

# **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2008**

**3863/7863/MS/R/08**

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 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### AS GCE/Advanced GCE SPANISH – 3863/7863

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
2671:	Spanish: Speaking	1
2672:	Spanish: Listening, Reading & Writing 1	4
2673:	Spanish: Reading and Writing	8
2674:	Spanish: Speaking and Reading	11
2675:	Spanish: Listening, Reading & Writing 2	14
2676:	Spanish: Culture and Society (Written Paper)	18
2677:	Spanish: Culture and Society (Coursework)	22
	Grade Thresholds	23

## 2671: Spanish: Speaking

### General Comments

The majority of Centres are now well accustomed to the demands of this part of the Specification and relatively few problems were encountered with the actual conduct of the tests. Examiners would like to remind Centres to complete topic forms and working mark sheets for each candidate, rewind tapes to the beginning and check the recording quality of tapes/CDs. Tests should be dispatched immediately after they have been taken. On the whole, the process generally went smoothly and we thank colleagues in Centres for their co-operation and professionalism.

The role plays were well exploited by most teachers and candidates and all of them provided opportunities across the ability range. It was pleasing to find that points made in previous reports and in INSET sessions were filtering through to those conducting the tests and it was noticeable that Teacher/Examiners were taking increasing care to ensure that the role plays became a real dialogue rather than just a comprehension test. The more open general questions produced some good responses, though there were occasions when too much time was spent on these at the expense of covering the targeted information on the stimulus sheets. As always, there is the need to allow candidates the opportunity to tackle a range of question types, language and content, yet within a strictly controlled time limit – no easy task.

The topic section produced some interesting material. Alongside the traditional choices, many candidates prepared highly individual presentations and conveyed information on topics from the Hispanic world that were of particular interest to them. There were hardly any examples of topic choices that did not meet the “Hispanic” requirement, though naturally the depth and complexity of treatment varied.

Nearly all candidates had enough material to deliver their introductory presentation, though in a few cases, mainly in Centres with external or occasional entries for this test, candidates used their presentation to list what they were going to discuss rather than actually conveying relevant information under Assessment Objective 4 (mark grid 1D).

The main criticism of performance in the topic discussion was over-rehearsal and the tendency in some Centres to ask a series of well-prepared set questions and answers. Teacher/Examiners must of course follow the outline given by the candidate’s sub headings on the topic form, but these should be used as a framework for discussion. There were cases of Centres where all candidates offered the same topic, were asked similar questions throughout and in the same order. It should be remembered that the discussion should be just that: candidates who were allowed to give four or five mini-presentations on possibly unrelated elements could not score highly for spontaneity and fluency under mark grid 1E. Similarly, questions of a closed nature, although valuable in obtaining relevant information, did not permit candidates sufficient scope in the range of language and register.

Quality of language was very mixed. As previously, weaknesses were found in basic accuracy and limitations were found in the use and production of structures beyond GCSE level. More able candidates used a wide range of structures and subject-specific vocabulary with confidence, though even the highest-scoring candidates were not immune from slips with agreements and such old knotty problems *ser / estar* and *gustar*.

The standard of pronunciation was little different from that in previous sessions. Basic sounds were generally quite reasonable, with few examples of really poor pronunciation among candidates; authentic intonation, however, continues to be an area where improvement is needed.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Role Plays

Candidates had difficulty when asking the opening questions to establish the context and the needs of the client / examiner. The wording on the candidate's form generally requires some manipulation to produce a natural question. Many candidates unfortunately were tempted to use the phrases given, frequently without a verb, or they started with an unidiomatic or syntactically inaccurate question word. For example, *¿Qué la edad de los niños?*; *¿Por qué es la razón de su visita?* (role play A), *¿Qué detalles del grupo?* (role play B), *¿Qué (es) la manera normal de pagar las cuentas?* (role play C). Clearly, further practice in forming questions with the basic question words would be useful, not just for the opening of the exercise, but also to help the following conversation develop as a true role play. Simple questions would suffice, such as *¿Cuántos años...?*; *¿Cuántas personas... ?* *¿Cómo paga usted .....?*

Much of the key vocabulary is given in the information on the candidate's sheet. Surprising was the number of candidates who either did not know some basic vocabulary items, or who did not spot these when preparing the stimulus materials. In role play A, for example, "balloon" and "orange" sometimes caused difficulty, even though these words were given. Some candidates managed *globo*, but then described it as *amarillo* or *rojo*. In role play C, very many candidates appeared not to know "post office" or "stamp" – surely GCSE items – even though these too were given as a reminder in the *Situación* and *Tarea*.

Numbers as always provided a challenge, even for some otherwise good candidates. The main stumbling block appeared to be in role play B, where "junction 13 (of the M4)" was sometimes rendered by various combinations of *"junción tres / trece / treinta* and, occasionally, *diecitrés*". Most candidates coped with the "5" in role play C, but the accompanying "pounds" was subject to variations of *libres / libros / libras*.

Role play A was concerned with giving advice on keeping children safe in crowded areas and providing details of the orange balloon scheme. Most candidates conveyed the essential ideas, but sometimes confusion arose about whether it was the adult or the child who had to follow certain pieces of advice, eg carry a photograph, learn their telephone number etc.

Much of the stimulus passage contained instructions, and hence commands. Many candidates had linguistic difficulty, for example, in conveying the idea "tell children to stay close to you" – those who tried to translate this literally became tied up with the use of commands, subjunctives and personal pronouns. The vast majority of candidates, even those who gave otherwise good performances, were unable to use the correct disjunctive pronoun: *cerca (de / a) tú* was the most usual rendering. Indeed candidates should be reminded that attempts to translate the material literally rather than trying to paraphrase and convey the underlying advice are frequently a path to linguistic disaster, though a number of candidates realised this and had the good sense to bring in constructions such as *es necesario / mejor / debe*, etc with an infinitive. *Perder* and *pedir* were sometimes confused.

