



# Course report 2024

## Higher Latin

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. You should read the report in conjunction with the published assessment documents and marking instructions.

We compiled the statistics in this report before we completed the 2024 appeals process.

# Grade boundary and statistical information

## Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2023: 215

Number of resulted entries in 2024: 146

## Statistical information: performance of candidates

### Distribution of course awards including minimum mark to achieve each grade

<b>A</b>	Number of candidates	90	Percentage	61.6	Cumulative percentage	61.6	Minimum mark required	91
<b>B</b>	Number of candidates	26	Percentage	17.8	Cumulative percentage	79.5	Minimum mark required	78
<b>C</b>	Number of candidates	16	Percentage	11.0	Cumulative percentage	90.4	Minimum mark required	65
<b>D</b>	Number of candidates	8	Percentage	5.5	Cumulative percentage	95.9	Minimum mark required	52
<b>No award</b>	Number of candidates	6	Percentage	4.1	Cumulative percentage	100	Minimum mark required	N/A

We have not applied rounding to these statistics.

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in the appendix.

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 statistical reports on the [statistics and information](#) page of our website.

## **Section 1: comments on the assessment**

### **Question paper 1: Literary appreciation**

The component performed as expected. The question paper sampled all parts of the course and all types of question.

Most candidates engaged intelligently with the questions. In general, candidates appeared to know the texts. There was a good spread of marks demonstrating that the questions were accessible to all and allowed for differentiation.

Questions requiring evaluation of language techniques presented the greatest challenge to candidates, perhaps suggesting that they had had less time to master the understanding of these techniques.

Virgil was the most popular author followed by Cicero, Ovid, Pliny and Catullus.

### **Question paper 2: Translating**

Most candidates engaged well with the paper. They were able to follow the narrative and produce satisfactory English versions of the text.

The paper was set at an appropriate level of challenge. There were a number of shorter blocks which enabled less able candidates to demonstrate their understanding. Almost all candidates finished the paper.

This question paper performed as expected, with a spread of marks suggesting a suitable level of challenge. There were no candidates failing to score any marks and none gaining full marks; the mark frequency was concentrated in the second and third quartiles.

## Section 2: comments on candidate performance

### Areas that candidates performed well in

#### Question paper 1: Literary appreciation

##### Section 2

- ◆ Questions 9, 10(a); 10(b); 11(a);11(b);13(b), and 16: most candidates achieved higher than average marks in these questions.

##### Section 3

- ◆ Questions 18, 21(a); 24: most candidates achieved above average marks.

##### Section 4

Questions 25, 26(a); 26(b), 26(c), 27, 30(b),31(a), 31(b): most candidates achieved above average marks.

##### Section 5

- ◆ Questions 34, 36, 39: most candidates achieved above average marks.

#### Question paper 2: Translating

- ◆ Block 1: Temporal clause. Most candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 2: Most candidates handled the accusative and infinitive well. Some candidates gave very literal translations: 'believed Atticus to be in great danger'.
- ◆ Block 3: Causal clause. Most candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 4: Most candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 5: Most candidates translated this block correctly. It was pleasing to see most candidates translating the present participle correctly.
- ◆ Block 7: Relative clause. Most candidates translated this well and recognised the pluperfect tense. It was helpful to candidates that *cui* was given in the word list, although some struggled to render this in good English.
- ◆ Block 9: Most candidates translated this block correctly. Some omitted to translate *ei*. Most candidates translated *que* in this block even if they had omitted it in Blocks 6 and 8.
- ◆ Block 10: Concessive clause. Most candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 11: Consecutive clause with the subjunctive. Most candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 12: Most candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 14: Temporal clause with the subjunctive. All candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 15: Indirect question. Most candidates managed at least one mark here. Some candidates failed to gain the mark because they responded with 'asked Atticus where he was'.
- ◆ Block 16: Most candidates managed to gain one mark. Some candidates omitted *ei* so failed to gain the second mark,
- ◆ Block 21: Most candidates translated this block correctly.
- ◆ Block 22: Negative purpose clause. Most candidates gained at least one mark.

## Areas that candidates found demanding

### Question paper 1: Literary appreciation

#### Section 1

- ◆ All questions attracted lower than average scores.

#### Section 2

- ◆ Questions 11(b), 14 and 17: most candidates achieved lower than average marks.

#### Section 3

- ◆ Questions 19(a), 19(b), 21(b) and 23: most candidates achieved lower than average marks.

#### Section 4

- ◆ Questions 28 and 32: most candidates achieved lower than average marks.

#### Section 5

- ◆ Questions 40, 41 and 42: most candidates achieved lower than average marks.

Other questions performed at or close to the average.

For the most part, language and evaluation questions scored lower marks than factual questions, reflecting the greater demand exerted by evaluation questions.

