



GCE

Classical Greek

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H044**

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice for future examinations

It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification 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.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on [Interchange](#).

Further support from OCR

activeresults

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

CONTENTS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Classical Greek (H044)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
H044/01 Language	4
H044/02 Literature	6

H044/01 Language

General Comments:

Overall, the standard of responses was again varied, with the best candidates performing very well while weaker candidates were thrown by the language being tested in the paper. Candidates should be prepared to distinguish between similar forms.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

- 1(i) This was done well by only the better candidates. Candidates were thrown by the participle phrase and the relative pronoun, as well as *μεν...δε* which was surprising at this level. *πολλα* caused issues for too many candidates given how common a form it is.
- 1(ii) Candidates who did not recognise the question and could not translate *ποιαι* struggled. Centres are encouraged to ensure that candidates know and employ the meanings on the vocabulary list rigorously. Too many candidates did not recognise the plurals in ‘supplications’ and ‘reminders’.
- 1(iii) This was done better than (ii) – perhaps helped by a repeated error in several cases.
- 1(iv) Done well by lots of candidates, but candidates needed to know the phrase *το λοιπον*. Centres are reminded that candidates should know all meanings on the vocabulary list.
- 1(v) The tense of *ῶκτειρεν* threw most candidates. Candidates were not penalised for ‘which god’ rather than ‘which of the gods’ however the former is not what the Greek says and candidates are encouraged to look at the cases of nouns and pronouns carefully to avoid such errors in the future.
- 1(vi) Again, the tenses of the verbs caused problems – certainly one for centres to train their candidates on.
- 1(vii) The phrase *πολυ πλειστον* caused issues for almost all candidates.
- 1(viii) This was generally done well by all but the weakest candidates.
- 1(ix) This section, however, threw candidates who did not render the participle *οντας* well. *πληθει* also caused problems for many. *εδειξαν* was confused with the verb *δοκει* by some candidates.
- 1(x) This was done reasonably by many candidates.
- 1(xi) However, *κρατουμένων* threw candidates who did not recognise the passive form.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Question 2

- 2(a) Generally done ok, but candidates are encouraged to spot the superlative.
- 2(b) Most candidates knew what was happening here but some confusion started creeping in.
- 2(c) Few candidates struggled with (i) and (ii).
- 2(d) Most candidates understood the idea of giving chase immediately, but learning 'by smell' caused issues for some. Candidates often gained marks because they showed some understanding of this process.
- 2(e) The first part of the question was done well but (ii) was problematic for the majority of candidates who did not understand what was going on – candidates can be expected to show this level of comprehension in an AS Level comprehension – this is not GCSE.
- 2(f) Several candidates thought they were better at running!
- 2(g) Marks here were often gained for potted bits of the answer rather than an understanding of what was going on.
- 2(h) This was not done very well – the idea of something being left behind was not understood.

Question 3

Those who did the English to Greek sentences often did very well – particularly those candidates who had been prepared for these and did not attempt the comprehension as well.

- 3(a) Generally done well, but some did not know the gender of τα ὄρη.
- 3(b) Again, good attempts at this question.
- 3(c) Some good attempts at the condition – clearly centres have prepared candidates well for this. Some did not know how to form adverbs or aorist passives.
- 3(d) Good attempts at the first half of this sentence, generally using a genitive absolute.
- 3(e) Several candidates did not know ἀκουω + gen or χραομαι + dative – centres are encouraged to ensure that candidates are familiar with cases taken by verbs.

H044/02 Literature

General Comments:

The standard of responses in this second year of the new specification was generally of very good, though there were some lower ability candidates, and centres should again be congratulated for preparing candidates so well for this exam. Candidates responded effectively to the format of the paper and prove themselves well able to deal with the range of question types across the four set texts. The majority of candidates organised their time appropriately in the examination and were able to deal with the challenges of the different options to good effect.

Most candidates dealt effectively with the translation question and secured very high marks. A very few candidates did not stop at the end of passage set for Question 4(b), though of course they were not penalised for continuing further. The longer analysis questions on all the set texts were generally answered to a very high standard, but this style of question certainly presents a challenge to those candidates with a less secure grasp of the meaning of the Greek. As is often the case, many candidates were more comfortable writing about the verse authors, and found it more difficult to find things to say about Thucydides and Plato. There were, however, many very good answers to these challenging questions. The strongest candidates usually set out their work very clearly in paragraphs, so that examiners were left in no doubt how the candidate was trying to address the question. Some weaker responses required examiners to decide for the candidate what the different points were, and some candidates appeared to offer the same Greek text to make what seemed the same point. In a small number of cases, it was quite difficult to read the Greek text that candidates included in their answers; it is worth reminding candidates that examiners might reasonably expect to be able to recognise the material taken from the passage on the paper. There were also some, generally less strong responses, where the focus was on a single word, and this generally was less effective for making a coherent point.

A more problematic area again was the context question. These proved more straightforward in some sections and more challenging in others, and some time was taken during the standardisation process to ensure that all candidates had access to the full range of marks for these.

