

2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Classical Studies Level 1 91021, 91022, 91023

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

The overall quality of responses from candidates to the 2015 examinations was pleasing.

However, there were some candidates who chose to write pre-planned material instead of focusing on addressing the question. This, in turn, impacted the quality of their responses.

Candidates who gained Achieved often focused on the first part of a question and either did not address the second part of a question, or lacked the knowledge required to do so in any real detail.

Candidates who performed at the Merit and Excellence level had the confidence and skills to structure a response which addressed both parts of a question. Typically, candidates who achieved at the higher levels made good use of the planning space provided in the examination. They provided specific evidence consistently throughout their response and were able to articulate their understanding of the question in greater detail.

Part B: Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91021: Demonstrate understanding of ideas and values of the classical world

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Achieved | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> understood the question and answered in a straightforward manner focused on one part of the question and often made brief or vague references to the ideas and values of the classical world relied primarily on knowledge of the text, rather than interpretation of the ideas within it provided chunks of the plot rather than specific evidence made generalised comments or statements about the classical world. |
| Not Achieved | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not address the question wrote plot summaries wrote very general answers which lacked any specific or detailed information wrote prepared responses which did not address the question did not discuss ideas and values of the classical world. |
| Achieved with Merit | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> answered both parts of the question, although may have still focused on the first bullet point referred to a range of supporting evidence from the text and explained the relevance of the examples to the question expanded on key points with detailed explanations wrote structured responses using the key words to frame paragraphs displayed an in-depth understanding of the ideas and values reflected by the classical text. |
| Achieved with Excellence | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> addressed both parts of the question equally, with a focus on discussing how the text revealed classical ideas or values wrote focused, structured responses using key words to frame paragraphs and ensured that the question was answered specifically |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> selected relevant evidence from the classical text and perceptively interpreted how the evidence conveyed ideas and values within the classical text included perceptive insights into the ideas and values shown in the classical text referred to other aspects of Greek or Roman society outside of the classical text which enhanced the response. |
| Standard specific comments | Candidates should take care to select the question which best fits their learning as in some cases the arguments made were better suited to a different question. Candidates should ensure that they address the questions asked and focus on key words rather than rely on pre-planned material that does not answer the exam questions. |

2. Assessment Report for 91022: Demonstrate understanding of the significance of features of work(s) of art in the classical world

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Achieved | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wrote basic information but lacked detail and / or range did not always address both parts of the question and typically focused on the first part of the question did not always follow question instructions. |
| Not Achieved | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not address the question used examples that were irrelevant to the question wrote responses that held little information, lacked any specific detail, or provided incorrect information. |
| Achieved with Merit | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> showed detailed knowledge / breadth / range / depth addressed both parts of the question used the language of the question clearly in their responses provided specific references to support their responses. |
| Achieved with Excellence | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> showed detailed knowledge / breadth / range / depth addressed both part of the question used the language of the question clearly and consistently in their responses placed the art work / architecture in the wider context of Roman / Greek cultural importance – historical / artistic / religious / social remained focussed and thorough with convincing discussion. |
| Standard specific comments | <p>Common buildings studied included temples: the Parthenon, Propylaea, Erechtheion, Maison Carree; entertainment venues: the Colosseum, Amphitheatre at Pompeii, Hadrian's Baths, Circus Maximus.</p> <p>Common art works studied included mosaics: Alexander, Nilotic, Lion and the Bull, Grazing Goats, Sorceress and Client, Banquet scene; paintings: Perseus and Andromeda, Death of Pentheus, Harbour Scene at Stabiae; statues: Augustus of Prima Porta, bust of Commodus, Patrician carrying Busts, dying Gaul, Laocoon, Discobolus, Kritios boy; vases: Exekias, Berlin Painter; Arch of Titus, Trajan's Column, Panathenaic Frieze.</p> |

3. Assessment Report for 91023: Demonstrate understanding of an important historical figure in the classical world

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Achieved | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrated a straightforward understanding of the importance of the historical figure chose appropriate contexts within the scope of the question referred to details from primary evidence, though only in description and without reference to those details being from a primary source |
|-----------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • used mostly narrative detail to address the question, with some implied analysis • used generalised explanations and descriptions of contexts • addressed at least one part of the question in some detail. |
| Not Achieved | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • described narrative detail, at times inaccurate, without explanation of aspects • often demonstrated understanding of much of a context without responding to any part of the chosen question • chose contexts that were too vague or broad, ie Caesar's relationship with the people of Rome • did not refer to evidence from primary sources. |
| Achieved with Merit | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrated in-depth and accurate understanding of the historical figure through focused and developed explanation • focused on answering all aspects of the question, rather than giving narrative detail • used a methodical structure for their response that allowed them to build towards an argument • used primary source evidence in the correct context to support the points made • were able to give accurate references to sources used. |
| Achieved with Excellence | <p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrated perceptive understanding of the historical figure by analysing sources of evidence in relation to the context of the question • considered the wider social and/or political context of the historical figure in relation to the question • used a comprehensive range of accurate details to support explanations • answered all parts of the question in detail • structured their answers to develop a coherent and convincing argument in response to the question • provided a range of primary source evidence, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the context • demonstrated perceptive understanding of the perspectives of the sources of evidence and connected this to the context of the question. |
| Standard specific comments | <p>Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar and Nero were used widely. Other figures included Socrates, Crassus, Spartacus and Agrippina. Cleopatra was used well on some occasions, though candidates need to carefully relate their answer to classical contexts specifically. Candidates who answered on mythological figures were not successful, as the standard requires the figure to have been historical.</p> <p>Successful candidates chose questions that best suited the historical figure they had studied and did not rely on previously learnt responses. They focused carefully on the question and used primary evidence in their answers. These candidates also avoided giving long sections of narrative detail, and instead focused on discussing the historical figure in the context of the question.</p> <p>Merit and Excellence answers were more analytical and addressed all parts of the question methodically. They were able to provide accurate source references for primary evidence and used the evidence in the correct context.</p> |