



Course report 2022

Subject	Latin
Level	National 5

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report 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 assessment documents and marking instructions.

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any appeals.

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	415
------------------------------------	-----

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

A	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	360	Minimum mark required	70
B	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	35	Minimum mark required	60
C	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	10	Minimum mark required	50
D	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	[c]	Number of candidates	5	Minimum mark required	40
No award	Percentage	[c]	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	[c]	Minimum mark required	N/A

All figures are rounded to the nearest five. Figures between one and four inclusive have been suppressed to protect against the risk of disclosure of personal information. All percentage figures for a course have been suppressed where values between one and four inclusive have been suppressed. Cells containing suppressed figures are marked up with the shorthand [c].

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

- ◆ 'most' means greater than 70%
- ◆ 'many' means 50% to 69%
- ◆ 'some' means 25% to 49%
- ◆ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of [SQA's website](#).

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Question paper 1: Literary appreciation

This year, candidates were to select and answer questions on one author, rather than two. The complete range of skills could still be demonstrated by all candidates through their responses to questions about one author only.

The question paper was of the same standard as in previous years. The questions performed as expected and were accessible to all candidates. The full course content was covered in the paper, and all skills were sampled in every section. The different sections were of comparable standard.

All five authors were attempted, with the most popular being Catullus, Ovid and Pliny. Most candidates understood what was required and completed the paper in the allocated time.

There were no adjustments made to the grade boundaries for this paper.

Question paper 2: Translating

The text 'A Weaving Contest' was adapted from Ovid: *Metamorphoses* VI. Candidates were expected to deal with the following:

- ◆ tenses: present, future, imperfect, perfect, perfect participle, and infinitive; singular and plural nouns and verbs
- ◆ irregular verbs *esse* (to be) and *posse* (to be able)
- ◆ active and passive voice
- ◆ accusative and infinitive construction
- ◆ imbedded clauses; balanced phrases
- ◆ positive and superlative adjectives
- ◆ all five cases
- ◆ pronouns

Most candidates understood what was required and completed the paper in the allocated time. The strong storyline encouraged the less assured translators to do their best to make sense of the narrative.

There were no adjustments made to the grade boundaries for this paper.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas that candidates performed well in

Question paper 1: Literary appreciation

Most candidates prepared well and answered to the best of their ability, which was often very good. All candidates completed the question paper and most produced full and thoughtful answers. Most candidates showed engagement with their chosen author. Responses were creative and interesting. Sometimes the answers were unexpected but still valid. All answers were marked positively.

Most candidates responded well to questions that involved personal response, discussing reasons, giving explanations, relating the content to wider Roman society, and evaluating the texts in general.

Time management was good, as was the ability to match the length of the response to the number of marks available. There were few unanswered questions.

Catullus

- ◆ question 3: both parts of this question, about what Lesbia said to Catullus, were thoughtfully answered
- ◆ question 4(b): despite this being a challenging question about Catullus thinking about the future, responses were full of insight and valid comment
- ◆ question 5: most candidates discussed Catullus' grief in a sympathetic and mature way
- ◆ question 6: responses about Roman humour were of a very high standard. Candidates followed the instruction to refer to both poems to support their answers

Ovid

- ◆ question 9: this question, about Icarus' childish behaviour, was very well done and most candidates developed their answers sufficiently to gain the full 3 marks
- ◆ question 11: many candidates handled this language question, on the use of the bird simile, very well, with many including in-depth discussion
- ◆ question 13: the stronger candidates handled this discriminating question about Icarus' mistakes very well and gained the full 3 marks. All candidates managed to respond sufficiently to gain at least 1 mark
- ◆ question 14: some candidates produced sophisticated and thoughtful answers to this language question about pathos
- ◆ question 15: this question asked candidates to weigh up evidence in deciding who was more to blame, Daedalus or Icarus. Most argued both ways, that they were equally to blame, and gained the full 3 marks

Virgil

- ◆ question 21: this 4-mark question gave candidates the chance to develop their ideas about Trojan attitudes towards the wooden horse. There was a number of excellent answers
- ◆ question 23: most candidates handled the command word 'summarise' well, and succinctly explained the key points of Laocoon's arguments
- ◆ question 24: most candidates avoided the pitfall of rewriting the English text in extract 5 and instead gave a full answer in their own words about Laocoon's frightening death

Pliny

- ◆ question 27(b): this question elicited some excellent answers, with candidates offering all kinds of explanation as to why the slaves were sent away, all of which were valid and interesting
- ◆ questions 29 and 30: the details of the dolphin's appearances, which can be confusing, were very familiar to the candidates who had clearly prepared thoroughly for this part of the narrative
- ◆ question 31: answers identifying evidence for the friendship between the boy and the dolphin were wide-ranging and reflected independent thought

Cicero

- ◆ question 33: most candidates knew the details of this part of the text very well, and they discussed the temple and the attack with confidence
- ◆ question 35: most candidates answered this challenging question about Cicero's technique of mockery well
- ◆ question 39: most candidates displayed their knowledge of religious statues in the Roman world well

Areas that candidates found demanding

Catullus

- ◆ question 1(b) and (c): some candidates found it difficult to develop their answers to gain the second mark for each of these questions on Roman curses
- ◆ question 2(c): some candidates ignored the command word 'discuss' and instead listed the different emotions felt by Catullus, which could not gain them full marks

