

# **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2006**

**1928/MS/R/06**

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.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide 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.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education

### Spanish (1928)

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
2381 01/02	Listening	5
2382 01/02	Speaking	8
2383 01/02	Reading	12
2384 01/02	Writing	14
2385 01/02	Speaking	8
2386	Writing Coursework	16
*	Grade Thresholds	19

*Reports on the Units taken in June 2006*

## 2381/01 and 02 - Spanish Listening

### General Comments

Judging by the detailed and constructive annotations throughout some scripts, the five minutes' reading time before the start of the tape was again usefully employed by candidates in both tiers in order to familiarise themselves with the paper.

Very few infringements of rubrics were reported; very few candidates answered in the incorrect language. Although fewer in number than in previous years, some of the alterations to answers in the objective-test exercises caused problems of interpretation to examiners. Teachers are advised to inform their candidates that it is preferable to cross out the first answer and write the new one alongside the box where it can be clearly identified. Candidates should also form letters clearly, allowing examiners to distinguish between, for example, A and H; B and D.

Centres are requested to adhere to the Board's stipulation that Foundation and Higher Tier scripts should be despatched under separate cover.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Section 1: Foundation Tier only

In the first exercise, all questions were well answered by almost all candidates. In Question 4, *castillo* proved difficult for some and 'museum' or 'cathedral' were sometimes offered in response.

In Exercise 2, many candidates received full marks. Letter A was sometimes given in Question 6 and, less commonly, letter C. Some candidates did well until Questions 13 and / or 14. In Question 14, where the answer was incorrect, B was always chosen.

Exercise 3 also proved accessible for most. The most problematic items appeared in Questions 17 and 18. If candidates did not score on one, they usually did not score on either, suggesting that their knowledge of clothes items was lacking or that these had not been revised recently. Failure to score on these two questions tended to occur in a group of candidates from a particular centre. Surprisingly, some candidates did not recognise *hamburguesa*, in Question 21, and / or *bocadillo* in Question 22.

All but the weaker candidates performed well in Exercise 4, some gaining seven or eight marks. A common pattern with a number of candidates was for them to answer correctly the first item in each pair as, in this part of the sentence, the activity alluded to was more obviously specified. However, letters D and K were both generally correct.

## Section 2: Foundation and Higher Tier

As is to be expected, Foundation Tier candidates found this exercise fairly testing, whilst many Higher Tier candidates found it fairly straightforward. Question 3 was almost universally correctly answered, candidates recognising *No se permite fumar*. It was quite alarming that even good Higher Tier candidates sometimes did not understand *un cuarto de hora*, interpretation of which was required for the mark in Question 1. '4 hours' was a common response offered; there were also some '40 minutes'. Quite a number of candidates did not know *billete* and, in Question 2, wrote a range of possible answers instead; 'toilet'; 'help'; 'to get past' being the most common. In Question 4, many candidates lost the mark since they did not understand *quince*. Others had not borne in mind the context given ['at the airport'] and so suggested that passengers were told to go to 'platform 15', demonstrating furthermore a failure to recognise *puerta*. 'Door' was accepted as were other renderings which would get a passenger to the correct area in the airport, but 'port 15' and 'terminal 15' were not. Question 5 was the most testing. Less proficient candidates had to resort to a guess, and the wording of the question led to responses such as the very common 'delayed' and 'cancelled'. Others gave 'it's full' or the closer, structurally at least, but still incorrect, 'it's not left'. The verb *llegar* -in the form *no ha llegado* - was seemingly unknown to many.

Both Exercises 2 and 3 saw high scores amongst Higher Tier and better Foundation Tier candidates alike. In Question 13 of Exercise 2, some Foundation Tier candidates, presumably expecting to hear *dinero* in reference to icon C, gave J as their answer. They had heard *No me van a pagar ....* In Exercise 3, understanding of *no había nada que teníamos que hacer. Podíamos escoger nuestra actividad* was the activity referred to most obliquely and, therefore, not all candidates correctly selected letter D, *día libre*.

## Section 3: Higher Tier only

Question 1 was the least well-answered in Exercise 1. It would appear that candidates did not understand *ladrones*; instead, the mention of a large sum of money led them to select letter D, *deportes*, presumably associating the money with winnings or a transfer fee. This exercise differentiated well, producing a range of marks.

Letters C and D were often transposed in Exercise 2 and some candidates did not recognise *vegetariano* in number nine. Question 10 was the best answered.

Better candidates had few problems in Exercise 3 but others found this more demanding. In Question 13, many had not understood how Martín came to know about the job and, in Question 14, many did not correctly deduce from what they heard that Martín's job was ideal for him. Question 18 often proved difficult; a common answer was B, *no encontró las llaves*, which contradicted the material heard on the tape.

