

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2011 Assessment Report

Classical Studies Level 2

- 90247 Examine a passage from a work of classical literature in translation**
- 90248 Examine a work of classical art and /or architecture**
- 90249 Examine in essay format an aspect of the classical world**

COMMENTARY

This was the final year for examinations to assess these achievement standards.

In the 2011 examinations, candidates were expected to:

- answer two questions for 90247 and 90248 and respond to both bullet points within each question
- write one essay for 90249 and address all parts of the essay question.

Successful candidates chose questions that best suited their learning and managed their time effectively. They also read all parts of the question, thought carefully about what the question required, and then planned their approach. Their answers showed that they followed instructions diligently and gave equal attention to all parts of the question.

There were some excellent answers from candidates who responded to all parts of the question in detail, while avoiding irrelevant information. These candidates explained their ideas clearly and showed excellent knowledge and understanding of classical concepts as well as individual thought and insight.

Successful candidates consistently provided supporting evidence from a variety of relevant sources and used evidence to reinforce and illustrate their answers. They also expressed their views clearly and effectively and used Greek/Latin words and other technical terms confidently.

It is important for candidates to remember that:

- following the structure of the question (i.e. answering each bullet point in turn) is more likely to produce higher grades than any other approach
- a 'write all you know' approach seldom earns the candidate more than an Achievement grade; candidates who aim for higher grades must be judicious in the selection of their material.

STANDARD REPORTS

90247 Examine a passage from a work of classical literature in translation

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- answered two questions
- demonstrated a basic understanding of the texts
- addressed most parts of the question
- followed the instructions in the questions, for example "giving evidence from this extract."

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- wrote answers that were significantly brief
- answered only part of the questions
- answered only one question
- showed little understanding of the texts
- retold irrelevant aspects of the plot.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- used evidence from the extract and other parts of the text to support their answers
- answered two questions with a reasonable amount of detail in each
- demonstrated both knowledge and understanding of the text
- gave some specific details such as names, titles, and relevant past events
- addressed both sides of comparison questions
- presented some analysis
- selected appropriate and relevant supporting evidence, while avoiding a narrative-based response.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- answered both questions fully and with specific detail
- used historical/social/political context to demonstrate an understanding of the wider context
- used specific evidence from the extract and other parts of the text to support their answers, as required by the question
- demonstrated an appreciation of the literary features and wider themes in the text
- gave a deeper analysis of the subject matter of the question.

90248 Examine a work of classical art and/or architecture

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- attempted two questions on their chosen topic
- omitted part of the question chosen/did not cover both parts in detail
- applied some learned knowledge that was appropriate to the question asked
- gave basic outlines without evidence to support their answer.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- attempted only one question or wrote about two sentences only on each of two questions
- wrote responses that included only irrelevant material not related to the question asked
- wrote responses based on visual observation of the plates included in the paper
- did not understand terminology used in the paper – e.g. “layout”.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- answered both parts of the question
- attempted to discuss, supplying evidence to support their answer
- applied a generally sound knowledge of the art works e.g. demonstrated familiarity with stylistic techniques
- wrote structured paragraph answers
- attempted to tailor their knowledge to answer the questions set.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- discussed fully the required features
- supported their answers with relevant evidence consistently supplied
- wrote comprehensive, well-structured answers covering both parts of the question
- wrote answers that included an analytical focus
- applied a thorough knowledge of the art works to answer the set questions.

90249 Examine in essay format an aspect of the classical world

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- attempted all parts of the question with varying levels of success/accuracy
- attempted most parts of the question but wrote more successfully on one part of the question than others
- wrote a simple introduction and conclusion that simply reworded the question but that did not include any specific information on what they would write in the main body of their essay
- did not write an introduction or conclusion that bookended the essay with any distinction
- did not plan a response and as such their essays lacked structure and clarity often rambling clumsily through the question
- wrote essays that were too brief and vague despite clearly attempting all parts of the question
- misinterpreted a key component of the question

- wrote very short paragraphs that lacked evidence and/or discussion
- attempted to use Latin/Greek terms and primary evidence, sometimes with success.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- did not plan a response
- did not identify the multiple parts of the questions and did not address the majority of the question
- did not write in an appropriate essay format, e.g. wrote with bullet points, diagrams or very short paragraphs
- wrote in the style of a story
- wrote extensively on their opinions rather than using facts
- wrote everything they had learned, regardless of whether it fitted the question
- wrote a prepared essay for a very different question
- showed general lack of depth of knowledge and understanding
- did not use primary sources at all (not even terms), or made up primary evidence
- confused Roman and Greek worlds/terms in their essay.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- wrote a methodical introduction and conclusion that used the wording and structure of the original question
- answered every part of the question but were unbalanced in their approach to the various elements of the question
- wrote in-depth answers but their ideas were at times inadequately explained
- used supporting evidence in most aspects of their answer but they did not use a range of supporting evidence nor was it spread evenly over the entirety of the essay
- wrote accurately and with confidence but occasionally they made sweeping generalisations or factual errors.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- planned their answers
- responded to all parts of a question and showed depth of knowledge and understanding
- applied what they learned to the question and wrote with accuracy and confidence
- made several analytical points in their discussion, showing insight
- consistently provided supporting evidence
- interspersed supporting evidence throughout the essay and not just in the discussion section

- showed an element of flair in the essay.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Students clearly understand the importance of using supporting evidence, but this was sometimes done at the expense of topic knowledge or understanding
- highlighting (literally), underlining or pedantically sign-posting where and when they were using supporting evidence made the essay difficult to mark.