Content differentiators included the advice not to leave a child in an unsupervised play area (missed by many candidates), or for a child who is lost to ask another parent with a child to ring for help. Prompting was frequently needed to elicit the information on how to recognise a shop assistant.

Vocabulary items used in better performances were *escaparate* for *ventana* (the most usual rendering) and any way of expressing till or counter. Surprisingly, *dependiente / dependienta* was rarely offered.

The more general questions, for example, about places likely to be dangerous and the candidate's views on different types of shops, were handled quite well. Candidates had

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

obviously thought about their answers during the preparation time and frequently came up with some creditable ideas.

Role play B was for the most part handled well – gratifyingly so, since in the past the “day out” type of context has sometimes lacked real development. The idea of a visit to an artificial rainforest seemed to grab candidates’ imagination and the bulk of the essential content was generally clearly transmitted. There were some items that tended to be overlooked, however. The examiner’s response to the candidate’s initial questions gave the information that the visitors were a group of students, yet few candidates really brought out the availability of arrangements for group and school tours, or the flexibility for day or evening visits, though many candidates mentioned that the site was accessible in a wheelchair.

The candidate was also told that the party was travelling by coach: only a few candidates capitalised on this to mention the free parking and that coaches were welcome. Most candidates made some reference to the shopping and catering facilities, though most overlooked the possibility of taking a picnic. Comparatively few mentioned the fact that the experience offered the “sights, sounds and smells” of a rainforest.

There were no particular vocabulary items that caused general difficulty, except, however, for the opening times. Very few candidates indeed were confident in the correct use of *por / de la mañana / tarde*, and numbers were sometimes inaccurately given.

The more open questions were tackled enthusiastically and many candidates were able to make helpful suggestions as to how to organise an enjoyable visit for everyone.

Role play C dealt with savings through the Post Office. Candidates who had used their preparation time wisely had little difficulty in describing the outline of the scheme, though some important points of detail were lost, or were only partially conveyed. Many of the problems encountered were due to lack of basic vocabulary, eg “stamp, pay for, flowers, gifts”; *cartas* was commonly used for “cards”; “groceries” was not infrequently *groserías* and many candidates coined words like *insurancia* and *colectar*. Again, several errors could have been avoided had candidates noted the key items of vocabulary given in their sheet.

Most candidates were able to give examples of things for which the savings stamps could be exchanged, though some gave misleading information, such as the need to buy the stamps at the same rather than any post office.

The more open questions were handled reasonably effectively, especially discussion on the merits of having local shops.

## 2672: Spanish: Listening, Reading & Writing 1

### General Comments

Candidates appeared to be well prepared for this paper, although in parts some candidates appeared to find it more demanding than in previous years. It provided a very wide spectrum of marks ranging from the maximum of 80, which was achieved by a number of candidates, to some scores of under 20, which suggested that these candidates were not quite ready for the demands of the AS exam. The paper permitted a clear differentiation to be made between candidates.

A small number of candidates were unable to finish, apparently because of the pressure of time. Although in a few cases the rest of the paper had been very promising, the general trend was that, where *Tarea 6* and/or *Tarea 7* were not attempted or were incomplete, the earlier tasks had been poorly done.

There was concern about the lack of basic knowledge and the quality of both the English and Spanish used by some candidates. One obvious problem was the very limited range of vocabulary of these candidates, an issue which became particularly evident in the later tasks of this paper. There were, in fact, some very difficult vocabulary problems to solve but many candidates did not seem conversant even with the vocabulary base required at GCSE level. Further, both in *Tarea 6* and *Tarea 7*, inadequate grasp of grammar meant that candidates' communication of tenses and persons was sometimes very weak.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Tarea 1

The text was accessible but candidates must pay close attention to what exactly is being said. It proved a good test and provided a wide range of marks. Very few candidates scored zero here and many were able to give 4 or 5 correct answers. Unusually for this exercise, there was no pattern to the correct/incorrect answers and no particular questions emerged as noticeably easy or difficult, apart perhaps from the most common errors being V for question c) and F for question e).

#### Tarea 2

This provided a similar scenario but was slightly better done than the first task. Most candidates were able to cope and achieve at least three out of the five marks available, with a reasonably high percentage achieving 4 or 5 marks. There was more of a pattern here, with alternatives a) and j) proving to be popular but incorrect answers.

#### Tarea 3

This task proved unexpectedly difficult but did provide a good test of understanding. The theme of a Spanish national's impressions of London was an interesting one but candidates had to concentrate hard on the spoken text and then pay close attention to the possible alternatives, where the distractors were very plausible. This factor may have had some adverse influence on candidates' allocation of time in the overall scheme.

This year, prepositions and prepositional phrases (*antes de*, *a poco de*, *según*, etc) provided a significant challenge, which could only be met by genuine understanding of both the phrases and the passage. Similarly, while the nouns were simple and everyday, the choice required

Careful listening. The task produced a good range of marks and the convincing distractors of 4C, 8T and 9Q were very popular, but incorrect, alternative answers.

#### Tarea 4

As with the previous task, this was a very demanding exercise, both in terms of the difficulty of the Spanish text and the plausibility of the distractors. Popular incorrect answers were O for Q1, K for Q5, J for Q7, I for Q9 and H for Q10. Again, a pattern was difficult to determine, with some candidates scoring well on the first half of the task and others doing better on the second.

#### Tarea 5

This proved to be a very demanding exercise. The questions requiring non-verbal answers appeared to give more problems than in previous years. Many candidates did not recognise that *anteayer* related to 2 days ago, that *entre el doce y el quince de febrero* encompassed four days and that *noventa y nueve euros más el siete por ciento de IVA* (where *IVA* was given in the question) would result in paying more than 99 euros.

