

Classical Greek

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1941**

Report on the Components

June 2007

1941/MS/R/07

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

GCSE Classical Greek (1941)

REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS

Component	Content	Page
1941/01	Paper 1 Language	1
1941/02	Paper 2 Verse Literature	5
1941/03	Paper 3 Prose Literature	9
1941/04	Paper 4 Greek Civilisation	
1941/05	Coursework	
*	Grade Thresholds	

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

1941/01 Paper 1 - Language

General Comments

There was a lively response to this paper and a large number of candidates gained good marks. They and their teachers are to be congratulated on their careful preparation and thoughtful, accurate presentation of the translation and comprehension answers. Less strong candidates made some headway in parts of the paper, but could be hindered by insecurity over vocabulary and constructions. Nevertheless they grappled with the translation with some determination and often made a recovery after a shaky sentence.

Blanks:

As usual, candidates were sensible about not leaving gaps, and, even where they produced a distorted version, they usually obtained some marks. It is not acceptable to give for an infinitive, whose meaning has been forgotten, 'to ----'. There are no marks available for this and similarly for writing 'accusative, object', but not including a noun.

Alternatives:

This year, a number of candidates gave alternative meanings for a word, e.g. 'they would have fled/escaped' in (C) and expected the examiner to select the correct answer. If either meaning was wrong, candidates lost the mark. This form of hedging one's bets came out in other ways, e.g. βουλόμενος – 'wishing to plan'.

There is, however, no objection to candidates, who give a rather free, but often stylish, rendering of a phrase, writing down the literal meaning in brackets, so that the examiner knows that they have understood the Greek.

Vocabulary:

1) αὐτόν

Some candidates did not distinguish between the possible meanings of αὐτός and αὐτόν and tacked on the word 'himself' or 'themselves' to any form of αὐτόν, thereby losing marks. When their big moment came with αὐτός in (C) para.1, many ignored the word.

2) Word confusion:

The usual chestnuts occurred with candidates unsure about ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖ, and ἔπειτα in (A) and (C). In (A) the following pairs of words were sometimes confused:

φιλοῦσα, φίλος; ὅτι, διότι; πιστεύων, πιστός; ἄλλα, ἀλλά; ἀνδρί, ἀνδρεῖος; ἤθελε, ἦλθε; and in (C) βουλόμενος, βουλή; ἐβοήθησαν, βοάω.

3) Vocabulary given with the passages:

With the reduction in the DVL for this paper, candidates have to be given more vocabulary with passages. It is very important that they should be able to make proper and confident use of the information provided. In (B) σκηπή is given as 'tent' and appears in that form in the text, but quite a number translated it as a plural and this affected their perception of what was going on. There was also a heavy preponderance of that biological curiosity - the one-jawed lion. Candidates could help themselves by visualising what they are writing about. If a word is underlined, candidates should use the meaning given, even if they have learnt different meanings in the DVL. They should also make sure they have correctly related the word in the vocabulary to the one in the text. There was some confusion between the Ionians and the Ister in (C) and Scythia and the Scythians, but, on the whole, students dealt well with the proper names.

Participles:

- 1) Reversal of a finite verb and participle is not acceptable and often does not make sense. Candidates, who wrote 'he died, leaving' for ἀποθνήσκων κατέλιπε in (A) were penalised, as were those, who wrote 'they marched very quickly, arriving first' for τάχιστα πορευθέντες, πρώτοι ἀψίκοντο in (C).

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

2) Genitive Absolute:

Most students knew how to produce a proper translation of a genitive absolute and make a link with the rest of the sentence. All ways of expression are acceptable: e.g. for τῶν Ἐκυθῶν οὐκέτι παρόντων '(with) the Scythians no longer being present', 'since/as/when/because the Scythians were no longer present', or 'the Scythians were no longer present and/so the Persians crossed safely'.

οὐδενὸς κωλύοντος was well expressed by some as 'without any hindrance' and it was also possible here to write 'since they were not hindered by anyone'.

Constructions

1) Relative Clauses

In general candidates handled the relative clauses in (A) successfully. There are two possible ways of dealing with ἐν ἣ ἔγραψε: they are 'in which he wrote' and 'and in it he wrote', where there must be the connecting 'and' to form a complete sentence. A few ignored ὅς ἦν and simply wrote 'a winged horse', so lost marks.

2) Result Clauses:

The result clause in (C) caused problems for some. Candidates need to be familiar with the forward pointing word οὕτως with an adverb or adjective followed by ὥστε. Those, who translated οὕτως as 'in this way' ran into difficulties. In some cases ὥστε was treated as ἵνα.

3) Conditionals:

All candidates should be able to handle the two types of conditions prescribed with confidence and be secure with their expression in English. Very many candidates are to be commended for their correct rendering of the final sentence in (C). Some had the right idea, but unfortunately added 'could have' or 'would have been able' to their versions.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

There was plenty of stylish and accurate translation here.

