

## 2025 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	Latin
<b>Level:</b>	2
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91194, 91195

### General commentary

These achievement standards involve translating adapted Latin text of medium complexity into English, demonstrating understanding; and interpreting adapted Latin text of medium complexity, demonstrating understanding.

In general, responses indicated that candidates were well prepared. It is recommended that candidates read the introduction to the passages carefully to get the context before starting the translation and the interpretation of the text. Successful candidates used the vocabulary list to establish not only the meaning but also the part of speech and relevant information (such as declension, conjugation, and irregular formation) of words. When asked to provide Latin evidence in questions that require this, candidates need to restrict that evidence to only the relevant words, not the whole sentence. When asked for a translation of that evidence, it was pleasing to see that many candidates followed this instruction.

### Report on individual achievement standard(s)

#### **Achievement standard 91194: Translate adapted Latin text of medium complexity into English, demonstrating understanding**

##### Assessment

The assessment required candidates to translate a passage of adapted Latin text accurately into English. The passage of approximately 150 words was of narrative prose based on authentic Latin, adapted to conform to the requirements of Level 7. A glossary was provided and candidates were expected to display knowledge of Latin syntax and grammar up to and including Curriculum Level 7 in their translations.

##### Commentary

The passage had a strong narrative that almost every candidate followed. While the specific story was not necessarily known, the context of a myth involving Hercules was certainly familiar to many candidates. Almost all candidates completed the task, and time seemed to be sufficient for the task. Most candidates made good use of the vocabulary provided, although judgment by candidates is still needed when making choices from available alternatives. On the whole, most candidates handled the grammar of the paper well, but quite a few missed some finer points, such as pluperfect tenses and singular / plural number for nouns and adjectives. Candidates who annotated their own translations and provided alternatives in a variety of parenthetical styles did not enhance their answers. Reported speech was generally well handled, but a full clause rendition is expected at this level and this was often a grade boundary marker. Similarly for ablative absolutes, a translation with a clause is expected.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- translated straightforward tenses accurately, such as *traxit* as perfect tense
- correctly linked nouns and adjectives, such as *boum ... inclusorum*
- translated prepositional phrases, such as *prope Tiberum fluvium*, correctly
- recognised straightforward plurals and cases, such as *caudis*
- identified and translated ablative of time accurately, such as *prima luce*
- used the vocabulary list and so were not distracted by other similar words, such as translating *forte* as “by chance” rather than as a form of “brave”.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- identified *vadentem* as a present participle correctly
- identified *captus* as a past participle and translated it accordingly
- used the vocabulary booklet carefully to distinguish between similar words, such as *fero* and *ferox*
- translated most of the tenses correctly
- translated prolative infinitives such as *abigere* correctly
- translated pronouns in a variety of cases, such as *eorum*, correctly.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- identified the ablative absolute phrases, such as *illo superato*, and translated them with a clause
- recognised and translated indirect speech correctly and with a complete clause
- handled different tenses of infinitives with confidence, such as *inventurum esse future*
- translated the deponent verb *conatus est* actively
- translated *Herculem* as accusative in the clause *Herculem convertit*.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- confused *reficere* and *recrearet*
- did not recognise pluperfect tenses and translated them with by a perfect or imperfect tense
- did not link nouns and adjectives / participles consistently, such as *cibo gravatum vinoque*
- did not distinguish between *in + acc* and *in + abl*
- missed out phrases.

---

## Achievement standard 91195: Interpret adapted Latin text of medium complexity, demonstrating understanding

### Assessment

The assessment consisted of a narrative text of approximately 150 words divided into three paragraphs with five questions attached to each paragraph. Candidates were expected to interpret in detail the content and grammar of the passage. The passage was based on an authentic Latin text adapted to conform to the requirements of Level 7 of the Latin curriculum. A glossary was provided.

### Commentary

Overall, candidates followed the general narrative of the passage. Some of the finer details (such as how the letter, the strap and the spear were related) proved challenging. Almost all candidates responded to all parts of the questions. Some candidates did not read the specific details of the

questions, especially when Latin phrases AND their translation were asked for. On some occasions, candidates did not give all the information that was required for a detailed answer, omitting things like “a certain” in Question One (b). Distinguishing between singular and plural nouns often became a discriminator between Merit and Excellence responses, which was surprising. When responding to questions, some candidates altered the voice of the verb; this made it difficult to gain maximum credit at times. Candidates often gave very lengthy quotations in Latin, rather than focusing on the key phrase needed to give a response to the question – this was particularly the case in Question One (a), where only a two-word phrase was required. The error in Question Two (d) was regrettable, but almost all candidates coped with this, and there were processes in place to ensure that those who did not, were not disadvantaged in any way. The grammar questions remained a good test even for the top candidates.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- answered most parts of many questions
- showed understanding of the narrative in general
- gave Latin evidence and a translation when required, such as in Question One (a)
- showed understanding by identifying some of the grammatical features asked for, such as realising that the mood was subjunctive in Question Three (e), even if they did not recognise the tense and reason for the mood
- identified ablative of point of time, *tertio die* in Question Two (c), correctly.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- showed a sound knowledge of grammatical forms so that they could identify them fully and also explained why a particular structure was being used
- gave only the Latin evidence asked for and did not quote unnecessary words, such as *magnis itineribus* in Question One (a)
- ensured that adjective + noun groups were accurately translated, such as *hanc conscriptam*
- included all adverbs, such as in Question One (c), where *facile* “easily” was included in the response
- rendered reported speech in a natural way in their response, such as in Question Three (d).

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- answered all parts of all questions, providing full details when required
- showed an excellent knowledge of grammar and syntax, often getting all the (e) parts of the questions correct
- exercised care with singular and plural forms, especially neuter plural forms such as *consilia*
- kept responses in the same voice as the passage, such as responding to Question Two (b) by keeping *nostrī ... animadverterunt* as active
- made good choices from the vocabulary list where there were options given, for example recognising how to translate forms of *se* according to grammatical rules.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not make full use of the vocabulary list
- often omitted simple words such as *facile* or *omnem*
- did not appear to understand the basic narrative of the passage
- in the grammar questions did not understand the technical terms such as ‘mood’ or how to give a grammatical reason.