

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Latin and Classical Greek**

**Qualification area**

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

**Latin Standard Grade**

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	831

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	700
<b>Post appeal</b>	

## Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

### Interpretation

1	72%	2	44%
3	60%	4	44%
5	65%	6	50%

### Translation

1	70%	2	50%
3	62%	4	50%
5	84%	6	72%

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

#### Investigation

The standard of performance in the Investigation element was particularly high this year. Candidates seem to be receiving even better guidance from teachers as to the requirements in this element. This may to some extent be the result of feedback from the appeals process.

#### Interpretation

There was a wide range of attainment. There were some extremely good candidates, but others were ill-prepared. Two markers commented on weak spelling. Foundation candidates were often well-prepared and answered the paper well.

#### Translation

Although the results corresponded well with the teachers' estimates, there were few outstanding performances. This may be explained by the relative difficulty of the Credit and General passages: a sound knowledge of basic constructions (especially relative clauses, ablative absolutes and result clauses) and case endings was necessary to achieve a top mark. Some knowledge of commonly encountered constructions is essential, as is the ability to use the word-list with care.

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

#### Investigation

There was good evidence of knowledge and understanding, and often the presentation was of a very high standard. Reports were often produced on computer.

#### Interpretation

Credit Q3 was well done.

#### Translation

Credit translation was a testing passage, but many candidates coped well. Candidates' results reflected teachers' estimates and candidates were in no way disadvantaged. The middle section produced the best results. The General paper was also testing, but again candidates' results reflected teachers' estimates. Foundation translation was generally well done.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

#### Investigation

- ◆ Some Investigations exceeded the word limit and were therefore automatically downgraded.
- ◆ Source material was sometimes included without relevant comment, or a clear explanation of its relevance.
- ◆ Photocopied material was sometimes difficult to read.

## Interpretation

- ◆ Some candidates did not relate their answers to the specific lines mentioned in the question, and therefore lost marks (eg Credit Q2(a); 4(a)).
- ◆ The length of answers should reflect the number of marks available.
- ◆ The subdivision of questions requires careful consideration. If the candidate's answer in one section of the question is too broadly based there may be confusion as to what to write in the next section. However, sensitive marking can often surmount this problem.

## Translation

Credit Candidates had problems recognising the oblique forms of "quis"; hence most mistranslated "propter quas" (line 2). The phrase "quibus factis" was, surprisingly, seldom recognised. Some candidates confused "quibus" with "quies", producing a translation "when it was calm". Many candidates understood "tam" as "itaque", with no recognition of the consecutive clause.

The last sentence was particularly testing and, not surprisingly, poorly done. Few of the better candidates realised that "cariores" was a comparative.

General This was a testing passage, but candidates responded well. Results showed that the level of difficulty, compared with the Credit paper, was appropriate. Almost all candidates managed to pass at the lower level where they had failed at the upper level.

The first half of the passage was well done. Candidates had problems with "alarum" (line 9) and the "primum Gallum", whom Manlius battered down with his shield. The final sentence, with the double ablative, was found very difficult.

Foundation The Foundation passage was a very suitable choice, and was handled well by candidates. The translation of "familia" as "household" may have caused some perplexity.

## Recommendations

### Feedback to centres

#### Investigation

- ◆ Pay attention to the bibliography. Lack of care in this aspect will affect the mark for overall presentation.
- ◆ Avoid submission of photocopied materials which can be difficult to read.
- ◆ As always, do not exceed the word limit (1,200).
- ◆ Avoid lengthy Latin quotations.
- ◆ Comment on source materials: this will demonstrate understanding of the significance of the source. Do not simply repeat the context of the source in different words.
- ◆ Avoid telling the examiner how much the candidate enjoyed doing the investigation, or hoping that the reading of the investigation will be an enjoyable experience. This wastes words which could be more profitably employed in drawing conclusions.

#### Interpretation

- ◆ Answers should focus on the line references stated for the particular question. Extraneous information may well be irrelevant.
- ◆ The length of the answer should reflect the number of marks available.

#### Translation

- ◆ Practice in using the word-list is a priority. Many careless mistakes suggest a lack of care, as candidates only look at the first couple of letters in the word, choose wrongly and often produce a meaningless translation. Candidates should be encouraged to go back to the word-list if their first choice produces an unsatisfactory meaning.