For other individual questions:

- c) *exponer* was often seen as *es poner*, while there were a variety of spellings of *lanzar*, some of which were seen as acceptable (*lansar*), others not (*lancar*). Some candidates attempted to rephrase, a praiseworthy endeavour in itself, but with varying success.
- (d+e) *un formulario* caused difficulties, as did what you had to do with it – *mandar* in this question and *rellenar* in question e). The latter was rarely recognised (although many were able to use *llenar*) and was often given as *reinar* or *reunir*. Again, very few managed *mandárselo* correctly, even without an accent; obviously this is not easy, but was not beyond some candidates. At the same time, *mandar* here was often accompanied by *para atrás*, sometimes written as *patrás*.
- f) On the whole this was well done, even by candidates who had not succeeded in the previous few questions. Spellings of *superficie* were legion, suggesting that it was a word not well-known by many candidates, but lots were able to give an approximate transcription (*supeficie*, *superficia*) which it was felt would have been understood by a sympathetic native speaker.
- h) well done by most candidates
- i) *incluir sus detalles* often led to confusion and offerings such as *inclusos detalles* were reasonably common. In addition, *adicional* was often misheard as *oficial* or *tradicional*.
- j) This was well answered on the whole, with candidates recognising the need to *explicar más detalles*. Very few managed to spell *detalladamente* correctly, however.

Candidates' language in this task and Task 7 seemed slightly less competent than has been usual in recent years, and there were fewer examples where careful and idiomatic Spanish was a pleasure to read. Many papers showed a relative carelessness in their use of language, particularly with regard to use of accents, initial 'h', correct verb endings and accurate spelling. There also seems to be an increase in the number of candidates who hear the right sounds and understand them, yet do not reproduce them accurately.



## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

More than most languages, Spanish spelling is very phonetic, and candidates would do well to concentrate on learning the few simple rules that would enable them to transcribe correctly. Even among middle-scoring candidates, disregard for accuracy was sorely prevalent. *Detalle*, for example, was generally understood as an exact translation of 'detail'; yet it was all too often spelt as two words, *de talle*.

### Tarea 6

Despite specific difficulties throughout the text, most candidates were able to cope with the general demands of this task and produce an acceptable final version, although faultless renderings were few and far between.

The introductory "*El Salón*" created surprising difficulties and many candidates did not make the connection with the *feria*, so that responses such as "The front room was inaugurated over 25 years ago" were reasonably common. It was puzzling that candidates who subsequently referred to show or exhibition did not go back and change their original impression that it meant office, lounge or shop. Similarly, *miles de visitantes* often led directly to "miles of visitors". *Abarca* was seldom understood though often successfully avoided, although one candidate felt that the thousands of visitors had come "to get away from all the office equipment". There were guesses at what office equipment might consist of, with rugs and music getting a mention along with the less exotic desks and chairs. Surprisingly few candidates knew *techos*, which was often linked with "technology" and even those who recognised the word were tempted to use "roofs" as a solution, which was evidently inappropriate in the context. This need for flexibility was also illustrated later when *azafatas* was often given its usual meaning as "air hostesses", which again demanded a slight adjustment in this particular context.

In the middle section of the text, there was some confusion initially as to who was going to benefit from participation in the show, and what was to be done about it was understood only by a small minority. There were also problems with the following section and – while the need to obtain contacts and pay for publicity was well understood – it was often unclear who would have to pay. Candidates often felt that the phrase *tendrá que pagar* had an impersonal sense, along the lines of *hay que*, and therefore did not clearly identify that "you" would have to pay. This confusion could to some extent be attributable to a number of difficult vocabulary items (*rentable*, *subrayar*, *seguimiento*) but it was compounded by the fact that some candidates did not seem to know the abbreviation *Vd.*

In view of the company name 'Hill's Office Furniture', it was surprising that so many candidates did not recognise the word *muebles*. *Hará falta* was frequently mistranslated as 'there will be a lack'. Virtually all candidates correctly expressed the need to decorate the stand, but *letreros* and *seguros* respectively caused problems in the two final points.

In general, the quality of the language was good and candidates scored well on this section despite the problems posed by "necessary", "personnel", "interpreters" and "installation".

### Tarea 7

It was good to see that, in some respects, candidates appeared to be better prepared for this task than on previous occasions, and most were able to communicate the essentials of what was required. Only a handful directly translated the English instructions for the memo, ie translating "Thank Mrs Garcia for the information...", which has been a considerable problem in previous years, while the use of the *tú* form, a perennial complaint, is becoming less and less evident. The variety of the linguistic demands imposed by the English instructions gave candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to use Spanish in a general commercial context and to employ both basic and more complex language structures.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

It was initially disappointing to see that many are still unable to cope with what has become a standard introduction to this exercise, ie thanking someone for a letter, a phone call or for information that has been received. While a good number of candidates had been well prepared and were able to use *agradecer* in this context (even though the spelling or the exact phrasing were not always correct), the use of *gracias para* was all too common. Similarly, the use of *gustar*, which was needed on a couple of occasions, caused the usual problems. Alternative versions of *le gusta* included *él gustaría*, *me gusta* and *se gusta*. *Al señor Hill le gusta* was as rare as it was exciting to meet.

Verbs that required some thought about structure and phrasing also caused difficulties, for instance: “we are interested in” (where *somos interesantes en* was fairly common), “we are proposing” (which presented a hurdle for those who tried to translate it literally, although there were some good examples of a more flexible approach from some candidates who used such verb forms as *quisiéramos*, *esperamos* or *pensamos*) and “we would be grateful”.

Unexpectedly, *mes* seemed to cause problems for many, *mez* or *mesa* frequently being substituted.

Pronouns, once again, baffled many candidates – “you can show him” for example or “he will contact you”, which often became *va a contactar usted*, or *contactará su*.

On a more advanced linguistic level, the ability to handle *si* clauses accurately was limited. ‘If’ here was often followed by the present subjunctive or else the conditional – either the present indicative or the imperfect subjunctive would have fitted the sense. Similarly, the subjunctive forms introduced by *cuando* (which often produced a future verb in the French style) and *para que* were not known by most, although in the latter case there were some excellent versions when the subjunctive was used successfully or the phrase was turned round effectively. It was also surprising that the theme of hotel bookings should provide such a stumbling block with “booking”, “single room” and “from the fifth to the seventh” causing difficulties for many candidates, even though these are all standard GCSE terms and ideas. The more specific business language was generally well done although “sales manager” did cause difficulties.

