CLASSICAL GREEK

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 11	12 – 24	25 – 36	37 – 51	52 – 64	65 – 79	80 - 100

All five candidates performed well, some very well indeed and one was very good.

Higher level paper 1

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 –10	11 – 18	19 – 25	26 – 33	34 - 40

One candidate performed very well indeed on the translation whereas the other four were variously disappointing. There was in many a failure to understand the general context in spite of the help afforded by the title and the translations of the lead in and continuation provided. The second half of the translation section was better answered than the first; most errors occurred when candidates refused to be guided by accidence and syntax which, on the evidence provided elsewhere, they were perfectly familiar with.

Higher level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 5	6 – 10	11 – 15	16 – 20	21 – 24	25 – 29	30 - 40

All five of the candidates performed well on this paper, four very well indeed. There were no common errors, between them, they could have provided an almost perfect response.

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 11	12 – 13	14 – 15	16 – 17	18 - 20

This was a very encouraging session. Although Option A was by far the most popular, all three Options were attempted by at least one candidate.

In the case of Option A, where candidates understood that they were asked to produce a 'research dossier' they performed well. Those who thought that what was sought was merely a conventional essay by another name fared much less well.

The ideal response started with a research topic, a question (explicit or clearly implicit) which required an answer.

The statement of the question should be followed by a brief discussion on what evidence was available, and how best to use it with, if appropriate, some indication of its reliability.

Next should come examples of evidence, each example followed by a brief account of what contribution the evidence makes to answering the question.

Candidates chafe at the word limit, but that is part of the exercise. The candidate is not expected to solve the problem, only to explain how best a solution would be arrived at. Depending on the nature of the question and the evidence available, the candidate's opinion may become obvious but that is an outcome which candidate's should seek neither to achieve nor to avoid.

Option B is very difficult to do well unless the candidate is fearless in front of the microphone. On the other hand, for the right candidate, it can be very rewarding. The technical analysis and the performance itself will teach candidates so much about why classical literature still maintains its appeal.

Option C should be attempted only by candidates with a secure knowledge of syntax and accidence and, in the case of aspirants to verse composition, quantity and metre. It was gratifying to encounter candidates who could indeed take full advantage of this very attractive option; it was sad to see other candidates whose ignorance of the basic technical requirements was cruelly exposed by their submission.