



New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Home > NCEA > Subjects > Assessment Reports > Classical Studies - L3

Assessment Report

Level 3 Classical Studies 2016

Standards [91394](#) [91395](#) [91396](#)

Part A: Commentary

It is pleasing to note that many candidates were able to develop analytical responses. However, some candidates answered a question they had prepared for, rather than a question from the options available in the examination. This led to responses that did not adequately address the conceptual foci of the question. Similarly, candidates who used inappropriate text(s), art work(s) or a significant historical figure for their chosen question found it challenging to meet the standard. Candidates who used the key concepts/words in the question, e.g. ideology, to focus and structure their analysis produced more successful responses than those who did not. Similarly, candidates who wrote in extended paragraph format were able to develop greater analysis than those who focused on communicating their understanding primarily through diagrams and bullet-points. Candidates are encouraged to spend time planning their responses in the space provided.

Part B: Report on Standards

91394: Analyse ideas and values of the classical world

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- analysed ideas and values at a basic or under-developed level in the context of the question set
- used key words from the question
- provided some primary source evidence in the form of direct quoting or paraphrasing
- included a lot of plot details which was appropriate to their chosen question
- briefly analysed episodes / passages from the literary text(s)
- largely relied on generalised points
- drew basic conclusions.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- lacked understanding of the ideas and values of the classical world, often overgeneralising
- recalled narrative/plot without realising the importance of events in light of ideas and/or values
- used pre-learned material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question, e.g. prepared a response that was based on a previous examination question
- wrote unbalanced and short responses
- described episodes from the text, but provided no analysis
- drew undeveloped or unlikely conclusions with little relevance to the question
- provided evidence that was incorrect or misinterpreted.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- discussed, in depth, ideas and values of the classical world in the context of the question set
- used key words from the question to form their response
- effectively linked episodes from the text(s) to classical ideas and values
- wrote coherent, fluent answers that were well organised
- made attempts to include judgements or evaluation around 'the extent to which...'
- referred to the text(s) by quoting or paraphrasing, in order to develop their argument, and used Latin and/or Greek terms where appropriate
- used multiple examples to support their points
- often provided too much information about the socio-political context that was not relevant to their chosen question
- drew sound conclusions about the ideas and values of the classical world, taking into account the examples they had analysed.

Candidates who were awarded as **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- discussed, with insight, ideas and values of the classical world in the context of the question set, and linked them effectively to literary text(s)
- used the wording of the question to formulate their response
- analysed 'the extent to which...' very well, their argument often clearly stated at the beginning of their response
- focused on the analysis of the ideas and values rather than recalling plot in detail
- made links to many parts of the text(s)
- wrote a fluent, sophisticated response
- appreciated the complexity of the text(s) and their characters
- included original ideas, well-developed argument(s), quotes from secondary sources, and/or insightful links to the socio-political context of the text(s)
- showed superb textual knowledge and often included comparisons to modern day parallels beyond the usual scope of the text, e.g. the philosophical drivers for Aeneas' behaviours with modern-day parallels
- drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates responded to this standard using a variety of classical literary texts – Aristophanes' *Frogs*, *Lysistrata* and *Wasps*, Homer's *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, Juvenal's *Satires*, Euripides' *Medea*. The majority of candidates responded using Virgil's *Aeneid*.

It is recommended that candidates are familiar with the latter books of Virgil's *Aeneid* and not just the 'traditional' set books.

Candidates who responded to a question using Homer's *Odyssey* often struggled to deal with the complexity of the ideas and values inherent in this epic poem. A focus on *xenia* alone did not provide enough scope to meet the standard at Merit or Excellence levels of achievement