The phrase “he speaks Spanish fluently” caused considerable consternation and whilst some were able to render this effectively, others had difficulty recalling the precise structure that was needed and produced ideas such as *habla español en soltera*, or *habla español con efluencia*. More practice in class with this sort of exercise to emphasise the types of problems that recur and the flexible approach that is necessary would reap significant rewards for most students. Finally, a plea for more accuracy with accents. As has already been noted, there is an increasing tendency for them to be neglected, but with some verb forms they are essential for understanding (*hablo*, *habló*, and, more pertinent in this context, *contactará*, *contactara*).

## 2673: Spanish: Reading and Writing

### General Comments

The examination proved to be a fair test, providing opportunities for candidates across the ability range to demonstrate their skills in comprehension and writing in Spanish. The time allocation seemed to be perfectly adequate to complete all four tasks; indeed, many candidates were able to produce an extra page or two in their answers to Task 3.

A good spread of marks was achieved, ranging from those who had not progressed beyond GCSE level to candidates who deservedly scored near maximum marks.

In the writing exercise there were pleasing indications that candidates had really thought about their use of language and were trying to incorporate extended structures as well as varied vocabulary. There was a more confident and natural use of genuinely advanced structures, particularly the subjunctive, which fitted the context and were not just forced in inappropriately. There appeared also to be an improvement in the ability to communicate ideas and opinions in Spanish, albeit with variable grammatical accuracy.

Candidates should be reminded of the importance of reading the rubrics of questions as this year many provided themselves with an unnecessary handicap, especially in Task 2.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Task 1

This was reasonably well done, although perhaps fewer candidates scored full marks this year. At the other extreme a few candidates scored zero. Questions (c), (f) and (g) attracted greater numbers of wrong answers.

#### Task 2

The rubric stated unequivocally that candidates were required to put a number in a box beside **eight** of the statements. **Ocho** was in bold capitals and was reinforced by the following sentence which advised care because three of the statements were false. Despite these warnings, a number of candidates penalised themselves unnecessarily by putting a number in all eleven boxes. Only the first eight numbers were marked.

The task itself was not as simple as it appeared at first sight. Although the subject matter would have undoubtedly been familiar to most candidates, some of the vocabulary, or its usage in short, staccato phrases, was perhaps not. The better scripts scored 5–8 marks on this task, although lower scores were more prevalent. Question (c) caused difficulties for many, whereas (i) and (j) proved to be the most accessible (provided that candidates had not excluded themselves from marking at this point by having already entered eight numbers).

### Task 3

As mentioned earlier, there were satisfying signs that performance is improving in this exercise which never let it be forgotten, carries half the total weighting of the examination. There were times, especially in the latter parts of answers, when the structures and the vocabulary seemed to flow quite naturally, rather than merely being part of a list that had been pre-memorised for use whatever the context.

The stimulus text, which seemed accessible to most, was an article comparing facts and figures, looking at trends and identifying areas or groups that are showing increases. It was not just a waffly piece about holidays on the beach. Candidates needed to recognise future tenses, and precise meanings of '*a mayoría*' *más de la mitad*, *más gente*, *umenta*, *casi un tercio* etc. It was sometimes disappointing to see potentially very good answers fail to score really high marks because candidates chose to summarise the main comprehension points, missing out on vital details which were essential to gain the point, eg *la gente que no quiere descansar en la playa va a un lago o una montaña*. Such a statement makes no mention of this holiday option being on the increase or the fact that 30% of those who choose it stay within the confines of the province of Madrid. The technique required to display comprehension in this exercise is one of precise paraphrase rather than more generalised precis.

In answering the second question the main pitfall to avoid was writing about the benefits of holidays in general. The intended focus was the necessity or otherwise for **long** holidays. Candidates who bore this in mind and did not curtail their ideas by sticking rigidly to 200 words, (only a 'recommended' limit, with no sanctions applied for exceeding it), came up with some very good arguments both for and against. In support of three or four weeks' holiday were claims that this length of time is necessary for families to bond together, is essential to relieve the year's stress, is good for local economies, is good for the health and, finally, if you've got the money, why not? Arguments against holidays of such a duration included: they were boring and led to family squabbles, the high cost, too much time in the sun was bad for the health, it was much better to take two or three shorter breaks in the year and it was harder to return to work or study after such a length of time.

Pleasing features of the quality of language have already been commented upon. However, there were also areas worthy of attention:

A worrying trend this year was the use of an infinitive instead of a tense, eg *mucha gente quedarse* or *los madrileños ir a la playa*.

Opportunities to show knowledge of the difference between *ser/estar aburrido* or *ser/estar seguro* were often not exploited.

*Gastar* is fast becoming the all-purpose word for 'spend', eg *gastar las vacaciones* or *es importante gastar tiempo con amigos*.

*Gente* caused all manner of problems with verbs in the plural, *las gente*, *las gentes*, *muchas gente* etc.

*Suelo* was often used as an adverb eg *prefiero suelo ir a la playa*.

The concept of 'holiday' and 'holidays' is quite clearly defined in English. The quest to find a Spanish singular form was unceasing and with every conceivable spelling permutation.

Renderings of 'stressful' and 'destination' attracted similar numbers of variations.

#### Task 4

As always, this is the opportunity for candidates to use their knowledge of grammar to boost their grade. The weighting for this exercise is one quarter of the total for the paper, which can significantly affect outcomes. Marks ranged from the maximum to three or four.

The most popular incorrect choices included:

- (1) *desde*
- (2) *al*
- (3) *gustamos*
- (8) either *aunque* or *todavía*
- (10) *bien*

Generally speaking, the last five questions were answered better than the first ten. Candidates should be advised that it is often a good idea to try and work out the meaning of the passage as a whole, rather than to consider each phrase in isolation.

