

2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

Latin

Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to the 2015 examination.

Candidates took full opportunity to demonstrate skills and knowledge in translation and analysis at Scholarship and Outstanding Scholarship level. Marks awarded for Questions One and Three ranged from 8-1, and for Questions Two and Four, from 7-1.

The range of components of responses made to Questions Two and Four demonstrated instances of insight at a very high level, but achieving this quality consistently at the highest level through an entire response proved to be elusive.

All candidates observed the requirement not to write their responses (including scansion) in pencil, so that their scripts would be able to be reconsidered.

Report on performance standard

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wrote translations that demonstrated sustained accuracy and fluency at a very high level and communicated the meaning of the Latin in a perceptive and convincing manner wrote analysis of the Latin passages that demonstrated insight at a high level, sophisticated integration and independent reflection.
Scholarship	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wrote accurate and fluent translations that demonstrated precise use of highly developed knowledge and critical thinking wrote analysis of the Latin passages that demonstrated synthesis, logical development, precision and clarity of ideas at a high level.
Other candidates	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wrote translations that demonstrated lesser degrees of accuracy and fluency, e.g. in Question One, translating profuerit (line 1) as a future tense, and not correctly recognising the future participle audituri (line 3), the relative pronouns (quas in line 7 and quod in line 8), the cases of neminem (line 4) and Catonis (line 8), and the significance of the comparative in hebetiores (line 2). In Question Three misunderstood aspects which impeded accuracy and fluency were the tense of veniet (line 1), agreement of adjectives with nouns e.g. taking scabra with pila (line 3) and the ablative which follows dignus (line 13) attempted complicated or esoteric responses to the analysis questions, when what was required was to identify and examine in a straightforward manner rhetorical techniques (Question Two) and poetic devices (Question Four). This is done by supplying a term/label, illustrating it with Latin quoted from the passage (with an English translation), explaining it clearly, and discussing the effectiveness of its use, giving reasons. Candidates need to convince the marker that they understand both what the technique/device they are citing is, and its effect. This was often not done successfully for terms such as metaphor, apostrophe, chiasmus and synchysis.

Standard specific comments	<p>Some candidates wrote alternative translations in brackets for various words and phrases. It is better for them to cross out clearly one of the alternatives which they have written, to show which one, after their consideration, they prefer as being accurate.</p> <p>In response to literary analysis questions, an introductory sentence to explain that Cicero uses rhetorical techniques or that Virgil uses poetic devices is not needed. Candidates should get straight onto their analysis to make the best use of their time.</p> <p>Latin examples of techniques and devices need to be written out and translated (and scanned, if poetry and if scansion is relevant to the remarks being made). It is not sufficient for Scholarship standard to refer simply to a line number, and to expect the words under consideration to be recognised. It is also not sufficient to make broad statements without providing Latin evidence to support them.</p>
-----------------------------------	---