Paragraph 1: Candidates used a variety of words for λόγους, such as 'message' or 'invitation', all of which were acceptable. It is essential to select the right equivalent in a case like this and 'stories' or 'accounts' were not suitable.

Paragraph 2: Here candidates needed to keep the words in the right clause so that Stheneboea did not threaten the young man. Not everyone knew ἔδωκε. Certain parts of -μι verbs are given in the Specification Content under Accidence on page 16 and candidates must know these parts as well as the vocabulary in the DVL. For ἐν ἣ ἔγραψε some wrote 'in which was written'. The active/passive interchange is always acceptable, but if a passive is used the agent must be expressed, so 'by him' was needed here. θεῶν was not always recognised and sometimes latinised as 'the gods'.

Paragraph 3: ταύτην was sometimes treated as ταῦτα. There was some doubt over the meaning of ψοκεῖσαι and who was to kill whom.

Paragraph 4: generally began well, but a number made μετά into a conjunction and wrote 'after he did all this'. They needed to consider word order and sentence structure, as there is only one finite verb.

Paragraph 5: Most translated well here, but some missed the tense of ἀποθνήσκων.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Section B

This section proved quite testing. Good candidates recognised that they had to go close to the text and give adequate detail.

- (a) was well done.
- (b) Candidates had some problems with Lion's Head, as they did not recognise καλουμένη and did not realise Lion's Head was the name of a city. A few, who had misunderstood, made up their own story here, which led to mistakes further on.
- (c) Many candidates gave accurate detail from the text, but some answers were too vague and relied on material from the heading.
- (d) This question was often answered well, but some lost the idea of Themistocles falling into the lion's jaws.
- (e) (i) Candidates needed to be careful here, as elsewhere, to translate the superlative.
(ii) Not all students put in 'he left the road' and simply wrote 'he set up camp in a field', also losing the plural in ἀγροῖς.
- (f) (i) Good in general, though αὐτοῦ might be omitted. Some did not read the question or the Greek carefully enough and went in for pack animals and tents.
(ii) Often well done.
- (g) Not all candidates checked which lines they were asked to refer to, with the result that their answers fell outside the questions and could not be given marks.
- (i) Some students ignored or did not know εἶδον and in their answers referred to a clear night.
(ii) Good candidates took note of the verb's prefix and the preposition ἐπί and knew that the soldiers ran at the tent.
(iii) Usually well answered, but some omitted εὐρήσειν.
- (h) (i) Those who translated διότι ἐσώθη did well. Others gained some credit for 'he had survived' or equivalent, but had lost the idea of his being saved.
(ii) Many did well here, and most acquired some marks. A surprising number did not know θύσας and some ignored ὡς 'as' a priestess. A few sacrificed the daughter.

Section C

There were many good answers here.

Paragraph 1: Some candidates were hampered by vocabulary problems and did not recognise εισέβαλεν or διαβάσης. αὐτοῦ might be ignored and τοὺς Ἴωνας μένοντας was translated as 'the waiting Ionians'. Good students handled the future tense of ἐξέσται successfully.

Paragraph 2: There was some insecurity over ἔδοξε and a few candidates made Darius go to his country. Not everyone recognised the indirect question, but a pleasingly large number knew that the Scythians reached the bridge of boats first or were the first to reach the bridge.

Paragraph 3: ἐπειρῶντο was not always known and might be translated by a participle and πείθειν converted into the main verb. Surprisingly λύειν was sometimes presented as 'to leave'. Good candidates handled χρή well and recognised that the infinitive ἐπανελθεῖν was dependent on it. ἔμελλον caused problems and some turned the sentence round saying 'they would be badly treated by Darius'. Most dealt capably with the double negative and realised that it intensified rather than cancelled out.

Paragraph 4: Students began well here and put in something on correct lines for ἤρξαντο. They ran into difficulties if they ignored the word order. Candidates should be able to translate the genitive split correctly. Not everyone used the information about παραινότητες successfully and some had the Ionians being advised by the Scythians.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Paragraph 5: Most candidates managed the first sentence very well and there were many excellent translations of the final one.

Section D

A small number of centres did this section and most students dealt with it competently, producing some good accurate composition.

1, 2 and 3 were done well.

4 Most candidates used a participle for the temporal clause, but some wanted this to be a genitive absolute. The tense of 'were fighting' was not always correct.

5 Some had difficulty over the future infinitive.

The comments on what went wrong in the different sections are intended as a guide for the future and not as a criticism. Overall there was an encouragingly high level of performance on the paper.