## 2674: Spanish: Speaking and Reading

### General Comments

Once again this year examiners are delighted to be able to report that the vast majority of Centres conducted the A2 oral tests very well indeed. There was a pleasing abundance of evidence to suggest that Teacher/Examiners were comfortable with the inevitable pressures involved in getting their students through this test and that their preparation had been thorough. The professionalism of the teachers who step up to the mark in this positive manner is greatly appreciated by examiners and it necessarily provides opportunities for candidates to score more marks. It is also worthy of note that many candidates had obviously prepared themselves really rather well for their oral test and were seemingly untroubled by the demands of it all.

The stimulus texts were perfectly accessible to the overwhelming majority of candidates. *Texto A* (*La adolescencia – “edad difícil”*) was the most commonly used text, although the three texts seemed to offer equivalent levels of challenge. The occasional candidate struggled with the more abstract nature of *Texto B* (*La importancia de la felicidad*), whilst *Texto C* (*El agua y la sequía*) was handled well by most candidates, given the popularity of topics related to environmental issues. In terms of linguistic complexity, examiners felt the three texts were comparable.

From the point of view of the timings of the oral tests, it is with considerable relief that examiners can report that only a small number of Centres ignored the stipulated timings and proceeded in a way that invariably involved examining the candidate for far longer than the maximum of 18 minutes. Whatever the rationale behind this, it is worth stating once again that absolutely no advantage can be gained from this. Equally, finishing the general conversation part of the test a few minutes early in order then to spend a couple of minutes asking the candidate about his/her plans for the summer is a similarly poor tactic which should be avoided at all costs. Obvious as it may seem, the test is designed to give the candidate ample opportunity to perform to the best of his/her ability. This clearly implies that the questions asked by Teacher/Examiners should be brief, constructive and to the point. A few Teacher/Examiners were far too talkative, thereby guaranteeing insufficient input from the candidate.

Administratively speaking, the majority of tests went very well indeed. Most Centres sent off their cassettes/CDs with each candidate having both the accompanying documents – the Working Mark Sheet, duly filled in with the candidate's details, and the topic sheet (Form OTF). This lists the three possible topics for discussion from which the Teacher/Examiner can then select one or two to form the basis of a conversation. If a Centre fails to supply a Working Mark Sheet for each candidate, the examiner is entitled to send the script parcel back to the Centre in order that such documents are subsequently enclosed. It is well worth checking therefore that both the aforementioned documents are included for each candidate and sent in the script parcel. Otherwise the entire process is delayed and this benefits nobody.

Examiners remain hugely grateful to all Teacher/Examiners for making sure that candidates can be heard clearly and at reasonable volume. It would appear to be the case, however, that some Centres insist on using internal microphones instead of stand-alone ones. The quality of reproduction with an internal microphone is considerably poorer when compared to a stand-alone microphone placed on a stand. It is also a good idea to place the microphone stand on a book or two in order to dampen vibrations caused by candidates shuffling in their seats.

The wisdom of the suggestion that Centres check each cassette or CD for recording quality before sending them to the examiner is worth stressing here.

## **Comments on Individual Questions**

### **Texts A, B and C**

It is now established practice that Teacher/Examiners use the suggested questions as presented in the Examiner's Booklet. If, however, Centres wish to use questions of their own, this is quite acceptable provided they give the candidate the opportunity to be stretched and to show exactly what they can do. This is often necessary, especially if a candidate gives brief responses to the questions set out in the Teacher/Examiner booklet.

Examiners need to stress that candidates who rely almost exclusively on the wording of the text for their spoken responses will not gain access to the upper mark ranges. Conversely, candidates who paraphrase the original text or who manipulate it successfully in order to make their point are far more likely to score higher marks in this section. The key points in this part of the test are to interpret the text and give explanations when required. Candidates wishing to score good marks in this section need to respond to and understand both the text and the questions asked by the Teacher/Examiner on the text itself as well as the issues relating to it.

### **General Conversation**

Many fewer candidates this year lost marks for spontaneity as a consequence of delivering overly rehearsed, pre-learnt material when asked to go into more detail with their chosen topic/s. However, some Centres did not offer their candidates enough opportunities to be spontaneous by, for instance, not asking unexpected questions on the topic/s.

The intention with this section of the test is for it to be a conversation and **not** an opportunity to deliver several pre-learnt paragraphs in response to a number of very generalised questions. Candidates will not score highly if they restrict themselves to a quick-fire question and answer session whereby they deliver a series of disconnected and superficially factual statements. Ideas need to be introduced, discussed, investigated and developed.

Although many recent reports have covered similar ground, it needs to be stated yet again that candidates will lose many marks if they fail to make reference to the target language country whilst discussing their topic/s. The Specification and the mark scheme make this very clear.

The Specification requires candidates to select topics for discussion that are of 'current' relevance to the Spanish-speaking world and that can be placed in the topic list in section 5.2 of the Specification. Topics on the life and work of Pablo Picasso, Tourism on the Costas, the revolutionary fervour of Che Guevara or Almodóvar's latest film, whilst fascinating in their nature, all infringe the rubric and will therefore lose the candidates valuable marks in Grid 4E of the mark scheme.

### *Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

In terms of the quality of language used by candidates, the same sort of problems as in previous years were very much in evidence this year. Rising intonation at the end of simple statements was widespread and worrying. The mysteries of the verb *gustar* continue to confound many candidates. The inability to distinguish between our old friends *ser/estar* paid many candidates a visit this year – particularly so in utterances such as ...*sí, sí, soy muy interesante en este tema...* [sic.] and ...*recientemente, mi interés estuvo captado por este asunto...* [sic.]. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the subjunctive managed to cause trouble for many candidates.

However, examiners are able to conclude this year with a certain degree of pleasure that the majority of candidates can be pleased with their performance in this test. Their self-evidently committed teachers should be equally pleased with their students.



## 2675: Spanish: Listening, Reading & Writing 2

### General Comments

The level of the paper was felt to be appropriate, although in some areas some candidates found it more challenging than in previous years. Candidates achieved scores on the paper across the entire range of marks.

In overall terms, candidates attained a satisfactory level of written Spanish. Tasks 1, 5 and 6 provided the candidates with ample opportunity to display their command of a range of tenses, as well as their ability to use varied syntactical structures; many candidates availed themselves of the opportunity. Task 6 saw many candidates showing sound knowledge of the Preterite and the Perfect tenses, active and passive in both cases, the Future Tense, the impersonal *se* structure, and the present and perfect subjunctive. Most candidates demonstrated a good range of vocabulary. However, most candidates seemed to make little attempt to come to grips with the use of the written accent. There was a significant number for whom control of language and accuracy were problematic.

With regard to reading skills, candidates generally appeared to have understood the Spanish text; however, examiners had the impression that more effort had been put into the tasks which involve writing in Spanish. In some cases the quality of candidates' written English made it difficult to understand answers in Task 2. Although there were no marks given for the use of English in itself, some candidates penalised themselves in this area by their poor self-expression. Some candidates felt that it was sufficient to provide word-for-word translations, even though the resulting English had a different or no meaning. There were some nonsensical translations, such as "impulsate" (for "drive, encourage") as a translation for *impulsar*, or "implicate" (for "imply") as a translation for *implicar*.

Examiners would like to thank those many Centres whose candidates presented their papers well. These candidates achieved this by having clear handwriting and by avoiding needless crossings out, arrows and asterisks; no doubt they took advantage of the rough paper provided by their Centres to work out the more difficult answers before they wrote on the answer paper.

### Comments on Specific Questions

#### Task 1

Most candidates answered well and appeared to have understood the general situation as well as the specific details and the story told by Maria Amelia.

The main general issue was to do with manipulating verbs, personal, reflexive and possessive pronouns so that they referred to the relevant people in the written answers, based on a series of events related in the first person.

- (a) Only a few candidates missed this point. There were issues regarding minor spelling or language errors.
- (b+c) *Mi nieto* was rendered as *minieto* or *miñito* or *miñeto*, as in *miñeto se dio un regalo*; this coinage reappeared through the text used as a noun. There were problems in understanding *relaciones con gente*, which became *relacion escongente*.
- (d) Many scored well here but a few failed to give her reaction and missed the idea of what she thought would happen. There were problems in dealing with *contestar*.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- (e) Well done on the whole. Some candidates reported that Maria Amelia felt that it **was** indeed stupid at her age to be using the internet, ie simply repeating what others said to her. A few did not seem to know the word *tontería*. Most seemed to understand the second point, with some expressing elegantly in their own words her enjoyment of the internet.
- (f) This question was generally answered well by most candidates, although the form of *durmiendo* escaped many. *Sillón* was not a key part of the answer; it was rendered as *silla*, *salón* and various other combinations of the letters.
- (g) Transcribing *acercar* was a problem for some. Many did express the idea of getting closer to the screen.
- (h) This question was generally well answered; however some rendered *no hay quien* as *no hay que*, which has a different meaning.
- (i) The question asked for the relevance of tea to the story and most candidates were able to answer, but many did not give the detail invited by the use of *exactamente* in the question.
- (j+k) Some candidates were struggling at this point. The pieces of information and ideas tended either to be understood perfectly or not at all. *Se hartaba de galletas* sometimes became closer to *se ataba con galletas*. Many simply recounted how she ate biscuits and then went to bed, without realising the significance of what happened or the conclusions that were made.
- (l) Although many gave a suitable adjective or picked up on the idea of “no merit”, other candidates seemed not to have read the question or did not understand it; therefore answers referred to the time that Maria Amelia spent answering her emails or made vague reference to Russian visitors.

### Task 2

Many candidates scored well on this. One candidate, despite circling the words IN ENGLISH in the rubric, answered in Spanish and therefore scored no marks.

The level of difficulty of the text was entirely appropriate and it was therefore disappointing that common words and phrases caused problems.

- (a) This question was generally well answered.
- (b) There were problems for some students with *comportamiento* and *seres humanos*, “human brain activity” being a not uncommon rendering of the latter.
- (c) This was generally understood, although students who insisted on using the word “characterised” – as in the Spanish – frequently could not spell it.
- (d) The precise nature of the problem was sometimes not mentioned. The word *ferrocarriles* was not known by many candidates, who relied on the rather obvious *industrias y actividades comerciales* for their answer.
- (e) The increase in traffic was included by nearly all candidates. Very few understood the idea of a technical check on a vehicle. Most talked about cars being equipped with the necessary controls. Some did not understand the final idea, that the checks would allow a reduction in noise. A few wrote here about the emission of gases, rather than noise.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- (f) Not all candidates realised that the economic boom was *adding* to the building works; some failed to link the machines to the building work.
- (g) Many candidates did not understand *casas particulares* or *locales comerciales*. There were many answers about *certain* or *particular* houses, rather than private houses, and about shopping centres. *Quejas* was not known by some.

### Task 3

Candidates' scores ranged from 0 to 5. There were many with 4 or 5 and few below 3; (c), (e) and to a lesser extent (g) all attracted candidates.

### Task 4

As in previous years, this was the point at which many candidates were challenged. The task was less well done this year with much recycling of the original words in a completely unchanged form. Unfortunately in (b), *conductas* was sometimes taken as a reference to *driving* or *drivers*.

The best answers consisted of phrases in simple, elegant and correct Spanish. These were achieved through control of vocabulary and syntax.

### Task 5

There were very varied marks as usual. Correct information was sometimes added on to the prompts, but without any regard to appropriate choice of language to maintain correct usage to follow on from the stem, in terms of tense, mood, person, part of speech etc. Simple tenses were a challenge to some candidates.

