

# **National Certificate of Educational Achievement**

## **2013 Assessment Report**

### **Classical Studies Level 3**

- 91394 Analyse ideas and values of the classical world**
- 91395 Analyse the significance of a work(s) of art in the classical world**
- 91396 Analyse the impact of a significant historical figure on the classical world**

## COMMENTARY

Candidates often 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 in the question, e.g. power, 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.

## STANDARD REPORTS

### 91394 Analyse ideas and values of the classical world

#### ACHIEVEMENT

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

- analysed ideas and values at a basic level in the context of the question set
- made a link/s between ideas and values and the socio-political context
- provided some supporting evidence, although this was largely plot recall
- referred to more than one event in their chosen text
- demonstrated knowledge of a set of beliefs in their chosen text, and how a character/s is affected by it
- demonstrated knowledge of imagery in their chosen text and used example/s to support their analysis
- drew basic conclusions.

#### 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:**

- over-generalised ideas and/or values
- misinterpreted the conceptual focus of the question
- recalled narrative without realising the importance of events in light of ideas and/or values
- chose inappropriate characters, events, relationships or text(s) for the chosen question
- used pre-learnt material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question
- wrote unbalanced answers, often responding to the italicised statement only
- provided evidence which was incorrect or misinterpreted, e.g. provided examples of literary conventions such as slapstick, role-reversal, use of a *proem*, *in medias res*, rather than conventions of imagery
- confused Greek and Roman societies
- drew undeveloped or unlikely conclusions.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

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

- discussed, in-depth, ideas and values inherent in the chosen text(s)
- effectively linked episodes from the text to ideas and values
- briefly referred to, as appropriate, the contemporary values behind ideas and/or values, e.g. religious beliefs in Augustan Rome
- compared and evaluated relevant episodes in the text
- addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced, e.g. the second bullet of the question was more narrowly focused
- wrote coherent answers which were well organised
- referred to the text(s), by quoting or paraphrasing, in order to develop their argument, and used Latin and/or Greek terms where appropriate
- discussed different viewpoints
- referred to the author's message/s, as appropriate
- drew sound conclusions about the ideas and values of the classical world.

## **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, with insight, the ideas and values of the classical world in the context of the question set
- made links to many parts of the text(s), and other classical or modern works
- wrote effectively, with maturity and sophistication
- addressed all aspects of the question in appropriate detail
- treated the text as a humanly created form, rather than reality
- explained specific motives and intentions behind the author's writing, e.g. friends of Augustus, used as propaganda, could be seen as Virgil guiding him, Aristophanes trying to guide the audience into seeing Cleon for what he really is, reflecting on the state of 'democracy'
- chose an array of 'imagery' to examine and explained how each worked together to reinforce the author's main purpose
- avoided providing irrelevant or extraneous information
- critically evaluated connections between ideas and values and the wider socio-political context, e.g. Augustan values, if discussing Aeneas' heroism, the political context of Athens during the Peloponnesian War for Aristophanes or Euripides' plays, the decline of the patron-client relationship in Juvenal's time
- drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.

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

### **ACHIEVEMENT**

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

- discussed the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set
- answered at least one aspect of the question sufficiently or addressed all aspects in a general manner
- addressed the conceptual focus of the question, e.g. depth
- chose an art work(s) that made it possible for them to respond to the question, e.g. candidates who achieved in Question One chose art works that related to a social activity such as gladiator fights and *symposia*
- provided some specific evidence for at least a part of the question, e.g. for Question One, candidates who discussed bath houses showed a good knowledge of the different rooms and what they were used for
- drew basic conclusions.

### **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:**

- misinterpreted the conceptual focus of the question
- provided very little relevant and accurate information in response to the question, e.g. for Question Three, Roman Art, some candidates were not able to write about *Verism* or Idealism correctly
- chose inappropriate art work(s) for the chosen question, e.g. for Question Two candidates who wrote about the Patrician Carrying Busts were usually not able to answer the question
- wrote lengthy and irrelevant introductions
- lacked a coherent structure, e.g. responding in bullet-points that did not link/relate or develop clearly.

### **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

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

- discussed, in depth, the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set
- addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced, e.g. the second bullet of the question was more narrowly focused
- developed a structured, analytical response
- chose art works wisely and were able to use their art works to answer the question in detail, e.g. for Question One, candidates used the Exekias *Kylix* and were able to write with some authority about *symposia* and its related activities
- used one or two art works and wrote in depth rather than covering multiple art works in breadth
- drew sound conclusions supported by evidence.

## **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, with insight, the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set, e.g. for Question One, in the Greek context, candidates made sound judgments about what sorts of things were likely to increase the social status of the owner of the vase, even though the particular person could clearly not be known. In the Roman context, candidates were able to discuss not merely the status of 'the emperor', but were able to name the emperor and explain with insight how their chosen art work(s) added to that particular emperor's prestige or status
- thought carefully about the demands of the whole question and selected art works appropriately
- approached the question methodically addressing all aspects in appropriate detail
- included either no, or a small introduction, and then began directly responding to the question without giving extraneous information about the works they had chosen. For example, for Question One in the Roman context, candidates knew about gladiatorial games and focused their answer only on the parts of the Colosseum which were relevant to that social activity. They did not, for example, waste time on the exterior decoration as part of a response to the first bullet point
- drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.

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

### **ACHIEVEMENT**

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

- discussed a significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- used narrative detail to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding
- provided some primary source evidence, mostly in the form of paraphrasing
- drew basic conclusions.

### **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 about a non-historical figure, such as Aeneas or Odysseus
- misinterpreted the conceptual focus of the question
- retold a narrative of a significant historical figure's life/career
- used pre-learnt material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question
- provided little or no relevant primary source evidence.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

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

- discussed, in depth, a significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- analysed most concepts in the question with purpose
- addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced, e.g. the second bullet of the question was more narrowly focused
- developed an argument throughout their response
- 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
- provided alternative viewpoints, e.g. different primary/secondary source perspectives on an event or relationship
- drew sound conclusions supported by evidence.

## **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, with insight, the impact of a significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- skilfully used the concepts in the question to structure and develop argument/s
- 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 source evidence of specific relevance to the context
- implicitly and/or explicitly acknowledged the complexity of 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 and their chosen significant historical figure
- 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.