1941/02 Verse Literature

General Comments

This year's examination paper, based on a new syllabus with fewer lines of prescribed Greek and no wider reading in English, produced a very high level of performance from the vast majority of candidates. Scripts showed a thorough knowledge and a detailed understanding of the text, and answers were often full, interesting and relevant. Homer was a more popular choice of text than Euripides by approximately 3:1.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A Euripides: *Ion*

- Q.1 (a) No problem identifying Hermes, but some weaker candidates misunderstood the second part of the question (which asked for the role he 'played in events leading up to the present situation') and wrote about the function of the prologue. Some failed to include the fact that he was acting under orders from Apollo/his brother.
- (b) Well answered by most, although some tended to translate the Greek without giving clear information, e.g. on which side Xuthus fought in the war or which side eventually won.
- (c) Very straightforward.
- (d) Most answers showed awareness of the couple's childlessness; some failed to mention they had come to consult the oracle about this.
- (e) Very straightforward.
- (f) Translations were not always as accurate as they might have been e.g. *τάδε* often ignored, careless verb tenses, mistranslation of *ἐς τοῦτ'* such as 'to this place'.
- (g) Lots of good answers. Sometimes it was simply a lack of sufficient detail that cost marks, e.g. not specifying what 'deed' Apollo wanted to be kept secret.
- (h) Weaker candidates misunderstood Ion's 'rightful place' to be a physical location.
- (i) There were many good answers, prepared to discuss the behaviour of Apollo with examples. Less good answers were guilty of a lack of structure/planning or struggled to develop an answer beyond 'I dis/approve because Apollo did this or that'.
- 2 (a) Both parts were answered well.
- (b) This was an awkward question about the goddess Shame, although many candidates gained full marks without necessarily giving a clear or fully convincing answer.

- (c) A number of translations again lacked accuracy, e.g. *φησί* omitted, 'a friend' for *τις φίλων ἐμῶν*, subject and indirect object switched (*Φοίβῳ γυνή*), and *λάθρα πατρός* misunderstood as 'without its father (Apollo) knowing'.
- (d) No problem for the majority of candidates. A few confused Erechtheus with Erichthonius, while some simply appeared not to know that Erechtheus had been king of Athens.
- (e) The point should be reinforced that in any scansion question candidates may leave the final syllable unresolved by marking it 'x'. Some were penalised for scanning the final syllable of *ἄθλια* long. If candidates are to ensure full marks on the alternative question, about the arrangement or choice of words, it is important to practise the style of answer. Candidates sometimes struggled to explain clearly or go far enough with an answer.
- (f) It is usually a good idea to offer a translation of the relevant phrase (here *οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδεὶς*) in this type of question, as it helps to get the candidate started on the answer. Sometimes candidates assume the translation and launch into an answer which remains unclear.
- (g) A number of candidates seemed to think that the baby had been eaten by wild boars, (or in one case 'wild bores').
- (h) Well answered.
- (i) Most had no difficulty with the idea of dramatic irony.
- (j) Many candidates scored full marks; some racked up the marks with a series of relatively superficial points, whereas the best candidates showed a real insight into Ion's character and illustrated their ideas appropriately and with good judgement.

Section B Homer: *Iliad* 1

- Q.3
- (a) Both parts were generally well answered, although not all candidates saw a connection between burning the dead and preventing the spread of the plague. The phrase in the question 'under the circumstances' was an attempt to steer candidates away from general observations about religious practice.
 - (b) See 2 (e) above.
 - (c) Almost all gave a correct answer.
 - (d) Very well answered.
 - (e) Again small inaccuracies often cost full marks e.g. *οἴω*, *ὄμοῦ*, *ἄν* frequently omitted, and *παλιμπλαγχθέντας* paraphrased (very loosely) or simply not known. A number wanted to insert a negative in the third line of translation.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

- (f) Many strong answers, but for (ii) some offered no further than the idea of Apollo being angry. It is always advisable to note the number of marks on offer for each question.
- (g) Lots of good, thoughtful answers on the relationship between men and gods, usually focusing on Apollo and Hera, but many also noting the significance of priests etc, sacrifices and dreams. Some answers strayed outside the passage.
- Q.4 (a) This was perhaps the least successful translation question on the paper. Common errors were: not linking *Τρώων* with *αἰχμητάων*, mistranslation of *ἔνεκ*, omission of *μοι*, and the failure to recognise the gender of *ἐμὰς βοῦς*. There was also a tendency to paraphrase unnecessarily.
- (b) Many did not have a clue where Phthia was. Guesses ranged from an island (common), to Africa, Lebanon, Troy or even Mt Olympus.
- (c) Usually correct.
- (d) (i) The most frequent answers were *ὁ μέγ' ἀναιδές* and *κυνῶπα*, although *μέγ'* was sometimes omitted or rather carelessly translated as 'complete(ly)' or 'most'.
- (ii) Problematical for a number of candidates; some did not understand the Greek and wrongly assumed the question was an extension of the theme on insulting language from part (i), while others were unsure what line of explanation to take.
- (e) Most identified Briseis as the prize. For the second part of the question most candidates went to the text (*πολλὰ μόγησα* and *δόσαν δέ μοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν*). Some were unsure about heroic status and material possessions, and very few referred to Achilles' feelings for Briseis.
- (f) Some very good answers here on Achilles' speech to Agamemnon, full of good ideas with perceptive use of the text. However, there were also many examples of answers which were poorly organised, and a disappointing number of candidates strayed outside the prescribed lines and, having made what were thought to be three good points, then stopped and thus ended up with a low mark because much of the answer was unacceptable.
- (g) Most candidates secured full marks by reading the last three lines of the passage. Some however were unsure about the focus of the question (perhaps because line references were not given along with the actual question), although there was an intended connection between the text (*νῦν δ' εἴμι Φθίηνδ'*) and the wording in the question 'Achilles threatens to leave Troy'.
- (h) Most candidates were able to recall Agamemnon's response in considerable detail, much more than was needed for three marks.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

1941/03 Prose Literature

General Comments

Candidates in general had prepared extremely well for this paper, as their excellent results reflected. Most appeared to have enjoyed the stories, particularly the Herodotus selection, and wrote very fluently and with great insight in response. As last year, the vast majority of Centres had elected to study the Herodotus rather than the Anthology. Those few who did tackle the Anthology produced a rather more mixed performance: the polarisation of excellent and very muddled answers was determined almost entirely by the level of understanding of the Aristotle passage. Some candidates had clearly found it very stimulating, while others simply struggled to make sense of it. Most disappointing of all were the candidates who scored very highly on the Demosthenes and then plummeted with the Aristotle.

It was a pleasure to see how many students were well versed in a wide range of literary devices. However, they need to realise that spotting such a device is rarely sufficient to gain a whole mark in a personal response question: this type of material needs to be used judiciously in support of more pertinent answers to the specific question. The stronger candidates, however, were capable of not only this but also producing individual, perceptive answers of which an A level literature candidate could justly be proud.

One area in which many candidates lost marks unnecessarily was the translation section of each question: too often they gave a summary of the content or casually introduced singulars or plurals, and occasionally even drifted on beyond the end of the specified lines. Precision at this level is vital.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

- 1 (a) (i) Well answered.
(ii) Well answered.
- (b) (i) Mostly fine, although it was important to note that the children were newborn, otherwise the whole point of the experiment was lost.
(ii) A question which differentiated between stronger and weaker candidates: too many either left the examiner to select the word or phrase from the entire sentence or gave the translation of *επιτυχόντων* as 'who happened to be passing'.
- (c) This was very well answered. A large number of candidates took the details of the experiment as read and instead explained the technicalities of the scientific method, for which credit was given. There were some very impressive responses to this question.
- (d) Generally well answered.
- (e) (i) Fine.
(ii) Almost universally correct.
(iii) Fine.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

- (f) In general this was very good, but relatively few candidates scored completely full marks. Words and phrases which caused problems were *τα πρωτα* (at first), *αυτω* (too often omitted) and *επιμελομενω* (often translated as 'take heed' rather than 'take care of'). One area of concern was the amount of colloquial English which seems to be creeping into candidates' writing: they need to be aware of what is and is not appropriate in a formal context.
- (g) Those who resisted the lure of the literary device wrote very fully and responsively on the ways in which Herodotus makes the story interesting: clearly the idea of an early scientific experiment appealed to them greatly and they found the character of Psammetichus fascinating. Surprisingly few candidates, however, expressed any concern on the babies' behalf.
- 2 (a) This was mostly well answered, although for full marks it was necessary to include a translation of *δικαιουνν*, as what was at stake was the way in which Amasis had changed the Egyptians' attitude.
- (b) Again the translation was mostly accurate, but words which caused difficulty were *εχρητο* ('adopted' or 'used', rather than 'conducted'), *κατεσκοπτε* ('played jokes ON', rather than 'with') and *παιγνιμων* (not 'amusing', but 'playful' or 'fond of a joke'). All these words are challenging and precision is needed to convey exactly the right flavour.
- (c) All candidates were capable of answering this question correctly, but unfortunately some did not check the line references before beginning to write: those who used material from line 13 rather than lines 9-11 unfortunately lost marks. It is essential to read the question carefully.
- (d) (i) This was generally well done, but candidates tended to leave out *δι' ημερας* and instead took 'spend his time' from the question itself.
(ii) This was well answered. Those who left out 'all day' in the previous question but used it here were allowed credit for it. Some candidates unfortunately misinterpreted 'Do not repeat material from d(i)' to mean that they could not use any material from lines 9-11, which led to muddled answers. When the line reference is given immediately before part (i) of a question, it should be taken to refer to all the following parts.
- (e) Some candidates here took the content of the lines as read and explained what techniques the friends used to encourage Amasis to behave differently: credit was given for this, but some reference to what was actually said was necessary.
- (f) (i) Fine.
(ii) Fine.
- (g) This was well understood and the answers were fluently expressed, although a large number of candidates tended simply to repeat the relevant section of their translation.
- (h) Candidates liked Amasis as a character: to some he was a lovable rogue, to others a dishonest charlatan, but all found him of interest and many had at least twice as much to say about him as they needed to gain three marks. Some of the better answers were quite sophisticated.

Section B

- 3 (a) (i) Mostly fine, although some thought the answer was the slaves or Conon and sons together.
(ii) Mostly good.
- (b) This was generally well translated, although a few candidates were totally muddled by the Greek itself and gave a summary of the content. Common errors were the translation of *ορωντες* in the aorist tense, the omission of *λυπουμενοι*, the omission of either *ειπομεν* or *προσελθοντες* and not maintaining the nominative case for *παντες οι συσσιτοι*.
- (c) Well answered.
- (d) Those candidates who checked the line reference for the question went on to answer correctly. Some unfortunately used the material for the next question and then were not sure how to proceed.
- (e) This was generally well answered, although some candidates did not realise that both *επειδη* and *θαπτον* were needed for 'as soon as'.
- (f) (i) Fine.
(ii) This was usually well done, although some candidates seemed confused as to who 'the men' actually were.
- (g) Most candidates responded with vigour to this question, although a small minority simply plucked *ασελγειας* and *υβρεως* from the passage and thought that this was sufficient.
- (h) This question produced some excellent responses. Many students felt that Ariston's intention to steer clear of trouble by ignoring the men and not immediately rushing to bring a lawsuit would endear him to the jury. Most repeated the litany of the men's bad behaviour and their failure to respect the general's authority. Candidates clearly enjoyed feeling shocked and outraged: if the strength of feeling in these responses is anything to go by, our Greek GCSE students will be model citizens.
- 4 (a) (i) Mostly fine, although some candidates were very muddled as to the context of the passage and referred to stories where the hero falls to ruin because of a tragic flaw.
(ii) Fine.
- (b) (i) This question produced mixed responses. Some candidates answered correctly, but others were still keen to talk about the tragic flaw and reversal of fortune.
(ii) Most candidates chose to write about Oedipus, many telling much of the story. Those who chose Meleager seemed less familiar with the story. Again people were keen to explain exactly how these men fitted Aristotle's model of a tragic hero. Some flexibility in marking was allowed.
- (c) (i) Most candidates answered that Euripides' tragedies ended in bad fortune, ignoring the *αι πολλαι*, which was essential. Those who opted for the alternative answer tended to get embroiled in a discussion of exactly what

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

τουτο δρα actually referred to: each answer, therefore, was considered very carefully on its own merits and credit given where appropriate.

- (ii) This question differentiated between those students who had simply learned the translation by heart and those who knew what the Greek meant.

- (d) Mostly very good.

- (e) This passage proved challenging to translate, particularly because of the three participles in the first sentence, which candidates had a tendency to move around. It was disappointing to see how many students failed to recognise the two comparative adjectives, *τοις βελτιοσι και χειροσιν*, and instead translated them as 'good and bad' or 'best and worst'.

- (f) There were some interesting answers here. However, the weakest candidates were unable to translate the Greek and so wrote answers which were nothing to do with 'what the audience wanted'. Those who did understand it, however, gave answers ranging from soap operas to romantic comedies and adventure films. Some responses were extremely sophisticated, suggesting that programme makers lost all artistic integrity by trying to please the audience.

- (g) Some candidates found this question difficult because they quite clearly felt that Aristotle had not maintained their own interest as readers. However, they struggled valiantly on, occasionally making long points about the frequency of particles in the Greek. Others, however, were very convincing in their argument that Aristotle presents his opinion as fact.

In general this question was clearly the most challenging to the candidates: those who did well tended to do exceptionally well, but there were students who really floundered.

Topic 1: Greek Religion

Section One

- Q.1** Question One proved popular. Most had no problem with (a) and (b). A few were unable to recognise that it was a burnt offering and did not identify the altar. Many concentrated on the gory aspects of a sacrifice in (e) without giving much detailed explanation of what actually took place at one.
- Q.2** In Question Two virtually all candidates performed well on this topic area. They were able to identify the gods and their responsibilities in (b) and how Poseidon was portrayed in (d) and most found something worthwhile to say in (e).
- Q.3** Question Three proved to be very straightforward for candidates. Needless to say, most candidates did score well and this indicates a marked improvement on this topic area compared to two years ago when a similar question was not so well done.

Section Two

Both essays proved equally popular. Although the Eleusis essay was probably done better in that answers padded out the bullet points whereas many did little more than repeat the bullet points in the second essay and said little about the impression the festival made in terms of Athens herself.

Topic 2: Home and Family in Athens

Section One

- Q.1** Question One was attempted by fewer candidates. Most scored well, although there was a tendency to be very vague in (d).
- Q.2** Virtually all candidates attempted Question Two and with a good deal of success. There were some particularly interesting and varied responses to (e) although few looked at the positive aspects. Knowledge of this area of the topic was, almost without exception, very thorough.
- Q.3** The same can be said of Question Three; again candidates were inventive in their answers to (e).

Section Two

Essay 1 proved the least popular. Information was very full on the whole. Performance on essay 2 was disappointing.

There are a number of essays at Foundation Level that take an empathetic approach. Candidates need to be aware that these are intended as a vehicle to allow them to demonstrate their knowledge of a particular subject area; they are not a piece of English creative writing. Thus many in this essay summed up the role of a slave in a couple of sentences and spent most of the essay telling heart-rending stories of how they were captured or abused.

