• good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to describe rather than support analysis and argument;</li> <li>• fair display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<p>Level 2</p> <p>19–10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues, analysis is limited/thin;</li> <li>• limited argument within an essentially descriptive response, conclusions are limited/thin;</li> <li>• factually limited and/or uneven, some irrelevance;</li> <li>• perhaps stronger on AO1 than AO2 (which might be addressed superficially or ignored altogether);</li> <li>• patchy display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>

<b>Level/marks</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
Level 1 9–0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• little or no engagement with the question, little or no analysis offered;</li><li>• little or no argument, conclusions are very weak, assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance;</li><li>• little or no display of relevant information;</li><li>• little or no attempt to address AO2;</li><li>• little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.</li></ul>

**General**

Any critical exploration as an answer to a Paper 3 question will necessarily encompass differing views, knowledge, and argument. Thus, the mark scheme for these questions cannot and should not be prescriptive.

Candidates are being encouraged to explore, in the exam room, a theme that they will have studied. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) may make for limitations in answers but this is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked materials of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the actual question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point.

*Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the interpretation and evaluation of the texts offered by an answer. Successful answers will need to make use of all three passages, draw conclusions and arrive at summative decisions.*

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>How significant was the impact of war on ordinary people during this period? In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading as well as the two passages below.</b></p> <p>The quotation from Ober’s book suggests that in 431 BC Athens looked to be in a superior position, as Pericles’ strategy suggested a very different approach to large-scale warfare in Greece than had been adopted previously. The emphasis on Athens’ success, built on empire and naval superiority, is key, together with the well-developed city defences which ensured that Sparta could not mount a direct challenge. This judgment is based both on Athenian strengths and Spartan weaknesses: the strength of the Spartan army was undeniable, but it was difficult for the Spartans to mount lengthy campaigns, partly because of their reliance on allies but also because of their lack of financial resources (this meant siege warfare was out). However, although Athens’ democracy voted for war, the reality of warfare was not quite so simple – some candidates may comment on ‘appeared to be’. So, the pressures of siege warfare, the damage caused to individuals and property and then the outbreak of the plague all challenge this view. Some candidates may also want to discuss the cost of the war, and explain why Athens failed to achieve a victory, limited or otherwise, in the Archidamian War, and then went on to lose the war altogether when it broke out again, due in large part to the ‘democratic political order’ and the resurgence of the Persians in the Greek world.</p> <p>The first passage from the <i>Acharnians</i> (425 BC) suggests that there were those in Athens longing for peace which smells so sweet to Dikaiopolis. Candidates may pick on the reference to ‘three days’ rations’ as referring to the constant campaigning, which kept many Athenians at sea and on campaign in different theatres of war. The phrase ‘Go where you please’ highlights the limitation of movement beyond the walls of Athens during the campaigning season. Dikaiopolis’ preparations for celebrations suggest the freedom of his celebrations in contrast to what Athenians could expect in a city under threat of attack. The second passage highlights the reception of news in Athens of the almost total destruction of the forces that they sent to Sicily, and the potential problems facing the city as a result. Candidates may focus on the various elements mentioned here: there was the extent of their losses in Sicily, the threat of renewed Spartan aggression and the potential for the breakup of their empire. So, this presents a strong contrast to the ‘super-polis’ mentioned in the Ober passage, and suggests that the democracy had brought itself into serious peril. Thucydides notes that the people turned on political leaders (and others); candidates may also consider what Athens might expect as the consequence of defeat, particularly bearing in mind the way they had dealt with states like Scione and Melos.</p>	50

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>To what extent were the Romans interested in understanding the culture and customs of the peoples they conquered? In your answer you should consider the passage above and your wider reading as well as the two passages below:</b></p> <p>The quotation from Erskine raises a point opposed to that suggested by the text – namely that the Romans were only really interested in tax and the maintenance of their power. They therefore built roads and supported cities to achieve this. This point should enable candidates to look afresh at the notion in the question that the Romans were interested in the culture of the people whom they conquered – a notion which is developed in the two passages from Caesar and Tacitus.</p> <p>Caesar’s account of the people in Kent suggests that he had some interest in the origins and nature of the people whom he was conquering. However, candidates might decide to question the reliability of this passage and look at whether he is reporting facts or just rumours. Moreover, they might consider the nature of Caesar’s work, and his political aims in publishing this work. The points about the nature of the family etc. should be questioned, and their impact on a Roman audience considered.</p> <p>Tacitus also gives a detailed and more considered account of the Britons. Candidates may use this account to show his interest in the people, and the nature of his research, as well as considering his motives in presenting these ideas to a Roman audience. Candidates should expand their answers beyond the limits of the passages set, drawing further examples of Caesar’s interest and that of Tacitus, as well as using examples of Josephus’ accounts of Jewish practices as they appear in his work.</p>	50