91395: Analyse the significance of a work(s) of art in the classical world

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- discussed the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set
- used key words from the question in their response
- wrote a lot on the historical/artistic/mythological context instead of focusing on answering the question
- provided more explanation than analysis
- based their answers on too many art works (often 4-5). As a result, their answers provided too many factual details and failed to respond to the question set in sufficient detail
- began their responses by writing several pages of factual information about the art work / artist / emperor, which was irrelevant and of no value in the context of their chosen question, almost like a lengthy introduction, which is not required
- drew basic conclusions.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- provided very little relevant or accurate information in response to the question
- chose inappropriate art work(s) for their chosen question
- based their response on too many art works which led to a superficial answer
- wrote very short answers and/or included too many inaccuracies.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- discussed, in depth, the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set
- analysed 'the extent to which...' although treatment was often unbalanced
- developed a structured, analytical response
- used key words from the question to focus their response
- chose art works wisely and were able to use their art works to answer the question in detail
- used 1–3 art works and wrote in depth rather than covering multiple art works in breadth
- made relevant connections
- drew sound conclusions supported by evidence.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- discussed, with insight, the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set
- analysed 'the extent to which...' throughout the response
- thought carefully about the demands of the question and selected art works appropriately
- used a few art works to answer the question perceptively and in depth
- approached the question methodically addressing all aspects in appropriate detail
- began directly responding to the question without giving extraneous information or an irrelevant introduction about the works they had chosen
- used relevant terminology with purpose
- drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.

Standard-specific comments

Candidates are encouraged to respond to the focus of their chosen question and not provide a response that merely communicates what they know about an art work(s).

Candidates are encouraged to draw a wide range of evidence from around 1–3 art works.

Candidates who chose 4–5 or more art works usually wrote a descriptive response that lacked analysis and prevented them from showing a higher level of understanding.

91396: Analyse the impact of a significant historical figure on the classical world

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- discussed a significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- provided some analysis, but this was not sustained
- used key words/concepts from the question in their response, e.g. leadership, ideology, conflict, social and political order
- used narrative detail to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding
- provided some primary source evidence, mostly in the form of paraphrasing
- drew basic conclusions.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- misinterpreted their chosen question
- chose a question that did not lend itself to their chosen figure as well as other questions would have
- wrote less than three pages
- retold a narrative of a significant historical figure's life/career rather than analysis

- produced an episodic response that was not methodical, e.g. events/details not in chronological order or linked thematically
- used pre-learnt material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question, e.g. some candidates wrote at length about a conflict, but did not analyse the extent to which the figure was successful in resolving it (Question Three), some candidates wrote about a figure's ideology(s) but did not connect to the effect on relationship(s) (Question One)
- used bullet points only
- wrote a lengthy introduction, not required by this standard
- provided little or no relevant primary source.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- discussed, in depth, a significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- analysed most key words/concepts in the question with purpose
- addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced
- applied a methodical approach to planning and structuring their response
- developed an argument although their analysis of the 'extent to which...' was often addressed near the end of the response rather than integrated throughout
- chose appropriate narrative evidence to support their ideas
- integrated primary source evidence of specific relevance to the context, with some attribution
- analysed connections between the significant historical figure's life/career and their historical context, e.g. relationships with people and places, historical events that continued to influence, conflicting ideologies
- provided alternative viewpoints, e.g. different primary/secondary source perspectives on an event or relationship, sometimes including their own viewpoint too
- drew sound conclusions supported by evidence.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- discussed, with insight, the impact of the significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- skilfully used the key words/concepts in the question to structure and develop argument(s) around the 'extent to which...'
- addressed all aspects of the question in appropriate detail
- presented an argument, critically evaluated alternative viewpoints, then synthesised all ideas to draw developed conclusions
- consistently integrated and attributed a range of primary, and where appropriate secondary evidence of specific relevance to the context
- implicitly and/or explicitly acknowledged the complexity of the primary, and where appropriate secondary source evidence, e.g. addressing the strengths/limitations of sources in relation to style, time, place and relationships in the context of the question set and their chosen historical figure, such as Plato being Socrates' pupil, bias in the *Res Gestae*
- critically evaluated connections between the significant historical figure's life/career and their historical context to draw conclusions about the extent of their impact
- drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.

Standard-specific comments

Historical figures most commonly used were Alexander the Great, Augustus, and Socrates. Some candidates wrote about figures such as Hippocrates, Agrippina, and Cleopatra. It is advised that candidates who use the latter female figures widen their focus beyond lust for power. It is recommended that using Hippocrates is avoided, as he lacks the socio-political aspect required for this standard.

[Classical Studies subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority