



---

# **EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

---

**LEVEL 1 LATIN**

**SUMMER 2022**

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:  
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=en>

### **Online Results Analysis**

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

### **Annual Statistical Report**

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Page</b>
9511	<b>1</b>
9512	<b>3</b>
9514	<b>5</b>

# LATIN – CORE LANGUAGE

## Level 1

Summer 2022

9511

### General Comments

Centres are to be commended on preparing their students for this paper given the disruption to teaching. The vast majority of candidates followed the storyline to its conclusion, although some details were not fully understood by all. Superlatives and comparatives, imperatives, singular/plural endings and the translation questions were good discriminators.

### Comments on individual questions/sections

The following questions served as good discriminators:

- Q.4** The superlative for *aegerrima* was required as *aeger* and *dives* were both glossed.
- Q.5** *itaque* was unknown to many (this was not penalised if the same incorrect answer was given in Q 9) Even quite strong candidates ignored the preposition *de*, but the pronoun *eam* was well handled.
- Q.7** This was more problematic than anticipated for many candidates: vocabulary seems to have been the barrier to correct answers.
- Q.8** The correct agreement of *multa* (with *dona*) would have helped candidates to realise that gifts were plural. However, a common error was to write ‘many gods’ (in which case *multa* was not credited). Many paraphrased this – ‘she asked the gods for help / she prayed to the gods’ etc. Such responses were awarded 1/4. Only the very best candidates achieved 4/4.
- Q.9** The imperative, the case of *haruspice* (some made this nominative) and the word *meam* were the biggest challenges in this question.
- Q.10** Many appeared to simply write what they thought was a sensible answer here (e.g. she wanted to understand why she was ill / why the gods were not helping etc). Some tried to engage with the words *debeo* and *facere* but did not always give the correct meanings for this context. ‘owe’ and ‘make’ were not credited.
- Q.12** Several candidates did not know *simulatque*. Some made *Antoniam* nominative; consequential errors made with *ei* were not penalised.
- Q.14** Not all candidates used the words in the wordlist here. Those who did often ignored *nolebat* and just made the verb *dicere* negative, which was awarded 1/2.
- Q.15** (i) and (ii) both *heri* and *optima* were not well known by all
- (iii) The key here was to provide enough detail for 5 marks. A small minority recognised *laete* as an adverb. However, provided they made ‘happy’ agree with the gods it was credited.

- Q.16** This was not particularly well done. *amant* caused some difficulty and, as elsewhere, the superlative was not generally rendered.
- Q.17** *visne* was widely ignored.
- Q.20 (i)** There was some confusion again with the preposition 'de' Most had only learned this as 'from' and when that did not fit the context, changed it to 'with' which is incorrect. Some answers did not render *scripsit* adequately.
- Q.22** It was encouraging to see so many answers deal with the present participle successfully.
- Q.24 and Q.25** *cur* was not acknowledged in several answers. The 2<sup>nd</sup> person ending of *invitavisti* (Q25) also proved challenging to some. The -ne was dealt with quite successfully.
- Q.27 and Q.28** The main problem here was including adequate detail.
- Q.29** This was not very well done – even by some otherwise very good candidates. The comparative proved a great challenge as did *quam te* – with many making *te* the subject of the sentence.

### Summary of key points

Although candidates did follow the story quite well, they should be encouraged to always give full detail from the lemma provided. Often answers were too vague with incomplete detail to be awarded full marks. A good rule of thumb is to approach the comprehension in the same way as the translation – i.e., with the same attention to grammatical detail. It is also worth emphasising that glossed words may appear in different forms in the passage. The basic meaning will be given (e.g. *aeger* – rich) but candidates are expected to recognise the superlative form if this is given in order to achieve the mark.

It is noteworthy that some candidates performed better in the additional language translation paper than in this paper, suggesting further practice in examination technique would be beneficial.

**LATIN**  
**Level 1**  
**Summer 2022**  
**9512**

**General Comments**

In a very small entry, most candidates chose to answer Topic 1, Daily Life in a Roman Town, rather than Topic 2, Roman Britain which has in the past proved to be much less popular choice. Given that this is the first 'normal' examination season since 2019, there was some uncertainty as to how candidates would fare after two years of disruption to teaching and preparation. The standard was very variable with some excellent scripts but also quite a few in both topics where candidates achieved fewer than half marks. This is disappointing given that these are familiar topics and the areas of study are clearly set out in the specification. Even the better candidates often failed to achieve high marks in section B, the mini essays, either by not focusing on the question with sufficient care or by failing to make specific points worthy of credit.

There were a few rubric errors; some candidates attempted both topics and slightly more wrote answers to all four mini-essays in section B of their chosen topic. Some appeared to have answered the wrong topic completely and there were a very few whose final mark was in single figures.

In Section A in both topics, there were some good answers; however, as in previous examination seasons, some candidates in their answers in Section B simply wrote down everything they knew about the subject without reference to the title of the question, the suggested bullet points or the need for evaluation. At the other end of the scale, there were those who answered in detail and who were able to gain high marks.

**Comments on individual questions/sections**

**TOPIC 1: Daily Life in a Roman Town**

**Section A:**

- Q.1** All parts were answered well although (c) proved a challenge for some.
- Q.2** This was generally well answered although some in answer to (a) did not link the question to the first and second hours mentioned in the poem. Some reference to the early morning greeting was needed.
- Q.3** All parts were answered well.
- Q.4** This proved to be the most challenging question in section A of this topic. Many did not know the answer to (a) (i) or (ii) and in (b), many candidates were only able to mention the lack of gas/electricity in a Roman kitchen.