Topic 3: Greek Athletic and Theatrical Festivals

Section One

The standard of responses overall in this topic was very good. All three Section One questions were attempted, although one and two proved to be the most popular.

- Q.1** In Question One, although the source material was a little different to simple

pictures of one event, candidates were not fazed and performed well almost without exception; a clear indication that the use of sources is being stressed rather than the concept that if you have not seen the picture before you cannot answer the question.

- Q.2** Question Two was done well. A few could not identify the altar. Differentiation in terms of knowledge of the topic was only clear in (d) often guessing according to what they thought the type of play might involve rather than giving specific details.
- Q.3** Question Three produced mixed responses. A number were unsure about the table in (b) and the significance of the phrase 'allowed to compete' in (e) was often overlooked, thus giving fairly bland answers which did not reflect the rules of the games.

Section Two

Essay 1 proved the most popular, the bullet points gave some structure to responses and there was some good discussion as to what was impressive. Answers to essay 2 were also generally well done. Weaker responses tended to do little more than copy the bullet points rather than putting any meat on the bones.

Topic 4: Greek Art and Architecture

Too few candidates attempted this topic on which to base a valid report.

There was a general improvement in candidates' understanding of the more technical terminology and processes relevant for the study of this topic.

Topic 5: Sparta and the Spartan System

Section One

- Q.1** Question One was attempted by most candidates and those who did attempt it tended to know their stuff. Again candidates should try to avoid repetition of information without further elaboration or discussion. This occurred in parts (c) and (e). The outsider's view of Spartan women, as required in (d) now seems better understood by candidates.
- Q.2** Question Two was done by virtually all candidates and with a great deal of success. Candidates finally got their chance to catalogue the horrid ways in which the Helots were treated and most, in (c), understood the type of life that the Spartan man lived although a few diverted the question onto his pasta and talked about the *Agoge*, which was not valid.
- Q.3** In Question Three candidates scored well and knowledge on this area of the topic is noticeably more thorough than in previous years. In fact this topic, which used to be a minority topic, is now being attempted by a large percentage of the candidate entry and the standard of answers is generally very good.

Section Two

Not surprisingly Essay One proved the most popular and candidates tended to score well because they were comfortable in elaborating on the bullet points.

Essay Two was less well done largely due to the fact that there were significant gaps in knowledge and understanding of exactly what each section of the government was responsible for. Answers to this question tended to be very good or very poor.

Principal Moderator's Report

1941/05: Coursework

General Comments

The coursework submitted this year, as in previous years, was generally of a high standard. It demonstrates in varying degrees the following outcomes.

- Considerable knowledge of the ancient world.
- Understanding the sources from which that knowledge is derived.
- Evaluating and responding to the evidence.
- The skills needed for delivering the coursework:
 - engaging with primary source material (textual, visual and/or archaeological) and secondary source material;
 - selecting facts relevant to the title;
 - commenting on and drawing conclusions from the material;
 - organising the material into a coherent whole;
 - learning to acknowledge sources through referencing and supplying a bibliography.

Almost all candidates showed evidence of all of these outcomes, and all candidates showed some evidence of most of them.

New Specification

This year a new Specification came into force. The main change is that the length of coursework is reduced from 3000 words to 2000 (Type A) 1000 + 1000 words (Type B). Oral coursework is no longer an option. This is also the first year when the Markscheme has been used by Centres as well as Moderators (see further below under 'Marking').

Choice of Title and Selection of Material

On the whole titles are well chosen to result in focused, well-organised work that gives scope for the use of primary source material, selection of content and understanding and evaluation. Entertainment, (especially gladiators) remains a popular choice of topic, along with the army and women, but excellent work has also been submitted on, for example, aspects of religion, housing, the theatre and the water system. There were some good empathy pieces, mostly well referenced in the text or in footnotes, and while marks are not awarded for the quality of the creative writing, these pieces are often entertaining as well as scoring highly on the criteria. It is clear that some candidates are pursuing their own interests with enthusiasm. This is obviously to be encouraged, and it is usually possible to find ways of accommodating candidates' interests within the Specification, but if Centres are in doubt they should consult OCR.

A few Centres continue to overlook the requirement that coursework must have a Roman Life (or Greek Life) element, and if based on the prescribed literature it must not overlap with the assessment of the literature in the written papers. Nor should work on Pliny's account of the eruption of Vesuvius focus exclusively on the details of the eruption on the one hand or on the movements of Pliny or his uncle on the other. Literary coursework remains problematic, as there is little literature that yields substantial evidence for Roman (Greek) life that can be analysed independently of its literary conventions and without diminishing its impact as literature. Centres contemplating literary coursework are strongly recommended to consult OCR on the choice of title.

