



External Assessment Report 2011

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

There were many scripts of a high standard. Candidates had clearly been well prepared and they responded well to wide-ranging questions. The Interpretation and Translation papers were equally well done.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Interpretation

- ◆ The Cicero questions were better answered than the Virgil questions.
- ◆ Q3 (b): Answers on Verres's character produced some imaginative responses.
- ◆ Q5: The analysis of Dido's character was also well done. Candidates restricted their answers to the specific lines requested. They suggested various appropriate emotions, eg anger, confusion, regret, self-pity, with good supporting evidence.
- ◆ Hand writing, grammar and spelling were general good (apart from the frequently misspelled word 'simile').

Translation

- ◆ Candidates coped well with deponent verbs.
- ◆ They managed their time properly and everyone finished the translation, with some having time to re-draft.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Interpretation:

Q1(c): When asked to describe the damage to the temple, some candidates described the damage to the statue.

Q4 (b): Asked to discuss details which might make the reader feel sad about the ghosts, some candidates simply listed the ghosts and ignored the 'sad' aspect to the question. There was confusion over the simile of the ghosts at the riverbank.

Q6(a): Discussion on the simile describing Aeneas seeing Dido was not well done.

Translation

- ◆ Some candidates did not take account of grammar rules and produced translations that did not relate to the storyline in the Latin text.
- ◆ Some candidates did not check the word list carefully.
- ◆ There was confusion over singular and plural nouns eg *canes* = dogs, *homo* = man.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Interpretation

- ◆ Candidates should restrict their answers to the line references given.
- ◆ Candidates should not write over-long answers which can result in poor time management.
- ◆ They should be prepared to answer style questions on similes.

Translation

- ◆ Candidates should be able to differentiate between the perfect and imperfect tenses.
- ◆ They should check the word list carefully.
- ◆ Candidates should take their time and check over their translation. For example, halfway through, several candidates changed 'hare' (*lepus*) into 'rabbit'.
- ◆ Candidates should make the nominatives the subject and the accusatives the object, where possible.
- ◆ They should check singulars and plurals.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2010	122
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2011	123
------------------------------------	-----

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	92.7%	92.7%	114	42
B	1.6%	94.3%	2	36
C	1.6%	95.9%	2	30
D	2.4%	98.4%	3	27
No award	1.6%	100.0%	2	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions that 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, though, very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Each year, therefore, SQA 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 Head of Service 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.