## **Section B:**

For those who chose to do Topic 1, questions 5 & 6 were by far the most popular choices. Overall, the performance was disappointing with many candidates failing to get half marks for this section. The bullet points are designed to guide the candidate but, in many cases, (as in previous years) some ignored these completely and homed in on a particular phrase in the question, such as 'slave' or 'Roman town' and proceeded to write as much information as they could, whether relevant or not. Evaluation in these answers was either minimal or, in the worst cases, completely missing.

An example of this which occurred several times was in question 5, in which a good number of answers described the manumission ceremony in great detail and even how the person had become enslaved in the first place.

## **TOPIC 2: Roman Britain**

### **Section A:**

- Q.1** Generally well done although there was an element of repetition in some candidates' answers to (a) and (b). In (c)(ii), the most popular answer was 'robbers' although 'highwaymen' appeared in several scripts.
- Q.2** Not everyone was able to tease out three answers for (a) although most candidates found something. In (b), the answer was people making profit from the corn tax, rather than the actual tax. In the rest of question 2, most knew about the Iceni and Boudica and achieved full marks.
- Q.3** This was well done although in (b)(iii), some made reference to the flights of birds.
- Q.4** This question was very well done with most candidates getting full marks.

### **Section B:**

For the small number of candidates who chose topic 2, questions 5 and 6 were overwhelmingly the most popular. Once again, some saw these questions as an excuse to write down pages of facts with little evaluation and others wrote at great length without saying very much at all. However, those who focused on the question being asked produced excellent and high-scoring answers.

Question 6 provided the best responses overall where those who chose this essay seemed to follow the bullet points closely, thus getting a good balance in their answers.

## **Summary of key points**

In future series, centres are advised to focus candidates' learning on:

- answering the question provided and not offering up all they know on the subject
- only answering as many questions as required – candidates who answered parts A and B or who answered too many mini-essays will have used up time that could have been taken to focus on their required responses

**Level 1**  
**Summer 2022**  
**9514**

**General Comments**

Overall candidates performed well in this paper, with a number of scripts achieving full marks.

The plural of *emblema* (*emblemata*) was provided in the wordlist to avoid confusion with the singular and plural form of this neuter noun. However, not all candidates took careful note of this in their translations.

**Comments on individual questions/sections**

- S.1** Some translations began in the present tense before shifting back to the past.
- S.2** Some translations did not render the second *multae eius* was a good discriminator. As noted above the plural form – *emblemata* - was not always recognised.
- S.3** *qui* was sometimes simply ignored. *novus* was occasionally confused with *novem* which again had a knock-on effect on the singular form of *emblema*.
- S.4** A significant number of translations made *Plauti* the subject of this sentence. Several did not know *itaque*.
- S.5** This section was quite challenging for some with the present participle agreeing with *Plautum*. Some confused *ianuam* with *iuvenis* and *prope* was not widely known.
- S.6** The major problem in this section was *quod te video* – only the best candidates translated this correctly, with the majority writing 'because / which you see'.
- S.7** This was quite well done generally, though some translations did not include every word.
- S.8** *tacebat* was widely unknown to candidates, although most achieved the mark for the tense and person of this verb. The tense of *viderat* was a good discriminator, as was the comparative (see note in summary of key points).
- S.9** Generally well done.
- S.10** This was quite challenging in several places. Firstly, the question, *quid facere debeo?* was not particularly well done. *tum* was frequently omitted. The prohibition was not well done at all although some did see that it was formed using the infinitive. It was good to see so many recognising the vocative *amice*.. The last sentence, *Catoni inquit* was widely translated as 'Cato said' which then had implications for the next section.

- S.11** Those who were confused by thinking Cato was the speaker struggled to get full marks here. However, the superlative was done quite well generally. Some candidates had not checked which nouns *omnes* and *meam* agreed with.
- S.12** Generally well done. Not all knew *septem* and some mistranslated or omitted *tandem*.
- S.13** Generally well done. Not all knew *simulatque*
- S.14** *bene fecisti* – both the adverb and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person verb proved challenging. Only the best candidates recognised the particular use of *quam*.
- S.15** *laete* had to be translated as an adverb
- S.16** The participle caused the most difficulties here, both in terms of its meaning in this context (or at all) and its form (present participle)
- S.17** *nunc* was occasionally omitted. Not all dealt well with *poterat*.

### Summary of key points

Some suggestions for candidates in future include:

Translate every word: credit is given to the meaning the first time it appears in the story and to the inflection for all inflected words each time they occur. Therefore, it is possible to gain some credit for an only partially correct translation.

Check the tense of verbs: some candidates started their translation in the present tense before reverting to the past, which lost them the inflection mark for these early verbs.

Comparatives can not be translated as ‘as ... as ...’ or ‘such a....’ Candidates must be told to translate comparative adjectives as ‘more... than...’ or ‘-er than...’.

Proper names must be written in their nominative form to be given credit.

If the story starts not to make sense, candidates should be encouraged to go back and check that their previous section is accurate. This was particularly apparent in this paper in section 10 where many made Cato the subject of the sentence and this became confusing when it did not make sense for him to be saying what was in the speech marks.





WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)