### Question paper 2: Translating

- ◆ Block 6: Some candidates failed to gain 1 mark for not translating *que*.
- ◆ Block 8: Some candidates omitted *que*. This was treated as a repeated error where candidates had made the same mistake earlier in Block 6.
- ◆ Block 13: A few candidates misread the word list and translated *officium* as 'sense of humour' rather than 'sense of honour'. *Memor*, 'mindful' caused some confusion however, most candidates gained at least one mark.
- ◆ Block 17: Indirect command. There was a variety of responses; candidates may have been confused by failing to choose the correct option given for *ne*, and some candidates struggled to translate the subjunctive accurately.
- ◆ Block 18: Indirect command. This block was not translated well. Candidates struggled with the subjunctive and also omitted *statimque*.
- ◆ Block 19: Indirect statement. This block was not translated well. Candidates struggled with the use of *se* in the accusative and infinitive. They also frequently omitted *eum*.
- ◆ Block 20: This block was not translated well. Some candidates translated the block 'for the sake of Canus' and omitted *eius*.
- ◆ Block 23: Causal clause. Some candidates confused *quod*, 'because' with *quod*, 'which'.
- ◆ Block 24: Predicative dative. A few candidates translated the essential idea correctly, recognising the predicative dative, but unfortunately got the tense of *fuit* wrong, translating it as a future. The predicative dative caused difficulty for most candidates, and they failed to gain any of the marks for this block.

- ◆ Block 25: Because most candidates scored 0 in Block 24, they struggled to gain credit for their translation of Block 25. Some candidates, however, did manage to put across the idea of a dear friend being protected.

## Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

### Question paper 1: Literary appreciation

Candidates should expect all parts of the prescribed text to be sampled. There will always be a range of different types of question, a range of command words and a range of questions worth varying marks. Candidates should gain experience and practise in understanding the meaning of command words and question types. Questions on Roman culture and Latin literary techniques will appear at least once in every section. There will be questions addressing candidates' knowledge of the text and questions assessing skills of analysis, argument and evaluation.

To answer the 'Roman culture' questions, candidates will not be expected to include information beyond what they have learnt specifically from the text but would be given credit for correct information from their own knowledge.

Candidates need to ensure that they do not stray beyond the line references given in the question. A frequent failure to gain marks is due to candidates referring to the wrong section of text. This was very common in the 2024 paper. Candidates should be encouraged to be aware of exam requirements.

Bullet points are acceptable in extended responses, if they are sufficiently expanded. Single words are not normally sufficient to demonstrate knowledge.

Matching the length of answer to the number of marks available is a useful skill to practise. Over-long and repetitive answers are unnecessary and are not a good use of time.

Where appropriate, candidates can answer both 'yes' and 'no' to questions, and credit will be given for any valid point. It may be helpful to give practice to candidates in writing 'yes' and 'no' answers to the same question. It is one way to achieve marks in high-value questions.

### Question paper 2: Translating

Candidates should be prepared to demonstrate their skills in handling a wide range of accidence and syntax. Centres are reminded that the list of prescribed accidence and syntax is available on page 5 of the course specification, available on [SQA's Higher Latin subject page](#). Accurate application of accidence and syntax will always be rewarded.

Effective use of the word list: care needs to be taken to find the correct meaning in the word list and to review the sense of the translation. It is very important for candidates to read the words in the passage carefully and accurately. Some candidates go wrong by assuming they know a word and failing to check the specific meaning in the word list, which supplies meanings for the Latin word in the context of the passage. Even if candidates know the meaning of the Latin word, taking a few moments to check the specific meaning would be advisable, particularly as a word which is repeated in a passage may have multiple meanings listed.

In the 2024 assessment, some candidates confused *quod*, 'because' with *quod*, 'which'. Candidates should practise using word lists in this way and determining the correct choice by reference to context rather than just taking the first meaning offered.

Candidates should check that they have not omitted any 'small' words: pronouns such as *ei* or conjunctions such as *que* which are small in themselves but important for the narrative. Reading the passage two or three times before attempting to translate will be helpful.



## Appendix: 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.

Every year, we evaluate the performance of our assessments in a fair way, while ensuring standards are maintained so that our qualifications remain credible. To do this, we measure evidence of candidates' knowledge and skills against the national standard.

During the pandemic, we modified National Qualifications course assessments, for example we removed elements of coursework. We kept these modifications in place until the 2022–23 session. The education community agreed that retaining the modifications for longer than this could have a detrimental impact on learning and progression to the next stage of education, employment or training. After discussions with candidates, teachers, lecturers, parents, carers and others, we returned to full course assessment for the 2023–24 session.

SQA's approach to awarding was announced in [March 2024](#) and explained that any impact on candidates completing coursework for the first time, as part of their SQA assessments, would be considered in our grading decisions and incorporated into our well-established

grading processes. This provides fairness and safeguards for candidates and helps to provide assurances across the wider education community as we return to established awarding.

Our approach to awarding is broadly aligned to other nations of the UK that have returned to normal grading arrangements.

For full details of the approach, please refer to the [National Qualifications 2024 Awarding — Methodology Report](#).