There are still some very broad titles that indicate the topic, but not a selected aspect of the topic, for example, 'Slavery', 'Roman women', 'The Roman army'. This kind of title is becoming less frequent, and it is to be hoped that the lower word-limit will provide further encouragement to Centres to narrow the scope and teach their candidates to select material for a particular purpose. Candidates working on any title should be encouraged to be selective: for example, a candidate writing on reasons for the popularity of gladiatorial contests who refers to a book or

website that lists the different kinds of gladiators and then selects one or two to consider in detail should gain at least as many marks as the candidate who reproduces the entire list.

In general, Centres are reminded that they are not obliged to get candidates' titles approved, but they are free to seek advice from OCR on any titles, as well as in the particular cases mentioned above. Advice received should be read in conjunction with the Specification and the published guidance, and Centres should enclose the advice they have received with coursework sent for moderation.

Factual Content (AC1 12 marks) and Use of Primary Source Material (AC2 8 marks)

These two criteria are connected and will therefore be discussed together. The discriminators in the Markscheme for assessing AC1 are:

- selection of facts relevant to title
- evidence of research
- extent of error or omission
- references.

The discriminators for AC2 are:

- facts derived from primary source material
- identification of sources as primary and referenced
- primary source material integrated into text.

It is therefore clear from the Markscheme that the priority is to derive factual content from primary source material, indicated as such, which should not be used merely to illustrate facts drawn from secondary sources. This priority reflects the skills of reading with comprehension and understanding the sources of our knowledge of the ancient world that are inherent in the study of Latin (and Greek) and thus ensures that the coursework option is in line with the objectives of the examination overall. The reasons for the emphasis on referencing are first, that candidates should appreciate the sources of their information, second, that they should acquire skills regularly needed in the workplace, and third, that they should avoid laying themselves open to plagiarism. A bibliography is not sufficient on its own: references should be provided in the text, with direct quotes indicated by quotation marks. See further below on 'AC3 Organisation' and 'Suspected malpractice'.

The coursework submitted demonstrates that practically all candidates understand what a primary source is. In a very few Centres there is some confusion about what can be credited as primary: reconstructions or modern demonstrations of military tactics can be credited under factual content, but do not count as primary source material. Nor does the use of Latin terms in itself indicate the use of primary source material. Conversely, Centres can encourage their candidates to be confident in the knowledge they acquire from their 'reading' of visual as well as written primary source material, and apparently simple observations should not be discounted: for example, 'This picture of a mosaic from Rome tells me that there were different kinds of gladiator with different weapons. The one on the left ...' etc.

In an entry that is generally of a high standard, there is naturally differentiation between candidates, especially on these criteria. Some candidates produce work of a very high standard on the principle of starting from primary source material: the sources of their factual content are primary and well referenced, and secondary sources are used appropriately to reinforce a point or provide a wider context. In outstanding pieces of coursework, candidates do not only reference their sources but add notes explaining exactly what they have learned from a source, or, in the case of empathy pieces, how they have used the information in their work. On the other hand, some candidates do not use enough primary source material, or use it purely as illustration. Others do not include references to indicate where they have derived factual content from primary source material, so that it cannot be credited as such. However, teachers' comments suggest that candidates are increasingly guided in the direction of greater use of integrated primary source material, and that this skill is regarded as a valuable and important aspect of coursework.

AC3 Organisation (4 marks)

Most work shows signs of being planned with paragraphs and a conclusion, and many pieces have an introduction setting out what the scope of the work is to be. Most candidates include a bibliography, but they do not always include all the websites they have used, laying themselves open to suspicion of malpractice (see further below).

Length continues to be a problem, and particularly so this year when the word limit is reduced to 2000 words. Notice was given of the change in 2005 and full details are in the revised specification distributed to Centres in hard copy in 2005, yet a number of Centres were taken by surprise. Teachers are reminded that Centres must use the current specification. Marks have not been deducted this year specifically for length and in general excessive length is one factor among several that are included in this Assessment Criterion, such as structure and relation of structure to title (see the Markscheme). However, submitting work that is overlength breaks the coursework regulations and Centres are advised that in 2008 any piece of work that is more than 5% overlength will be submitted to the Malpractice Team for further action. This action will be required by moderators of all subjects, not just Latin and Greek.

AC4 Understanding and Evaluation (14 marks)

Candidates generally score well on this criterion, and there are no longer Centres that believe that the assessment of Understanding and Evaluation is restricted to the conclusion. Most candidates include some kind of comment or reason for their section of material, and the best candidates reveal their understanding also by recognising the bias of some authors or the incompleteness of our evidence for certain aspects of the ancient world (for example, the lack of information about women produced by women). Modern comparison is often well used, and as last year, there were few cases where the modern element was out of proportion to the ancient one. In general modern comparison is more effective when it emerges from the context than when it is included in the title and can acquire excessive prominence.

A few candidates scored highly on this criterion through describing practical work they had undertaken. While this can be a good approach for the enthusiast with the necessary time and skills, such work should not be regarded as indispensable: it is very labour-intensive, and marks cannot be awarded for the quality of the artefact, only for the sources and factual content it is based on and observations that form evidence of understanding and evaluation.