Exercise 4, where answers were required in Spanish, was where the weakest performance was seen. Lack of attention to detail in Question 22 meant that many candidates did not score since they wrote *camareros*. In Question 23, poor spelling prevented the award of marks for some whilst others volunteered *Mexico* as the answer.

*Report on the Units Taken in June 2006*

Exercise 5 required responses in English and was aimed at testing material of grade A\* standard. Very many candidates earned the mark in Question 26, correctly interpreting *en el extranjero* although 'electricians' was a common incorrect offering. In Question 27 some marks were lost by answers suggesting that the father was living with the grandparents, whilst some candidates in this question and the next resorted to their general knowledge of dysfunctional families and gave a range of suggestions which were far from interpreting what they had heard. In response to Question 29, most answers made some reference to education, but the father's financial contribution was often omitted. Some candidates, having understood that there was some reference to living abroad in the text, believed that the father took his son abroad to be educated. Pleasingly, in Question 30, *celoso* was recognised by a high number of candidates, although success in this item again appeared to occur in whole centres. Other suggestions, which often did not respond appropriately to the question printed, were that Jorge was lonely or felt isolated.

## 2382/01 & 02 and 2385/01 & 02 - Spanish Speaking

### General Comments

The paper was considered a suitable and fair examination, and an appropriate test for the whole ability range.

Candidates were very well prepared both in terms of the Spanish they could produce but also in their understanding of the format of their exam. Examiners reported that, as in previous years, a small number of candidates should have been entered for Foundation rather than Higher Tier but also that a small number of candidates could have taken the Higher Tier test and earned more UMS marks. It is recognised that, in the case of borderline candidates, the decision regarding tier is a difficult one. Once again, there was some excellent work produced in both tiers.

Teachers' sympathetic handling of their students and their skill in eliciting proficient demonstrations of ability were greatly in evidence. The administration of the tests and the completion of the mark sheets were mostly handled efficiently but attention is drawn to the advice contained at the beginning of the Teacher Booklet regarding administrative procedures and, especially, achieving optimum recording quality. Poor quality recordings present a major problem to examiners and may prejudice a candidate's final score. Teachers are urged to check regularly the quality of their recordings, as the standard can vary even within a centre. Centres which present candidates in both tiers for external examination [unit 2382 rather than 2385] are reminded to record and despatch Foundation Tier candidates' work separately from that of Higher Tier candidates.

Timing was again commented upon widely by examiners. It must be stated that there has been a great improvement in this area over the years and much excellent practice was evident with teachers doing their best to adhere to time allocations. Long tests lead to candidate and teacher fatigue, as individuals are put under increased pressure. There is rarely, if ever, any improvement in a candidate's marks as a result of the teacher lengthening, for example, a General Conversation. This year examiners reported a larger number of very short Discussions, of barely one minute, a factor which is taken into consideration in the marks awarded.

Adequate reproduction of sounds, particularly those not a feature of English, in addition to correct stress on individual syllables present a challenge to some candidates. The most common pronunciation errors occur with the /X/ sound, as in *jardín*; *gente* and *colegio*. However, an adequate rendering of *pollo* should not be beyond English native speaker candidates but many produced *polo*; *castilo*; and *bocadilo (sic)*, sometimes losing marks in role plays as a result. Teachers' attention is particularly drawn to the Presentation section where pronunciation can deteriorate as some candidates over-rehearse and produce a garbled version, although there were fewer cases of this in this year's tests.

Centres are reminded that they will each receive an individual report written by the examiner who marked their speaking tests. This contains valuable feedback on a centre's performance as well as advice, where appropriate, on improving candidates' marks. Teachers are encouraged to consider the comments contained therein.



## Comments on individual questions

### Section 1: Role-plays

Full marks were commonly awarded with most items well known by candidates.

Problematic items were, in the hotel role play, *duble*, commonly given for *doble* if the candidate chose to request a double room; adjectives of nationality given rather than the name of the country in the role play about buying postcards and, in the role play about music lessons, 'guitar' for *guitarra*. Despite its frequent occurrence in this paper, some candidates had difficulty in remembering *¿Cuánto es?* or an adequate substitute.

### Section 2: Role-plays

Once again, candidates responded well to the unprepared questions and all but very weak Foundation Tier candidates often earned both marks. Most difficulty was experienced with recognition of *¿Cuánto tiempo ...?* which appeared in two role plays. Where candidates failed to earn both marks, it was usually because they had interpreted the question as referring to the weather.