The essay questions once again produced a range of responses. There were some outstanding answers, which demonstrated a thorough grasp of the texts studied. Nearly all candidates were able to draw on the set material in some detail, but there was again less certainty in their grasp of wider reading. Some texts perhaps made this rather easier than others: many of those who studied the *Odyssey* were able to develop Odysseus's back story to good effect to support their discussion of Odysseus' adventures, but this proved more difficult to do for other texts such as the *Antigone*. Some candidates made very clear where they were drawing on material outside the set text to ensure that this was not missed by the examiners; the examiners were grateful for this. This is certainly an area where teachers will want to consider carefully how best to prepare their candidates. At this level, it would certainly seem a good idea to look at those areas of the set text prescribed for the full A-level, though examiners were certainly prepared to reward a candidate who drew on, for example, the choruses from the *Antigone*.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1(a)

This question was generally answered well, though some candidates treated it as relating to the Greek text printed.

Question 1(b)

This was generally answered effectively, though there were some candidates who referred to single words or betrayed uncertainty over the meaning of the text. There was also some confusion over the precise situation so it was not always easy to see what was being argued.

Question 1(c)

This question was generally well done.

Question 1(d)

This translation was generally handled very well, though the meaning of ἀπαίροντες was not always clearly conveyed, and not everyone translated the κατα- in καταπλέοντες.

Question 1(e)

Generally well done.

Question 1(f)

Many candidates selected good examples from the Greek and used them effectively to highlight the dramatic nature of events. However there were also answers that struggled to select relevant Greek text, or who, when they had selected potentially good examples, revealed by what was written some significant misunderstandings of the text. Most commented on the unexpected nature of fighting on both sides, and there were some good discussions of ὑπὸ προθυμίας καὶ ἐκπλήξεως.

Question 1(g)

There were some excellent essays on Thucydides, though relatively few took the opportunity to develop the discussion of selected details in some depth. Many candidates were able to make effective use of the set text to highlight differences between Athens and Sparta. More perhaps could also have been made of the debate in Athens, and here again there were opportunities to go beyond the set text, which some candidates took. Some candidates made effective use of the passages on the paper to help develop elements of their answer.

Question 2(a)

This translation question was generally done very effectively. Common errors included the tense of διέβαλλον and also the failure to recognise ταῦτα in ταῦτα ταῦτα.

Question 2(b)

Generally well answered, though few candidates mentioned Aristophanes.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Question 2(c)

Most answers found a good range of points here, though there were some who made limited, or almost no, use of the Greek text, and some phrases were misunderstood (eg μή πως ἔγώ ὑπὸ Μελήτου τοσαύτας δίκας φεύγοιμι).

Question 2(d)

This context question was generally found quite challenging.

Question 2(e)

Generally well done.

Question 2(f)

Generally well done, though some candidates selected Greek, which they were then not able to use convincingly to make a relevant point.

Question 2(g)

The essays proved generally pretty effective, though some candidates were not very clear about what they understood a ‘master of rhetoric’ to be. Most were able to comment effectively on the way Socrates dealt with the jury, and there were some good discussion of his opening remarks. The best answers were able to use the result of the case to good effect, but it was perhaps surprising that fewer focused on the relationship between rhetoric and the sophists as part of their response. In particular, there were opportunities to assess Socrates’ response to the charges brought against him, but not all candidates seemed to be aware of these.

Question 3(a)

This context question was very well done.

Question 3(b)

Candidates in general seem to deal effectively with this question. Most were able to select relevant material from the passage and then relate it to Odysseus’ character.

Question 3(c)

Generally done well.

Question 3(d)

Generally done well. A few candidates translated the passage, rather than focusing on what Circe has just said.

Question 3(e)

Generally well done.

Question 3(f)

This was generally answered very effectively. Most candidates were well aware of what was happening here and could select relevant examples for discussion. There were some excellent analyses of Circe’s behaviour and agitated questions addressed to Odysseus.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Question 3(g)

This translation was generally done very effectively, though there were some words omitted and uncertainty over some phrases (eg μιγέντε εύνῃ καὶ φιλότητι).

Question 3(h)

There were some very successful essays. This was, perhaps, a more predictable essay, and many candidates seem well-prepared to make effective use of the set text, and even go beyond it. There were some very well organised answers that ranged over the set material, and candidates were able to select relevant detail with a sure touch. Candidates managed to pick out a range of features that could be used to address 'vivid and exciting', and seemed generally to relish drawing on the story to support their argument.

Question 4(a)

This was generally answered effectively.

Question 4(b)

This proved quite a challenging translation question for some, but it was generally well done. Some candidates stumbled over δρᾶν ἔφυν ἀμήχανος. Some words were omitted, and a few candidates continued beyond μὴ 'μοῦ προτάρβει: they were not penalised for this.

Question 4(c)

This was generally answered effectively. Candidates were aware of the complex interaction between the two sisters here, and were able to select examples that supported the discussion of character.

Question 4(d)

This was generally well done.

Question 4(e)

This proved a more challenging context question, as some candidates were not at all clear about what happened after this.

Question 4(f)

This question was usually answered well and candidates were well able to convey how Antigone's language underscores her response to Creon's actions and words.

Question 4(g)

This was generally well done.

Question 4(h)

Most answered this effectively, though there was sometimes confusion over who ὁ καθανῶν νέκυς was.

Question 4(i)

This question was allowed candidates to select specific characters for detailed discussion. Most spent time on Ismene and Creon; there were also some interesting discussions centred on Polyneices. There were also good points made about Haemon and Antigone's apparent

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

indifference through most of the play, and this allowed candidates straightforwardly to bring in material from outside the set text. Overall, candidates rose to the challenge and there were some very stimulating essays.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)

The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2018

