

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Latin and Classical Greek**

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
included in this report**

**Latin Higher Grade**

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	271

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	257
<b>Post appeal</b>	

## Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

A	70%
B	60%
C	50%

### General commentary on grade boundaries

#### *Notional percentage cut-offs for each grade*

Question papers and their associated marking schemes are designed to be of the required standard and to meet the assessment specification for the subject/level concerned.

For National courses the examination paper(s) are set in order that a score of approximately 50% of the total marks for all components merits a grade C (based on the grade descriptions for that grade), and similarly a score of 70 % for a grade A. The lowest mark for a grade B is set by the computer software as half way between the C and A grade boundaries.

### Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

These are the *a priori* boundaries. No adjustments were deemed necessary.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

The results this year were most encouraging. There were some very able candidates: one candidate achieved 100% and several others came very close to doing so.

Markers were divided in their comments: some reported that papers were generally well done and candidates were well prepared; others reported varied responses. Interpretation - Prose was better done than Interpretation - Verse, although those choosing the Plautus option did well. Essay questions were well done, although some candidates still produced rote answers and listed points without explaining their relevance. Translation produced some near-perfect work. Candidates managed their time well in all papers.

There was next to no criticism of the papers in the comments received. The questions allowed good candidates to demonstrate their skills, without compromising the integrity of the examination.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

#### Interpretation – Verse

Virgil - Questions 2(a) and (b) and 3(a) (description of Cerberus) were well done.

Plautus - Questions 1 and 2 were well done. There were some good responses to the final questions.

#### Interpretation - Prose

Cicero - Questions 1(a) and (b) were well done. Question 2 (b) (on rhetorical techniques) was also well done - (ii) and (iii) better than (i).

#### Translation

Many candidates performed well throughout the passage. Most candidates managed to translate lines 1-6 satisfactorily and most coped with the section “iste ornamenta ... transtulit”.

## Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

### Interpretation – Verse

Virgil	Question 1 (b)(i) - “vestibulum” was poorly done: some candidates failed to identify the image and consequently failed to answer (ii). Question 3. Many candidates assumed that the “h” in “haec” (line 150) was consonantal. (Line 151 was straightforward.) Question 4 (b) Some candidates did not restrict their answers to passage 5.
Plautus	Question 3 (a) and (b) badly done. Some candidates failed to identify the image in 3(b), surprisingly.

### Interpretation – Prose

Cicero	Question 3(b) confused some candidates. Some also laid undue emphasis on Apronius when discussing the Centuripini.
--------	--

### Translation

- ◆ Some candidates did not understand the passive “ab isto...direpta est” (line 3).
- ◆ “interiores templi parietes...vestiebantur” (line 5) often translated as “(the pictures) covered the inside wall of the temple”.
- ◆ Some thought it was “a picture of Marcellus” (lines 6-7).
- ◆ “quorum ornamenta” (line 8) was misunderstood, revealing lack of knowledge of “qui” in oblique cases (same problem at Standard Grade).
- ◆ “confirmare...possum”: too many candidates translated “to confirm”, and incorporated “possum” (wrongly) into the indirect statement.
- ◆ “quarum...opere” (line 16): candidates failed to spot the relative and so the final clause became detached from its antecedent.

## Recommendations

### Feedback to centres

#### Interpretation

- ◆ Continue to impress upon candidates the need to explain the relevance of any quotations to the answer being attempted.
- ◆ The reliance on “stock answers” seems to be lessening, but it is always worthwhile to alert candidates to the dangers of this strategy.

#### Translation

- ◆ There is often weakness shown in recognising singulars and plurals, actives and passives, and other basic accidents and syntax.
- ◆ Translations often reflect the original word order, with unsatisfactory results.