Whilst most items were handled well by both better Foundation Tier and Higher Tier candidates, in the role play about an exam, many failed to produce the Spanish *llegar* and instead introduced the French *arriver* or an English / Spanish hybrid *arrivar*. In the situation about going on holiday, there were many slips in producing the required *libro*: *libra* and *libre* were common. As these introduced ambiguity, marks were lost. In the context of changing money in a bank in Argentina, *cambiar* was surprisingly absent from the repertoire of many; the French *changer* was offered instead. An English or French rendering of 'passport' in the same role play was not credited.

Teachers are reminded that, at any stage in the examination, they can gently query a candidate error without prejudicing the marks available. Guidance on this is given in the Teacher's Booklet, both in the mark grids (reference to 'little assistance' and 'considerable assistance') and in the section on Prompting. Examiners reported this year that some teachers did not seek elucidation from candidates where it would have been valid and possibly worthwhile.

### Section 3: Role-plays

A balance needs to be struck in this section. At one extreme, some candidates narrate events as a monologue and teachers then move immediately to the next part of the test without any participation from them, thereby not meeting all criteria and limiting the candidates' marks (see reference to 'interjections' in Mark Scheme). At the other extreme, some teachers adopt a question-and-answer approach, which denies candidates the opportunity to display their ability to develop points. These extremes are outlined as guidance; fortunately most teachers do strike the balance and some very pleasing work is produced; some accounts from able, thoughtful candidates are indeed superb.

Examiners commented upon some candidates' failure to grasp the general situation, for example in terms of whether they were describing their visit abroad or their Spanish friend's visit to England; as a result there was subsequently confusion on occasions. The context is always simply outlined in the rubric at the top of the page and candidates must be trained to focus on this. Most candidates do not contextualise the piece by mentioning the general situation, but immediately embark on describing the events depicted in the first box with no preamble.

Across all the situations, weather expressions were often poorly generated. Candidates may be able to produce phrases in the present tense but struggle in the preterite and imperfect tenses. As these can be learnt as set phrases, this lacuna can perhaps be remedied.

In the situation about working on a campsite, the production of reflexive verb forms in the first picture was difficult for some; additionally, some candidates were inclined to omit the jobs they were engaged to carry out. In the Christmas-visit role play, as stated earlier, some candidates struggled to produce *nieve*; *nevaba* or *hacía frío*. As *trineo* was glossed, they could have explained the situation in the third frame by using this and an appropriate form of *jugar en la nieve*. Some candidates applied their knowledge to produce sentences such as *hicimos un hombre de nieve*. Most candidates conveyed the events of the second frame by a sentence such as *fuiimos de compras*, thereby missing an opportunity to talk about several features such as food items, *un árbol de Navidad* and presents given and received. In the context of the holiday in Mexico, many could talk about listening to music or the party held in their room in picture five, but found it difficult to state that their parents couldn't sleep or were angry or that the music was loud. In the fourth situation, that of the school exchange visit, the most problematic area was that of the upset stomach with candidates generally unable to generate *me dolía el estómago* or *tenía dolor de estómago* or even *estaba enfermo/a*.

### **Presentation**

Candidates had prepared well for this section and a wide variety of topics was discussed. Some excellent work was produced with the most interesting generally being on topics which candidates had selected themselves. On the negative side, some centres appeared to operate a 'template' approach with all presentations following the same format and subsequent discussions being based on the very same questions. Almost all examiners reported their concerns that this approach failed to differentiate adequately between candidates or allow some candidates the opportunity to produce original work. Teachers' attention is drawn to the criterion of 'delivery of material', mentioned in the Mark Scheme and to comments earlier in this report regarding pronunciation and intonation. The inclusion of opinions and, if possible, justifications also appears in the marking criteria. Much improvement appears to have taken place in adhering to the one minute allowed for this part of the test and this is to be applauded, but teachers should allow candidates to finish their sentence before introducing the first question of the Discussion.

### **Discussion**

There were some very interesting examples at both Foundation and Higher Tiers of appropriate questioning leading to good exploitation of the topic chosen. As mentioned above, a few teachers seemed to have a prepared 'script' with questions and answers recited by each party. Such renditions are not rewarded highly; neither is questioning which directs the candidate to reiterate material already produced in the presentation. A feature commented upon by many examiners this year was the brevity of a number of Discussions; one minute, rather than the requisite (approximately) two, was common. Such a shortfall will prejudice the Communication mark for the Discussion and General Conversation.