- (a) The word *estrecha* was apparently sometimes not recognised as an adjective.
- (f) This was a standard time construction, requiring the correct tense.
- (g,h+j) required the subjunctive for a grammatically correct answer.
- (g) This generally required a plural verb, because of the sense of the stem.
- (h) The second part of this answer was rendered untrue if it included the word *no*.
- (k) This was a standard structure, of *si* plus the subjunctive, followed by the conditional. It was quite rare to see the correct tense.

As with Task 4, many candidates found the language aspect of this task challenging.

In terms of comprehension, most candidates seemed to have identified the relevant information, although poor language often impaired the intended message. In (a), there was sometimes no idea of "many" (*predominan*). The idea behind (d) was not understood by some candidates, although some candidates did express this neatly with reference to battles or wars. In (f), few had the correct idea of this being when he started work there. In (g), the person was often wrong. In (l), cities were sometimes seen as inflicting damage.

## Task 6

In section (a), some common words caused problems, eg “population”, “inhabitants”, “century” and “prize”. Gender of nouns was an issue as well, notably with *parte* and *provincia*. There were very few answers where candidates could not find enough points of information in Section (a) and language in these answers was sometimes very poor. As ever, this was not intended as a translation exercise; candidates were not expected to struggle to find a specific translation for “resort”, or “winning ticket”, or “average”. More general explanations, such as *el billete que gana*, or *generalmente los españoles gastan €70 por persona* were perfectly acceptable because they showed that the candidate was able to use and to manipulate Spanish.

In section (b), the *inconvenientes* in the question was sometimes taken as “inconveniences”. Many candidates struggled to use their learned phrase: *Si yo fuera primer ministro...* etc, but these sentences were usually not convincing or relevant. Many candidates did write with passion and conviction about why they saw a lottery as harmless enjoyment or pointless and expensive delusion. Generally speaking, the quality of the language in part (b) of this task was higher than in part (a).

As ever, there were some very competent answers to Task 6 which easily gained high marks. However, there was a noticeable strand of candidates who seemed to struggle more than previously to express their ideas.

## 2676: Spanish: Culture and Society (Written Paper)

### General Comments

There were fewer candidates for this paper in this session. Work submitted was generally of a higher standard than last year and there were fewer candidates with results at the lower end of the mark range. More candidates wrote on literary texts. Students were generally well prepared. The best essays demonstrated individual understanding and research, built on solid classroom study.

The literary questions were well answered. Most candidates were able to handle the relevant issues and provide suitable evidence to back up their arguments. Generally speaking, candidates who wrote on the literary texts and topics demonstrated a thorough knowledge of their texts and had the ability to draw inferences from them, all of which pointed towards the sound teaching the candidates had received.

Some Centres had clearly prepared their own choice of literary texts for Section B; their candidates chose therefore from a range of suitable essay titles and on the whole answered them well. Lorca's other plays, *El camino*, short stories of Horacio Quiroga, *En la ardiente oscuridad* and *Crónica de una muerte anunciada* were used in this way. Questions from Section B tended to be less well answered by those candidates who tried to apply the titles to the prescribed texts of Section A. As one such candidate wrote, *es muy difícil ver las opiniones del autor sobre este tema*.

In non-literary essays, candidates were generally able to provide and to discuss the relevant factual information and statistics. In many cases, eg the topic of smoking, candidates had armed themselves with recent and relevant statistics and information. Likewise with regard to tourism, the figures quoted were up-to-date and credible. However, some strange statistics did appear, eg *En el año 2005, hubo 808 turistas en España*, or *hay 5 estaciones de metro internacionales en España*. While appreciating the pressure on candidates to perform in an exam, careful checking should eliminate such comments. Where candidates legitimately applied the questions to Spanish American countries rather than to Spain, it was generally with some knowledge, although not always with evidence of recent study of those countries. Some candidates were indeed not able to provide sufficient information relevant to the title and to a Spanish speaking country. Some candidates seemed to have memorised an answer to an essay from a previous paper, which was then repeated for this paper. Essays did not always address the question set in the title.

The best essays stood out because of the quality and range of language, the rich vocabulary and language structures, with a range of types of subordinate clause and confident use of verb tenses. Where there were errors, they tended to be those that have been mentioned in this report before. Even students who have studied tourism as a topic for an essay paper persisted in writing about *las turistas*. In some cases there were too many pre-learned pieces of language, which did not flow and which added neither information nor argument. Some of the pre-learned phrases seemed not to have been understood, judging by the way they were used.

Most candidates were well able to produce an essay of the required length within the time allowed – there were almost no occasions when the essay was too brief. Sometimes candidates managed to write very long essays in the time available; unfortunately, such essays sometimes strayed from the heart of the question and lost sight of what was required.

The following features made it particularly difficult for examiners to appreciate the work of certain candidates: poor handwriting (is the intended word *turco* or *terco*?), use of initials or abbreviations for book titles or literary characters, the use of asterisks and arrows in place of sound planning, as well as the use of unattached and unlabelled extra sheets.

It is helpful where candidates identify their essays with the relevant question number clearly written at the start, as well as writing those numbers in the boxes on the front page.

### Comments on Selected Questions

#### 3 Casona

- (a) Most answers drew out the themes such as fantasy and truth and made convincing points.
- (b) Answers sometimes concentrated on *verdad*, without considering *fortaleza espiritual*.

#### 4 Lorca

- (a) Many candidates chose this question. There were many perceptive comments drawing on good knowledge of the text.
- (b) All those who did this question tended to agree with the statement. Occasionally a more perceptive candidate would refer to the development of Yerma's character through the play and indicate the causes of her *intolerancia*, rather than just describing it. A few candidates misread the question, taking *hacia* as a verb and reading the question to mean that Yerma's intolerance was what made her husband brutal.

#### 5 García Márquez

- (a) There was plenty of consideration of the place of this extract in the novel but not the same in-depth assessment of *la ilusión no se come*. This phrase was not always connected with the importance of hope as a theme and its power to help overcome hardship. The colonel's naïveté was sometimes confused with his positive and idealistic qualities.
- (b) This was a popular question. The best answers analysed the novel and evaluated each aspect, rather than writing an essay based entirely on their own preferences or a list of incidents which they liked or disliked.

