2007 Latin

Standard Grade − Investigation

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2007

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from the Assessment Materials Team, Dalkeith.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's Assessment Materials Team at Dalkeith may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

SCOTTISH QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY

Standard Grade Latin — Investigation

Guidance on Assessment

General Principles

Assessment of the Individual Investigation is positive. It is an assessment of the degree to which candidates have satisfied the Grade Related Criteria (GRC) for Investigation. The GRC are made up of three sub-elements (Knowledge and Understanding, Comparisons and Conclusions, and Communication and Presentation); performance in each sub-element should be taken into account by reference to the extended GRC. HOWEVER, A FINAL CHECK OF THE GRADE TO BE AWARDED SHOULD ALWAYS BE MADE AGAINST THE SUMMARY GRC.

Assessment Procedure

The first step is to award points for essential features of each sub-element, as follows:

1. **KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING**
For mainstream topics (eg Spectator Sports, Education, Slavery, Women, Food, Army, Housing) **where sources are extensive and easily accessible**, the following guidelines should normally apply:

A **Number of secondary source materials used:**

unsatisfactory	= only 1 source used or evident, or referred to in text/bibliography	**0**
restricted	= only 2 sources used	**1**
reasonable	= 3 − 4 sources used	**2**
extensive	= 5 +	**3**

NB 1 Candidates may not in the case of secondary sources refer to them as such in the text − hence it is important to look at the bibliography for an initial impression, but the text should show evidence that the candidate has indeed made some use of stated sources.

NB 2 A problem arises if the nature of the topic is such that only a very restricted range of secondary sources exists, or is suitable for use by an S4 age group − this can apply to literary, archaeological and numismatic topics, where it may not be desirable even to use secondary sources except for essential background or contextual purposes. In such cases full allowance should be made for the nature of the topic when considering candidates' use of secondary source material.

B **Number of primary source materials used:**

unsatisfactory	= 0 or irrelevant primary sources	**0**
restricted	= only 1-2 primary sources	**1**
reasonable	= 3 − 4 relevant primary sources	**2**
extensive	= 5 + relevant primary sources	**3**

NB 1 A "primary" source means an ancient source. Indirect references which are properly ascribed (eg "According to Juvenal..."/ "We know from Martial...") are acceptable but would not warrant the allocation of the full 3 marks available if they constituted the sole way in which primary sources were referred to.

NB 2 In archaeological topics illustrations and plans perform the function of primary sources (ie primary to the Roman world). Moreover, **illustrations should also be taken as sources in all topics, subject to the proviso that they are used in a relevant way (ie not merely decorative) and are "primary" eg mosaics, buildings, relief, sculptures**. The relevance of illustrations used should be made clear. "Imaginative" drawings are excluded.

NB 3 A problem arises if the nature of the topic is such that only a very restricted range of primary sources exists, or is suitable for use by this age group − this can apply to some biographical topics, some literary topics (eg legends of early Rome/a particular poet), as well as archaeological and numismatic topics. Full allowance should therefore be made for the nature of the topic: eg a candidate writing about Catullus would be awarded full marks for quoting from an extensive range of the poems.

C **Understanding of source materials used:**

unsatisfactory	= considerable misunderstanding of the materials	**0**
basic	= brief statements indicating some understanding and interpretation	**1**
moderate	= a reasonably intelligent handling of the materials used and consulted, with some analysis, but marred by one or two serious misunderstandings	**2**
good	= an intelligent and confident handling of the materials used and consulted, with evidence of a fairly high level of analysis	**3**

NB It is important to distinguish between misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Candidates' interpretations of the source materials used may exhibit immaturity, or even waywardness of judgement, but this is quite different from a careless handling, or a fundamental lack of understanding, of sources.

2. COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This is the most difficult area in the assessment of the Investigation. **Comparisons** may seem to be obviously there or not **(but note that the nature and number of comparisons is dependent on the topic)**. **Conclusions and Personal Response/Evaluation** are not so obvious. There is sometimes a problem of **overlap**, since the candidate's conclusions may be embedded in comparisons or personal response.