Ovid

- ◆ question 10(a): it was difficult for some candidates to achieve a second mark for this question about Daedalus inventing the wings, although detailed knowledge of the text would have provided useful points for candidates to make

Virgil

- ◆ question 20: most candidates managed to find something to say in response to this challenging question about the Trojans' joy in believing that the Greeks had gone for good, but few achieved full marks. Detailed knowledge of the specific lines is needed to access all 4 marks
- ◆ question 25: some candidates struggled to make new points in this Roman culture question on how Romans viewed the Greeks. Instead there was a lot of repetition

Pliny

- ◆ question 26(b): most candidates wrote at length about the ghost, in response to what might make a reader feel nervous, and ignored other details in the text that would have provided a wider range of points
- ◆ question 28: some candidates strayed beyond the lines in their responses to what made these particular lines creepy
- ◆ question 32: this Roman culture question specifically asked candidates to consider the dolphin story when discussing different Roman attitudes to animals. Some candidates answered in more general terms, which could not gain marks. However, there was usually enough in the rest of their answer to gain the full 4 marks

Cicero

- ◆ question 36: despite this question being worth only 2 marks, few candidates gained the second mark when discussing Cicero's description of the weather
- ◆ question 38(b): in this challenging question required candidates to demonstrate detailed knowledge of the reasons for the behaviour of the local Senate. Few candidates gained the full 3 marks, as some answers lacked sufficient detail

Areas that candidates performed well in

Question paper 2: Translating

Many candidates coped well with the demands of the question paper. Major omissions, or failure to finish, were rare. There was a number of very good performances and all candidates made a good effort to provide a coherent story.

English style was generally good, although there were some omissions of definite and indefinite articles and punctuation.

- ◆ blocks 1–6: the opening paragraph scored particularly well and produced high marks. Most candidates knew how to translate the imperfect tense *erat* in Block 2; the genitive phrase *artem puellae* in Block 3; and the accusative and infinitive construction *putabat se meliorem esse* in Block 5
- ◆ block 9: most candidates coped well with the balanced genitive phrases: *opus deae...*, *opus puellae*
- ◆ block 11: some candidates translated *caput puellae percussit* (she hit the girl's head) as 'she hit the girl on the head', which was possibly a more natural way of translating the Latin

- ◆ block 15: most candidates spotted the superlative *crudelissimo* and translated it correctly
- ◆ blocks 16–18: most candidates managed to translate the different stages of Arachne's transformation into a spider very well, despite the strange content of the description
- ◆ block 20: all candidates got the story's punchline, that Arachne was now a spider

Areas that candidates found demanding

- ◆ block 6: some candidates confused *certamen* (contest) with *certare* '(to) compete', which resulted in not making sense of the whole block
- ◆ block 7: some candidates had difficulty with the ablative absolute and did not gain the marks by not making it passive
- ◆ block 9: some translated the noun *opus* (work) as a verb 'to work', which made making sense of the block difficult
- ◆ blocks 13–14: many candidates found dealing with both the direct speech and the future tense of the second person singular *dabis* challenging
- ◆ block 19: only a few candidates noticed that *in* was followed by the accusative and translated it correctly as 'into'

There was some misuse of the wordlist, with candidates sometimes opting for the meaning of the word above or below the correct one.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Question paper 1: Literary appreciation

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- ◆ expect all parts of the prescribed text to be sampled
- ◆ know that there will always be:
 - a range of command words and different types of questions, worth varying marks
 - questions on Roman culture and Latin literary techniques at least once in every section
 - questions assessing skills of analysis, argument and evaluation
- ◆ restrict their answers to what they have learnt specifically from the text to answer the Roman culture questions
- ◆ do not stray beyond the line references given in the question
- ◆ know that bullet points are acceptable, as long as they are sufficiently expanded
- ◆ are aware single words are not normally sufficient to demonstrate knowledge
- ◆ practise matching the length of their answer to the number of marks available. This is a useful skill to practice, as overlong answers are unnecessary and are not good use of time
- ◆ where appropriate, know they can answer both 'yes' and 'no' to questions, and they will gain a mark for any valid point
- ◆ practise writing 'yes' and 'no' answers to the same question. It is one way to gain marks in high-mark questions
- ◆ know that in any extended-response question, to gain a mark, they should make a new point, not just reword a previous point
- ◆ know that depending on the question, they can gain a mark for making developed points

Question paper 2: Translating

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates:

- ◆ are prepared to demonstrate their skills in handling a wide range of accident and syntax. The list of prescribed accident and syntax is in the course specification, available on the [National 5 Latin web page](#). Accurate application of accident and syntax will always gain marks
- ◆ take care to find the correct meaning in the wordlist and to review the sense of the translation
- ◆ check that they have not omitted any 'small' words
- ◆ even if they know the meaning of the Latin word, check the specific meaning in the wordlist as this gives a meaning for the Latin word in the context of the passage. However, candidates who supply a correct alternative meaning would still gain the mark
- ◆ carefully read the English linking paragraphs to help with translation
- ◆ can recognise common basic noun and verb endings and practise matching singular and plural noun endings with singular and plural verb endings

- ◆ know there should always be a subject for every word, for example:
 - *erat* **she** was
 - *percussit*: **she** hit

Appendix 1: general commentary on grade boundaries

SQA's main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- ◆ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade A boundary)

It is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level. Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- ◆ Where levels of difficulty are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the [National Qualifications 2022 Awarding—Methodology Report](#).