



**General Certificate of Secondary Education
June 2011**

Classical Civilisation 4020

**Unit 4: Greece and Rome: An Evaluative
Study**

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

Unit 4 Greece and Rome: An Evaluative Study (40204)

General Comments

The most popular topic this year was, as last year, Topic G, Nero. Topic G Task 1, on Nero's relationships, was attempted by 22 of the 82 centres who entered candidates. This echoes the trend this year for candidates to present work on the Task 1 titles rather than the Task 2, which were more popular last year.

Assignments were offered on all eight topics this year, with candidates from four centres answering the titles set in Topic B, Greek Comedy, and five centres answering on Topic D, Athenian Democracy.

Centres once again prepared their candidates well for the controlled assessment and many candidates produced work that fulfilled all the requirements of the specification. Many centres clearly have worked hard to ensure that the lessons learned from last year's assessment exercise have been implemented. Both teachers and candidates should be extremely proud of the work that has been produced this year.

Administration was generally completed well, although, as usual, a number of *Centre Declaration Sheets* and *Candidate Record Forms* remained unsigned or were not included with the sample. The moderators would appreciate it if centres could send both the pink and the yellow copies of the mark sheets or the relevant EDI forms by the 7th May deadline. It is important that centres label the work of their candidates correctly with both name and candidate number and fasten multiple sheets together securely. Most centres with fewer than 20 candidates satisfied the requirement to send the work of all candidates to their moderator by May 7th. Early dispatch of all correspondence to the moderators is greatly appreciated.

Research and Planning

As last year, the moderators were extremely pleased to receive examples of research diaries and essay plans. These showed how the candidates had gone about researching their chosen topics and titles, following a general overview taught by their teachers. This overview is intended only to give the basic framework of the topic and not be used to indicate the areas which the candidates should research. The candidates must make their own choices and decisions about what and how to research: the centre should not restrict this choice (within reason), nor instruct the candidates what information to include. Bibliographies should be attached to all work completed and submitted with the assignments.

The specification states that 'the research diary should not include lengthy passages which the candidate simply copies out in the final assessment'. Candidates may include short quotations from primary or secondary source material (properly attributed, of course) for use to support of their argument, but longer quotations, or indeed, any lengthy materials intended for inclusion in the final assessment, constitute malpractice. Teachers should carry out regular checks on the diaries throughout the research period to ensure no lengthy quotations or passages are included.

Unfortunately, a number of the assignments submitted this session did not focus closely enough on the question: for example, Topic E (Ovid *Metamorphoses*) Task 1 required some knowledge

of the moral aims of Augustus' reform and regeneration programme, but candidates often made only superficial reference to this. Similarly, Topic G, (Nero), Task 2 sometimes encouraged a presentation of Nero as a ridiculous figure whose only interest was in performing in public, thus trivialising the main issues. Careful planning and the sensible use of an essay plan will help candidates focus on the title.

Analysis and Evaluation

Teachers and candidates have taken on board the idea that AO3 (Analysis and Evaluation, worth 50% of the total mark) is of vital importance in the controlled assessment. Most candidates who had researched in an organised manner and prepared essay plans fared well in this respect. Those attempting Task 1 type questions (the traditional essay) seemed to find evaluation more straightforward, but many of those who presented Task 2 type questions had also engaged well with the question, made a more rigorous choice of relevant material and produced analyses with a clear and appropriate focus.

All centres had realised that to score highly on AO3, some supporting AO1 and AO2 classical evidence and understanding was necessary. The supporting evidence was sometimes rather narrative, but credit could nevertheless be given.

This was a great deal of variation in the length of the assignments submitted for assessment, from fewer than 500 words to some of more than 4500. The word limit of 2000 is a recommendation only, but assignments shorter than 1000 words are unlikely to score highly, having little space for thorough and detailed knowledge and thorough discussion of all the central issues. Conversely, assignments longer than 2000 words often lose sight of the focus of the title and tend to present (often irrelevant) narrative AO1. Candidates who used their research and planning time well and produced a detailed essay plan were better able to write a well organised assignment with a close focus on the task set.

Candidates who chose topics which used pictorial source material this year generally presented it to good advantage, remembering that all should be fully integrated into the text.

Marking

Centres appear to have understood the requirements of the specification and have submitted marks that were, for the most part, within tolerance. Once again, internal standardisation was seen to have taken place satisfactorily, where necessary.

The moderators would like to thank those teachers who followed the requirement to annotate clearly and also included summative comments either on the scripts themselves or on the *Candidate Record Form*. These comments allow moderators to see exactly where and why credit has been awarded in relation to the marking criteria.

Marking was generally accurate, but there were a few centres that submitted marks which were outside tolerance. This year, once again, work considerably short of the 2000 word limit had occasionally been awarded high level marks by the centre when there was insufficient material to justify these marks. There was also some generosity at the higher end of the mark range and severity at the other end, as is often the case. In particular, a small number of centres failed to take into account poor spelling, punctuation and grammar. While the classical content is the main driver, spelling, punctuation and grammar must be taken into account when awarding

marks in AO1. Pleasingly, however, many centres felt able to award full marks to work of outstanding quality.

Some centres awarded marks under AO3 which should rightly have been AO2 and vice versa. AO3 demands evaluation, analysis or a personal response whilst AO2 requires understanding. Both criteria include an awareness of the culture, civilisation and contemporary society and, where appropriate, of the limitations of the primary sources.

Overall, however, the moderators were once again very impressed. Teachers should be justifiably proud of their candidates and of the work they have produced.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion