



**General Certificate of Secondary Education  
June 2012**

**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](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the schools and college.

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

Once again the most popular topic was Topic G, Nero. 34 schools and colleges attempted this topic, the majority of which attempted task 1, the evaluation of the differences between the portrayal of Nero by Tacitus and Suetonius.

Overall, most schools and colleges decided to answer Task 1 in whichever topic they chose. This reflects the pattern of last year, which denoted a move from the popularity of Task 2 the previous year.

At least five schools and colleges attempted each topic, with six attempting Greek Comedy and seven Athenian Democracy: both of these increasing their take up from the two previous years.

Many students fulfilled the requirements of the specification and teachers had, once again, prepared their students well and provided them with sufficient resources. Schools and colleges should feel extremely encouraged by the standard of work produced this year and the students, very proud.

Congratulations are due to all of them.

The problems with the *Centre Declaration Sheet* that have troubled centres over the years have almost disappeared, presumably due to the fact that only one signature is required.

Moderators would appreciate it if those schools and colleges with fewer than 20 students would send the whole sample to them as soon as practicable and certainly by the deadline date. All other centres should send the Centre Mark Forms, or the relevant EDI forms, to their moderator by that date.

There is no need to send the samples by registered post, or by any other means that requires a signature - these can cause delays if there is no one at home to receive them.

There were, as in previous years, some incorrect additions and mistranslation of marks from script to Centre Mark Forms via Candidate Record Forms. It is vital that these are correct.

Moderators would be extremely grateful if schools and colleges could ensure that the work of each student is complete, in the right order, secured by paper clip, tag or staple and accompanied by its *Candidate Record Form* and relevant Bibliography. The moderators would be thankful if centres were to attach all plans, illustrations and designs relevant to the assessment.

### Research and Planning

Moderators are, of course, delighted to receive copies of research diaries as they show how the students have organised their research and their choice of material. It is, however, not necessary to send every diary: a small random sample will be appreciated, though not essential.

Last year this report contained a quote from the specification that "the research diary should not

include lengthy passages which the student simply copies out in the final assessment". This reminder is required again this year. Students may, of course, include in their diaries short quotes derived from their research, preferably of primary source material, but they must not include extensive print outs from secondary sources. Regular checks by the teachers should ensure this is not permitted.

It was felt that essay plans should be included in the research diaries to aid the actual writing of the assessment. The best answers have obviously used this method of preparation. It allows students to place reminders of how important evaluation and personal response (AO3) are in these assessments. These plans also enable students to include reminders of the focus of the task.

## **Analysis and Evaluation**

When students adhere to the focus of the title of the task, they tend to produce excellent assessments, especially when their evaluation includes support from primary source material. Students who depend too heavily on modern commentators and other secondary sources will be unable to score well under AO3 as their comments will not be using primary classical evidence in support. Any comment based on a secondary source or commentator needs to be contrasted with/compared by the student's own evaluation and personal response.

The need for a conclusion is essential: an ideal one is reasoned, but it must summarise what is stated elsewhere in the piece. It, too, needs classical backup and support.

The work each student presents will depend a great deal on their focus on the title of the task chosen. All the comments stated and opinions made must be relevant to the title and its focus. An area for special concern here is the notion of the "appropriate form and style of writing": some students get so involved with the scenario and waste time on narrative or scene setting that is irrelevant to the title, which will bring them no marks. Similarly, titles that demand comparison need the criteria to be compared to be well established.

All schools and colleges have taken on board the essential nature of scoring highly under AO3 by using the support of AO1 and AO2 classical evidence and understanding to back up their evaluative comments.

Most schools and colleges had given their students good advice about the length of their assessments. There were few of excessive length this year. There were however some very short attempts, which did not allow time for the student effectively to back up any relevant evaluative comments with specific detailed evidence or understanding.

## **Marking**

The marks presented were generally within tolerance, with internal standardising taking place satisfactorily when it was necessary.

Once again, the moderators would like to thank those teachers who followed the requirements of the specification to annotate clearly and also included summative comments for further amplification of the reasons behind the marks they have awarded. The moderators find these very helpful.

Marking was generally accurate, but some schools and colleges submitted marks that were outside tolerance. Once again there was generosity, often in AO1 when marks were awarded to facts, which though correct, were not relevant. AO2 marks were awarded where there was little understanding of the context and under AO3 when the personal response was not relevant to the question.

On the other hand, there were a few schools and colleges that were overly severe, quite often at the lower end of the mark range.

There were the usual problems with AO2 and AO3: some schools and colleges find it difficult to understand the requirements of the AO2 and AO3 criteria (AO2 requires understanding and AO3 evaluation, analysis or personal response).

Both criteria include where appropriate an awareness of the culture, civilisation and contemporary society and the attendant benefits and limitations.

This was a well prepared, well resourced and well expressed set of assessments: work of which teachers and their students can be rightly proud.

### **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](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)