

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2014 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 commonly:

- analysed ideas and values at a basic or under-developed level in the context of the question set
- understood Greek and Roman values and, to some extent, the socio-political context
- provided some primary source evidence
- used multiple examples to support the points made
- answered at least one of the bullet points sufficiently or addressed both bullet points in a general manner
- 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 commonly:

- lacked understanding of ideas and values of the classical world, often over-generalising
- misinterpreted the conceptual focus of the question
- recalled narrative without realising importance of events in light of ideas and/or values
- used pre-learnt material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question.
- chose inappropriate characters, events or texts, which meant it was difficult to meet the standard
- wrote unbalanced responses, often addressing the italicised statement only
- drew undeveloped or unlikely conclusions
- provided evidence which was incorrect or misinterpreted
- made errors such as Aeneas founding Rome, confusion over Greek and Roman deities, events

- based on adaptations of literary texts, e.g. film adaptations of the Odyssey.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, 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
- effectively linked episodes from the text(s) to classical ideas and values
- referred to the contemporary values behind ideas and/or values, albeit briefly
- addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced, e.g. the second bullet of the question was more narrowly focused
- compared and evaluated relevant episodes in the text
- drew sound conclusions about the ideas and values of the classical world, taking into account the examples they had analysed
- 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, where appropriate
- use multiple examples to support their points, e.g. a range of literary conventions as seen in multiple places in the text(s) for Question Three.

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 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)
- made links to many parts of the text(s), other classical or modern works
- wrote effectively, with maturity and sophistication
- treated the text as a humanly created form – rather than reality
- avoided providing irrelevant or extraneous information
- critically evaluated connections between ideas and values and the wider socio-political context
- drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.

OTHER COMMENTS

Candidates responded to this standard using a variety of classical literary texts – Virgil's Aeneid, Aristophanes' Frogs, Lysistrata, and Wasps, Homer's Odyssey and Iliad, Juvenal's Satires, Euripides' Medea and Hippolytus, Sophocles' Antigone, Oedipus Tyrannos and Electra.

Appropriate text choice is significant. Texts that offered limited opportunities to achieve at all levels were Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander and Plato's Life of Socrates. This is because candidates who responded using these contexts often focused on the historical figure, rather than the ideas and values of the classical world seen in these literary texts.

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 commonly:

- 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. figurative composition, enhancements
- 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
- provided some specific evidence for at least a part of the question
- began their response by writing several pages of factual information about the artwork/ artist/emperor, which was totally irrelevant and of no value in the context of their chosen question
- 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 commonly:

- misinterpreted the conceptual focus of the question, e.g. Question Three, many candidates did not address values
- provided very little relevant and accurate information in response to the question
- chose inappropriate art work(s) for the chosen question
- wrote lengthy and irrelevant introductions
- lacked a coherent structure, e.g. responding in bullet-points that did not link/relate or develop clearly, merely listing facts.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, 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
- 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
- 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 commonly:

- discussed, with insight, the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set
- thought carefully about the demands of the whole question and selected art works appropriately
- used one or two art works to answer the question perceptively and in depth
- 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
- 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 commonly:

- discussed a significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- provided some analysis, but this was not sustained
- omitted an aspect of the question in their response
- 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 commonly:

- misinterpreted the conceptual focus of the question
- retold a narrative of a significant historical figure's life/career rather than an analysis
- used pre-learnt material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question, e.g. Question Four, some candidates wrote about military conflict but did not address the ideas and/or beliefs that led to that conflict
- chose a question that did not lend itself to their chosen figure as well as other questions would have
- 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 commonly:

- discussed, in depth, a significant historical figure in the context of the question set
- analysed most concepts in the question with purpose, e.g. power, conflict, role model
- addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced, e.g. the second bullet of the question was more narrowly focused
- applied a methodical approach to planning and structuring their response
- 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, e.g. relationships with people/places, historical events which continued to influence conflicting ideologies
- 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 commonly:

- 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 (often including their own), 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.