

# 2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Classical Studies Level 3 91394, 91395, 91396

## Part A: Commentary

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

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/words 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.

## Part B: Report on standards

### 1. Assessment Report for 91394: Analyse ideas and values of the classical world

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analysed ideas and values at a basic or under-developed level in the context of the question set</li> <li>used key words from the question to form their response</li> <li>understood Greek and/or Roman values and, to some extent, the socio-political context</li> <li>provided some primary source evidence in the form of direct quoting or paraphrasing</li> <li>used multiple examples to support the points made</li> <li>answered at least one of the bullet points sufficiently or addressed both bullet points in a general manner</li> <li>drew basic conclusions.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>lacked understanding of the ideas and values of the classical world, often overgeneralising</li> <li>misinterpreted the purpose of the question, e.g. discussed staging in a general sense rather than literary conventions as seen in Aristophanic comedies</li> <li>recalled narrative/plot without realising the importance of events in light of ideas and/or values</li> <li>used pre-learnt material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question</li> <li>chose inappropriate characters, events or texts, which meant it was difficult to meet the standard</li> <li>confused Greek and Roman ideas and values</li> <li>wrote unbalanced and short responses</li> <li>drew undeveloped or unlikely conclusions with little relevance to the question</li> <li>provided evidence which was incorrect or misinterpreted</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Merit</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>discussed, in depth, ideas and values of the classical world in the context of the question set</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effectively linked episodes from the text(s) to classical ideas and values</li> <li>referred to the contemporary values behind the classical ideas and/or values, albeit briefly</li> <li>understood the purpose / requirements of the question and addressed all aspects of the question in some depth</li> <li>drew sound conclusions about the ideas and values of the classical world, taking into account the examples they had analysed</li> <li>wrote coherent answers which were well organised</li> <li>referred to the text(s) by quoting or paraphrasing, in order to develop their argument, and used Latin and/or Greek terms where appropriate</li> <li>discussed different viewpoints, where appropriate</li> <li>used 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> <li>made links to many parts of the text(s), other classical or modern works</li> <li>wrote a fluent, well organised response</li> <li>treated the text as a humanly created form – rather than reality</li> <li>often compared or contrasted quotes or passages from texts to show perception</li> <li>understood the positions of character, such as Dido and Dionysus, and how they were viewed by their ancient audiences</li> <li>critically evaluated connections between ideas and values and the wider socio-political context</li> <li>drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	<p>Candidates responded to this standard using a variety of classical literary texts. The most common were Virgil's Aeneid, Aristophanes' Frogs, Lysistrata and Wasps, Homer's Odyssey and Iliad and Sophocles' Antigone.</p>

## 2. Assessment Report for 91395: Analyse the significance of work(s) of art in the classical world

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>discussed the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set</li> <li>answered at least one aspect of the question sufficiently or addressed all aspects in a general manner</li> <li>used key words from the question in their response</li> <li>wrote a lot on the historical/artistic/mythological context instead of focusing on answering the question. E.g. Question One candidates who wrote about the Prima Porta or the Ara Pacis Augustae often provided an eloquent and detailed historical account on Augustus and his achievements but did not respond to the question adequately or did not sufficiently link to their chosen art work(s)</li> <li>provided more explanation than analysis</li> <li>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</li> <li>provided some specific evidence for a least part of the question</li> <li>began their responses by writing several pages of factual information about the art work / artist / emperor, which was irrelevant and of not value in the context of their chosen question</li> <li>drew basic conclusions.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>misinterpreted the purpose of the question</li> <li>provided very little relevant or accurate information in response to the question</li> <li>chose inappropriate art work(s) for their chosen question</li> <li>lacked a coherent structure, e.g. responding in bullet-points that did not link/relate or develop clearly, merely listing facts.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Achieved with Merit</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>discussed, in depth, the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set</li> <li>addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced, e.g. the second bullet of the question was more narrowly focused</li> <li>developed a structured, analytical response</li> <li>chose art works wisely and were able to use their art works to answer the question in detail</li> <li>used one or two art works and wrote in depth rather than covering multiple art works in breadth</li> <li>drew sound conclusions supported by evidence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Excellence</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>discussed, with insight, the significance of a work(s) of art in the context of the question set</li> <li>thought carefully about the demands of the whole question and selected art works appropriately</li> <li>used a few art works to answer the question perceptively and in depth</li> <li>approached the question methodically addressing all aspects in appropriate detail</li> <li>began directly responding to the question without given extraneous information or an irrelevant introduction about the works they had chosen</li> <li>used relevant terminology with purpose</li> <li>drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard specific comments</b></p>	<p>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 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. Candidates must be taught how to choose the best question that suits what they have learnt about.</p>

### 3. Assessment Report for 91396: Analyse the impact of a significant historical figure on the classical world

<p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>discussed a significant historical figure in the context of the question set</li> <li>provided some analysis, but this was not sustained</li> <li>omitted an aspect of the question in their response</li> <li>used key words from the question in their response</li> <li>used narrative detail to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding</li> <li>provided some primary source evidence, mostly in the form of paraphrasing</li> <li>drew basic conclusions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Not Achieved</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>misinterpreted the purpose of the question</li> <li>retold a narrative of a significant historical figure's life/career rather than an analysis</li> <li>used pre-learnt material in a way that did not authentically engage with the question, e.g. some candidates wrote about military conflict but did not address the ideas and/or beliefs that led to that conflict (Question Four)</li> <li>chose a question that did not lend itself to their chosen historical figure as well as other questions would have</li> <li>provided little or no relevant primary source evidence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Merit</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>discussed, in depth, a significant historical figure in the context of the question set</li> <li>analysed most key words in the question with purpose, e.g. power, conflict, ideological belief(s)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addressed all aspects of the question, although treatment was often unbalanced, e.g. the second bullet of the question was more narrowly focused</li> <li>• applied a methodical approach to planning and structuring their response</li> <li>• developed an argument throughout their response</li> <li>• chose appropriate narrative evidence to support their ideas</li> <li>• integrated primary source evidence of specific relevance to the context, with some attribution</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• provided alternative viewpoints, e.g. different primary/secondary source perspectives on an event or relationship</li> <li>• drew sound conclusions supported by evidence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Excellence</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discussed, with insight, the impact of a significant historical figure in the context of the question set</li> <li>• skilfully used the key words in the question the structure and develop their argument(s)</li> <li>• addressed all aspects of the question in appropriate detail</li> <li>• presented an argument, critically evaluated alternative viewpoints (often including their own), then synthesised all ideas to draw developed conclusions</li> <li>• consistently integrated and attributed a range of primary, and where appropriate secondary source evidence of specific relevance to the context</li> <li>• 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 and their chosen significance historical figure</li> <li>• critically evaluated connections between the significant historical figure's life/career and their historical context to draw conclusion about the extent of their impact</li> <li>• drew developed conclusions that were supported by specific, well-chosen evidence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard specific comments</b></p>	<p>Candidates are not required to write in essay format.</p>