#### 6 Goytisolo

There was an awareness that Goytisolo was trying to tell the truth as he saw it, with a sense of guilt shared among many parties. Don Ambrosio, and what he represented, was seen as the main culprit, although some guilt was also seen to be expressed by Goytisolo himself.

#### 8 Sender

- (a) The few answers clearly showed good knowledge of the novel and drew out the significance of the extract, particularly the perfidy of Mosén Millán.
- (b) There were some interesting assessments of Paco's role and of his death, showing familiarity with all the major incidents in his life and his place in the life of his village.

#### 10 Women in literature

Where this was answered with regard to Yerma, candidates did not generally use the play as successfully as they might have done. One candidate wrote about the female characters in *Eva Luna*, providing a thoughtful answer looking at many examples of both "positive" and "negative". Some candidates became confused as to whether they were writing about the author's view of the women as positive or negative, or their own.

#### 11 War

A few did this, using *El Coronel*, which was not an easy choice to answer this question successfully.

**12 The individual and society**

There were some excellent answers here on *En la ardiente oscuridad* and *Crónica de una muerte anunciada*.

**13 Love**

Candidates who wrote on Yerma found that they had made a difficult choice.

**14 Urban / rural life**

Answers tended to tell the story rather than evaluate the importance of location in the literary works chosen.

**15 Spain since Franco**

(a) There was one well-informed essay on Spain and the EU.

(b) Women. This was a popular choice. The best answers had relevant statistics and up-to-date knowledge of Spanish politics, although not all the essays managed to answer the question.

**16 Cinema**

(a) Actor/actress. There were some good answers on Javier Bardem. However others were rather slight.

(b) Development. The quotation considered whether the films were closely associated with the reality of the country; the issues here were not always grasped. Some used Almodóvar's focus on women as a way of reflecting a profound change in the country; they saw his concentration on characters on the margins of society as a way of portraying the country's new reality. Some answers saw the surrealist tradition in Spain as a different way of seeing the country's reality.

Weaker answers on film tended to give a list of film titles, with a few comments, rather than an argument.

**17 Health**

(a) Essays on AIDS tended to be rather general; they had information about the presence of AIDS in Spain, but little information on the response to it.

(b) Tobacco. Essays varied from a concise, well informed and incisive appreciation of the situation, to accumulations of statistics and rather vague generalities of experiences in Spain. The law was often seen as essential, but less well thought out and insufficiently resourced.

**18 Tourism**

(a) Positive and negative aspects. This was a popular choice and was handled reasonably well, but answers did not always deal with all the points in the quotation. In many cases this was a well prepared essay; it was often the better of the two essays candidates wrote.

(b) What is offered to tourists? The best informed essays referred to the wide diversification of Spanish tourism in recent years, in terms of regional offers and branches such as ecotourism, cultural tourism and adventure and activity tourism. Mass tourism was seen as unsustainable.

**19 Environmental issues**

The few who answered on this topic were generally well-informed and wrote with some passion. They were aware of the need to educate citizens about the law.

**20 A city, region or Spanish American country**

(a) The most frequent issue about answers to this question was that they simply described tourism in the area, without evaluating its importance. Essays on the role of tourism in Cuba were convincing, seeing how it was a motor for the economy but also a source of social friction.

(b) There were a few answers on the ecotax, but they were not particularly convincing arguments.

**21 Spanish American issues**

The few who answered these questions tended to be well aware of the general issues but only sometimes were they well-informed at a more specific level.



## **2677: Spanish: Culture and Society (Coursework)**

Moderators were impressed by the range of topics covered by candidates in preparation for Coursework. Virtually every aspect of Hispanic culture, society and history has been seen over the years. The quality of research is varied, with some candidates unfortunately limiting themselves to readily-available material from course books, which is not sufficient. Also, it is imperative to use primary resources in Spanish to give a base of essential vocabulary. Some essays this year were marred by candidates' inability to render key vocabulary for the topic in accurate Spanish. Essays on the 'Prestige' did not use the correct word for 'oil', for example.

Moderators must be given a complete bibliography – references to search engines are not acceptable, and if the website of a Spanish publication has been consulted, the precise article used should be named and dated. Moderators are exceedingly vigilant regarding plagiarism and indeed carry out checks as part of the normal moderation process. Plagiarism has been detected this Session. Such scripts are passed on to the malpractice unit. Candidates' formulation of titles has definitely improved, with most being in the form of questions and leading naturally into an argument rather than a narrative exposition. Moderators would advise that Centres invest time in essay writing skills, as the ability to present a logical argument, supported by evidence from research, to analyse and draw conclusions is essential to achieve good marks on Grid 6A2. Reading coursework submissions clearly reveals which candidates have been given the opportunity to develop these skills.

Administration continues to cause difficulty to Moderators, particularly if errors do not come to light until late in the Moderation period when time is short. Centres are requested to familiarise themselves with the necessary documentation well before the deadline for submission and to ensure that the correct paperwork is available and is up to date. Please have arithmetical calculations and transcription checked before dispatch. All relevant forms are required and coursework should not be accepted from candidates unless the plan, bibliography and coversheet have been fully completed. Moderators will have to chase these up if they are not sent. The MS1 must agree with the coversheets and be sent to Moderators.

Centres are welcome to make contact via the OCR Customer Contact Centre for advice on titles and plans prior to candidates writing their essays.

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Spanish (3863/7863)  
June 2008 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2671	Raw	60	47	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2672	Raw	80	65	55	45	36	27	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2673	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	25	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2674	Raw	60	48	43	38	33	29	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2675	Raw	80	63	57	51	45	40	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2676	Raw	60	46	41	36	31	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2677	Raw	60	50	45	40	35	30	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
<b>3863</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
<b>7863</b>	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
<b>3863</b>	28.1	50.7	70.2	85.6	94.7	100	1461
<b>7863</b>	41.6	69.5	86.2	95.8	99	100	1173

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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