



## External Assessment Report 2013

Subject	Latin
Level	Intermediate 2

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the examination.

# Comments on candidate performance

## General comments

In the Interpretation paper, candidates were generally well prepared and were enthusiastic to share their knowledge and views about the prescribed texts in the Interpretation paper. The standard of English was good, and most candidates wrote answers of appropriate length, giving detail supported by evidence when required. The Cicero questions were better answered than the Virgil questions.

In the Translation paper, overall, the standard was a little disappointing. There were fewer really strong answers, and candidates did make too many careless mistakes. However, all candidates did make sense of the story.

## Areas in which candidates performed well

In the Interpretation paper, the questions which carried the most marks, questions 3 and 7, were very well done, with many candidates gaining all four marks.

Question 6b), about Aeneas's reactions when seeing the monsters, was very well done.

In the Translation paper, the potentially challenging Block 8c *nam sciebat se sues revocare posse* was very well done, as was the whole of the last paragraph (Blocks 9–12).

## Areas which candidates found demanding

In the Interpretation paper, some candidates encountered problems when faced with questions which required detailed knowledge of specific lines eg questions 4, 5, 6a) and 8. Responses tended to be vague and confused.

In the Translation paper, marks were lost because tenses were not always translated correctly. Active verbs were turned into passive verbs and so the sense changed because the agent/instrument was left out. Candidates were careless over word-lists eg *tam* was read as *tum*, *errant* was mistaken for *erat*. Singulars and plurals were not often accurate, eg *navem* (line 5), *funibus* (line 5). Pronouns were not well done, eg *eum* (line 2), *eos* (line 5), *eam* (line 12). In Block 1, almost every candidate translated *agnoscit* as 'can recognise' instead of 'recognises'. Block 3 *haec vera fabula testimonio est* was found to be demanding by many candidates. In Block 6a), the ablative absolute *funibus solutis* was not well done, with the plural often not spotted. There was failure to spot the consecutive clause in Block 11: *tam repente...ut...*

## **Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

- ◆ Candidates need to be familiar with the content of specific line references, in order to answer the questions in the Interpretation paper which expect detailed knowledge of particular lines. They should not stray beyond the line references in their responses.
- ◆ Candidates need to have covered all the prescribed accidence and syntax required for this course; this list can be found on the SQA website.

**Statistical information: update on Courses  
Intermediate 2**

<b>Number of resulted entries in 2012</b>	139
---	-----

<b>Number of resulted entries in 2013</b>	156
---	-----

**Statistical information: Performance of candidates**

**Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries**

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 60				
A	88.5%	88.5%	138	42
B	9.6%	98.1%	15	36
C	1.3%	99.4%	2	30
D	0.6%	100.0%	1	27
No award	0.0%	100.0%	0	-

## General commentary on grade boundaries

- ◆ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.
- ◆ Each year, SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.
- ◆ An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related, as they do not contain identical questions.
- ◆ SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.