

Principal Assessor Report 2005

Assessment Panel:

Latin and Classical Greek

Qualification area

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

Latin Standard Grade

Statistical information: update

Number of resulted entries in 2004	570
---	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2005	638
---	-----

General comments re resulted entry numbers

It was pleasing to see an increase in the number of presentations at Standard Grade, especially in a context where departments are being closed down.

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of overall awards

Grade 1	48.9%
Grade 2	30.7%
Grade 3	7.1%
Grade 4	5.2%
Grade 5	2.4%
Grade 6	1.6%
Grade 7	0.2%
No award	4.1%

Grade boundaries for each assessable element in the subject included in the report

Assessable Element	Credit Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		General Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		Foundation Max Mark	Grade Boundaries	
		1	2		3	4		5	6
I	25	19	13	25	14	11	20	12	8
T	50	38	28	50	38	30	50	27	16

Comments on grade boundaries for each assessable element

It was decided to lower the boundary by one mark at General Level for Standard Grade Latin Interpretation.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Investigation

Candidates should be encouraged to write legibly: the marker's inability to decipher illegible writing may result in loss of marks. If material is word-processed, candidates should **not** present investigations in capital letters throughout, or use inconsistent fonts, or a variety of colours. (This does not apply to *sources*, shown in bold or italics, or in a different colour, to distinguish them from the main text.)

J.-A. Shelton should not appear in the bibliography as a primary source. Sources quoted in Shelton may appear, of course, properly ascribed, and Shelton can appear as a secondary source, if her introductory remarks have been consulted.

Candidates should not quote at length from secondary sources. Candidates are expected to present information gleaned from secondary sources in their own words. Quotations from secondary sources will be included in the total word count, whereas primary sources will not. Candidates should be careful not to over-rely on primary sources unless their relevance is properly explained.

Candidates often find difficulty in satisfying the demands of Investigation if they choose literary or biographical topics. Relevant comparisons can be particularly difficult to find. (Adolf Hitler frequently appears as a "one size fits all" model for military leaders and tyrants alike!) Able candidates often perform well, but weaker candidates may find social topics easier to tackle.

Illustrations, especially those down-loaded from the Internet, should be clear and relevant. There is a tendency to include "decorative" illustrations, without captions.

Interpretation

Again, candidates should write legibly. In some cases, teachers should consider seeking permission for the use of a scribe, or a word-processor.

Candidates should write in ink, not pencil (which can be faint and difficult to read). They should **score out all rough work**, and refrain from writing comments unrelated to the examination on their scripts.

Some candidates are being entered for the wrong levels (G/C instead of F/G). One candidate scored no marks at all on each paper. Teachers should remember that a candidate may be presented at different levels, for example at G/C for Translation, but at F for Interpretation, if the full prescription is deemed inappropriate.

Attention should be paid to the line references indicated for each question. Answers based on material from outside these references will not gain any credit.

Translation

Entries in this element were appropriate.

Candidates at Foundation level may have found the storyline confusing and found it difficult to understand the ending.

Teachers should note that recognition of superlatives and connecting relatives (at Credit level only) is often the deciding factor between a score of 2 or 3 for a sub-block. This may seem severe, but, given the help available in the word-list, such details help to distinguish the strongest candidates.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Investigation

Most centres appear to be giving pupils excellent guidance in the demands of this element.

Some candidates are choosing unusual topics, and handling the subject matter well. This should be encouraged.

Many investigations are beautifully presented, and a pleasure to read.

Interpretation

All levels were generally well done.

Translation

At Foundation level, Block 7 onwards (*subito venatoris vocem....*) was well done.

At General level, the middle paragraph was well done.

At Credit level, the final paragraph was well done.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Interpretation

At Foundation level, Q 3 (b).

At General Level, Q 1. candidates had a general notion of what was happening, but could not identify details from the text (eg the standing still, the wagging of the tail).

Answers to 3-mark questions generally (eg 3 (c), 4 (a)) often lacked sufficient detail. Conversely, candidates would write at length on questions worth only one mark.

At Credit level, candidates found it difficult to gain the full 3 marks at Q 1 (a).

At Q 1 (c) some candidates did not realise that Seneca *does* approve of killing criminals, but not in public as entertainment.

Translation

At Foundation level, candidates may have found difficulty with some of the English words (eg “antler”, “stag”), although every effort was made in the word-list to explain them (eg antler, horn).

Singulars and plurals were often not distinguished.

Juxtaposition of words with similar endings confused some candidates.

At General level, sub-blocks 4 (a) and (b) (*tandem uxor...quaereret*) with the embedded clauses caused difficulty.

At Credit level, recognition of the superlative (*pauperrimus*)(line 1).

cuius ianua patebat (line 3) (“he opened the door”).

Omission of *cui* (line 10).

Failure to recognise accusative and infinitive (line 5: *ille respondit se* “he answered himself that”; “shouted at him”).

in cauponam..in regiam (“he was not in an inn, bur had entered...”).

In general, careless omission of words such as *solus* (line 1), *ibi* (line 5).

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

Observations are recorded at the appropriate places in the report.