As in previous years, many candidates who submitted empathy pieces scored well on this criterion. Again, marks are not awarded for the standard of creative writing (often very high) but for the factual content and use of primary source material (generally well integrated and clearly referenced out in notes, as indicated above on AC1 and 2), as the basis for their understanding and evaluation.

Quality of Written Communication (2 marks)

Almost all candidates scored the two marks available for this criterion which is common to coursework in all subjects. A few Centres tended to mark candidates down for slight lapses, which should not be penalised given the small allocation of marks for this criterion.

Oral Coursework

The oral coursework option, taken by very few candidates, has been withdrawn under the new specification.

Marking

The marking of the coursework is of a high standard. The teachers' comments are a valuable and much-appreciated part of the process of moderation, and are evidence for marking that is thorough, consistent and an accurate reflection of the criteria often internally moderated. The comments also show that Centres are using the new Markscheme which is encouraging and it is to be hoped that the Markscheme will be a contribution to the principles and priorities that make coursework a distinctive form of assessment. The marking of very few Centres required adjustment, and comments in the individual Centre reports indicate where marking could be brought more into line with the criteria and Markscheme.

The two criteria on which the marking is most frequently over generous are AC1 and AC2. In the case of AC1, a lot of factual content is not sufficient on its own to gain the highest marks without fulfilling the other aspects of the criterion, such as the need for referencing. Similarly, on AC2, illustrations and allusions to primary source material are not sufficient on their own to score high marks: marks should be awarded according to how far the primary source material has been integrated as a source of factual content. See the summary above in the sections on AC1 and AC2, and the Markscheme setting out bands of marks as guidance.

Suspected malpractice

The problem of plagiarism in coursework continues to have a high profile. The importance of the Centre Authentication Form reflects the Centre's responsibility to supervise coursework effectively and minimise opportunities for malpractice.

Good practice at all stages is the best defence.

- Coursework titles should be directed towards tasks that are manageable and focused.
- Candidates should have confidence in their own research and skills.
- Centres *must* ensure candidates understand what constitutes cheating: copying sections from websites and books without indicating direct quotes, acknowledging their sources or including *all* sources of material, both primary and secondary, in their bibliography.
- Candidates whom the Centre suspects of copying should be challenged **by the Centre**, not simply flagged up in comments on work submitted for moderation.

Suspect work that reaches the Moderator has to be reported for suspected malpractice. For more guidance on avoiding and recognising malpractice, see the coursework guidance for Centres posted on the Latin and Classical Greek pages of the OCR website.

Centres should be aware that if they give their candidates excessive guidance ('scaffolding'), resulting in 'cloned' coursework, this is also malpractice. Guidance given by the majority of Centres appears to support candidates but also allows them scope to do their own work, but Centres should be aware of the dangers of guidance that is too detailed or prescriptive, thereby reducing the natural differentiation in outcome.

Administration

Centres co-operate with the procedures for administering coursework and the paperwork involved. Including the correct documents, properly filled in, and following the instructions for sending coursework make an invaluable contribution to the smooth running of the process. **Centres are reminded that private candidates are *not* allowed to submit coursework. A "private candidate" is one who has entered for a qualification through a centre without attending a course of study provided by that centre. Additionally, the Latin and Classical Greek specifications state 'internally assessed work should be completed during the course of normal curriculum time' p.25.**

Conclusion

The shorter word-limit has not had a major effect on the scope of the coursework submitted, but is perhaps an incentive to be selective and concise. As in previous years, the Moderators have been encouraged by the standard of the work submitted and the engagement with the Roman/Greek world it implies. They remain confident that coursework offers a rewarding and distinctive form of assessment that extends candidates' knowledge, develops their ability to handle and evaluate primary source material, and gives them the satisfaction of selecting and presenting content in a form they have chosen themselves. Keeping these objectives in view and encouraging candidates to take pride in achieving them through their own efforts can offer the most effective means of curbing malpractice.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Classical Greek 1941
June 2007 Assessment Session**

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
01 Paper 1	100	77	68	55	45	34	24	14	0
02 Paper 2	60	44	37	31	26	21	16	11	0
03 Paper 3	40	28	25	22	18	15	12	9	0
04 Paper 4	40	28	25	21	18	15	12	9	0
05 Coursework	40	32	28	24	20	16	12	8	0

Syllabus Options

Option A (01, 02, 03)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	149	128	108	89	70	52	34	0
Cumulative percentage in Grade		67.2	86.8	95.4	98.3	99.2	99.9	100	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 928.

Option B (01, 02, 04)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	149	128	107	88	70	52	34	0
Cumulative percentage in Grade		39.5	71.1	84.9	89.5	92.8	97.4	99.3	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 155.

Option C (01, 02, 05)	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall Threshold Marks	200	175	153	131	110	90	71	52	33	0
Cumulative percentage in Grade		42.6	70.4	88.0	93.5	97.2	98.1	100	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 108.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	61.4	83.2	93.4	96.7	98.2	99.4	99.9	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 1191.

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2007