Personal Response must not be confused with a liberal sprinkling of 1st person singulars throughout the text. Personal Response/Evaluation often comes out in a detailed conclusion to the Investigation or to individual sections of it. Perhaps the term Evaluation rather than Personal Response is best kept to the forefront in making assessments in this area − evaluation of the subject matter is true Personal Response.

D **Making comparisons:**

unsatisfactory	= none	**0**
simple	= perfunctory, with no reasoning	**1**
fairly detailed	= number and quality to be taken into account (min. 3, with simple reasoning/explanation)	**2**
reasoned/detailed	= either extended comparison(s), properly thought out, and showing some analysis <u>or</u> at least 5 showing some simple reasoning/explanation	**3**

E **Evaluation:**

unsatisfactory	investigation consists only of statements of fact, without any attempt to draw conclusions or offer personal opinion	**0**
simple	candidate occasionally offers a simple opinion (eg "I think this was cruel!") or has made some attempt to comment sensibly on the facts presented	**1**
fairly detailed	candidate comments on the facts presented, drawing simple and logical conclusions, clearly stated and supported by simple reasoning	**2**
detailed	candidate comments on the facts presented with developed reasoning, reaching logical conclusions, presented in some detail and clearly stated	**3**

The number of reasons will depend largely on the subject matter, although a minimum of 3 might be expected, and the award of a 2 or a 3 will depend on the quality of reasoning and conclusion.

3. COMMUNICATION AND PRESENTATION

F Clarity of communication:

unsatisfactory	= incoherent	**0**
basic	= reasonable standard of grammar, spelling, punctuation etc, but with little attention to paragraphing and/or use of sub-headings	**1**
moderate	= misspellings only occasionally, and mostly in complex vocabulary. Some attention to paragraphing, and/or use of sub-headings	**2**
good	= minimum number of spelling and grammatical errors − clearly written report, with full attention to paragraphing and/or use of sub-headings	**3**

G Presentation of material:

unsatisfactory	= disorganised and incoherent	**0**
basic	= reasonably orderly in appearance, but lacking in clear logical sequencing	**1**
moderate	= reasonably logical and sequential	**2**
good	= unified, logical and clear	**3**

This usually comes out as 2/3, with 0/1 being self-evident. The Investigation should read in a clear, logical way, with obvious sequencing of material (a beginning, middle and end). The general layout should be considered, including the positioning of any illustrations.

H Overall presentation of topic:

unsatisfactory	= untidy, messy and careless	**0**
adequately effective	= basic requirements of the topic met but with little evidence of engagement with the topic	**1**
reasonably effective	= a reasonably careful and involved approach to the overall production of the topic, but with the guidelines re bibliography etc not fully met	**2**
very effective	= a careful and involved approach to the production of the topic as a whole, with the guidelines re bibliography etc fully met	**3**

Again, this usually comes out as 2/3, with 0/1 being self-evident. Be careful not to penalise if there are no illustrations or if the Investigation is hand-written. Equally important is not to be swayed by word-processed documents, simply because they are easier to read.

The total number of points can then be added together to give an indication of a preliminary grade for Investigation:

Total	21 − 24	Grade	1	
	17 − 20		2	Credit
	13 − 16		3	
	9 − 12		4	General
	6 − 8		5	
	3 − 5		6	Foundation
	0 − 2		7	

Once a preliminary grade has been indicated, you should consider the Report as a whole and, if necessary, adjust the preliminary grade; any such adjustment should be by **no more than one grade up or down.**

Factors which may lead to an adjustment are indicated below.

1. Maximum words = **1200**. The following should not be included in the total: frontispiece, index, acknowledgements, source references, quotations illustrative from primary sources, captions attached to pictures and diagrams and bibliography.
   Downgrade by 1 if over this limit.
   Minimum words = **500**. **Downgrade by 1** if under this limit.

2. Remember that the aim is **holistic** assessment. Often it is obvious from reading an Investigation that it is at the top end of achievement: if the addition of points you have allocated gives a grade lower than your expectation from reading the whole report, then it is appropriate to read through it again and see if on the extended GRC it is worth upgrading. **In particular, be wary if in D and E (Comparisons and Evaluation) you have awarded 1s or 0s in what seems to be a good, thorough Investigation − you may have overlooked something**. By the same token, a downgrade may be appropriate on the GRC.

   The reason for any downgrade or upgrade should be indicated.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]