



## External Assessment Report 2015

Subject(s)	Latin
Level(s)	Intermediate 1

The statistics used in this report are prior to the outcome of any Post Results Services requests.

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

The six candidates all came from one centre. They all performed well and answered all the questions competently. They were able to express their views in mature and considered responses and they coped equally well with the Interpretation paper and the Translation paper.

## Areas in which candidates performed well

### Interpretation

#### Cicero

Q3: The complicated dealings between the people of Tyndaris, Verres and the local Senate were clearly understood by the candidates and most got the full five available marks.

#### Catullus

Q4: All candidates chose the same feeling to discuss (jealousy) and the question was well answered. However, all three options were valid if supported with credible reasons for their choice.

#### Ovid

Q6 and Q7 on the 'Daedalus and Icarus' myth were both well answered and all candidates showed detailed knowledge of the narrative and were able to analyse the text.

### Translation

Candidates coped well with the passage, about Ulysses' homecoming to Ithaca. All candidates sustained, for the large part, accurate translation in good English.

## Areas which candidates found demanding

### Interpretation

#### Cicero

Q2: The myth of Orcus visiting Henna continues to confuse candidates.

#### Catullus

Q5: When asked to discuss the content of Poem 7, some candidates wrote about Lesbia's declaration of love, which was not in this poem.

#### Ovid

There were no questions which the candidates found demanding.

## Translation

- ◆ Candidates had problems translating the tenses of verbs accurately. In particular, there was confusion between the perfect, imperfect and pluperfect tenses: *ceperunt* and *puniebat* were translated as pluperfect, and *redierat* as perfect.
- ◆ Singular and plural nouns also caused confusion: *ianuas* and *viri* were both translated as singular.
- ◆ There was some careless reading of the word-list. 'Troy' was mis-read for Trojans, and *inter* and *interea* were confused with each other.
- ◆ Words were omitted eg *nam*, *ambo*.

## Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

### Interpretation

- ◆ Candidates need to be familiar with the specific details within the lines of the texts.
- ◆ They should ensure their responses match the value of the question.

### Translation

Candidates should take care to handle the different tenses accurately. They should be precise when consulting the word-list and should ensure they do not omit any words.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	7
------------------------------------	---

Number of resulted entries in 2015	6
------------------------------------	---

## 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	100.0%	100.0%	6	42
B	0.0%	100.0%	0	36
C	0.0%	100.0%	0	30
D	0.0%	100.0%	0	27
No award	0.0%	-	0	-

The Course assessment functioned as intended, therefore no adjustment to grade boundaries was required.

## 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.