## General Conversation

More able Higher Tier candidates demonstrated extensive vocabulary, good application of tenses and a range of language structures, thereby accessing the top range of marks in both the Communication and Linguistic Quality mark grids. Less able Higher Tier candidates and more able Foundation Tier candidates struggled with their production of accurate time references, including present tense forms, beyond a few 'stock' ones (for example, *fui* and *voy a ir*); whilst a characteristic of the weakest candidates is their inability to use verb forms. They also have a greater tendency to answer "sí" or "no" wherever possible. With all but the best candidates, who tend to be capable of steering a conversation independently, teachers need to be careful that they don't restrict candidates by the use of closed or semi-closed questions. However, even some very able candidates need to be guided to demonstrate their ability and repertoire. Excessive brevity will not reveal to the examiner the true standard of such an individual.

On the whole, the majority of tests were well conducted in such a fashion as to allow candidates to produce of their best and acquit themselves well. As in previous years, there was evidence of some excellent work, and skilful questioning brought out a high quality of language with some candidates producing a mature exposition of their opinions and ideas.

## 2383/01 & 02 - Spanish Reading

### General comments

Once again examiners reported that the main lesson for centres is that vocabulary-learning should not be ignored. Particularly in Foundation Tier, knowledge of vocabulary proved the difference between success and failure. Markers expressed astonishment that classroom vocabulary such as *lápiz*, *cuaderno*, etc proved such a problem for so many in Section 1 Exercise 2. Equally, *calcetín* in Section 2 Exercise 3 was almost universally unknown by both Foundation and Higher Candidates.

Examiners reported that very few candidates were entered at an inappropriate level.

At each Tier, candidates scored highly in their first section, with a broader range of marks in their second section. There were no reports of problems with understanding the rubric or question-type.

There was evidence of good time-management: with only rare exceptions they all finished the paper. There were no reports of the last exercise being left blank.

This year only a handful of candidates answered Exercises 3 and 4 in Section 3 in the wrong language. Those who did automatically lost the marks.

In the gap-filling exercise, Section 2 Exercise 2, only occasionally did candidates fail to use the words given in the boxes and, in Section 3 Exercise 3(b), only rarely did candidates tick more than the three boxes required.

Teachers should remind students that when letters are altered the final choice must be clear to examiners otherwise no marks are awarded. No marks can be awarded if the candidate has not made clear the difference, say, between M and H in Section 3 Exercise 2.

### Comments on individual questions.

#### Section 1

- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>Exercise 1</b> | Almost all candidates scored full marks.   |
| <b>Exercise 2</b> | Disappointing performance here considering the simplicity of the exercise. Many mistook <i>mochila</i> or <i>cuaderno</i> for <i>llavero</i> ,               |
| <b>Exercise 3</b> | This was again disappointing. A lack of basic vocabulary was a stumbling-block to many. <i>Niebla</i> and <i>nieve</i> were often confused                   |
| <b>Exercise 4</b> | Again, relatively few scored full marks here. Question 17 caused the most problems. Again, scant knowledge of basic vocabulary was the main stumbling-block. |
| <b>Exercise 5</b> | Again, disappointing. The main problem was <i>termino mis deberes</i> . Many chose <i>se relaja</i> instead of <i>trabaja</i> .                              |

## Section 2

- Exercise 1** Most Higher-Tier candidates scored highly in this exercise. The vast majority scored full marks.
- Exercise 2** Candidates found this exercise difficult. In Question 9 *guapa* and in 10 *internacional* were well-answered. Many scored on Question 10 but then performance waned and many candidates resorted to guess-work. *Dejar* (Question 12) was generally unknown and *maquillaje* was often erroneously offered for Question 13. *Tabaco* was often offered erroneously in Q.15. In Question 15 both *marido* and *novio* were accepted as correct answers.
- Exercise 3** As mentioned above, *calcetines* was unknown by nearly all. Even candidates who scored 45+ got this one wrong. *Tie*, *tracksuit* and *trainers* were erroneously offered.

Many candidates failed to ignore the 'signposts' in this exercise. The 'signpost' for Question 16 was *nunca*; for Question 17 it was *segundo*; for Question 18 it was *antes de contestar*; for Question 18 it was *mejor*; for Question 20 it was *dificultades*. Hence many lost marks by offering a correct answer in the wrong question.

Question 20 caused major problems. Only the best candidates knew *entenderse*. Many wrote *did not get on with the interviewer* instead of ... *with your previous boss*.

## Section 3

- Exercise 1** Candidates with a good knowledge of the Minimum Core and Extension Vocabulary had no problems here. Questions 9 and 10 were often confused because candidates had seen *criminales* in the Ana text and linked it with *Abogado*.
- Exercise 2** Candidate achievement in this exercise was inconsistent.
- Exercise 3** The best candidates wrote the shortest answers. Answers which lifted long swathes of text – inviting the examiner to select an answer – were rejected.
- 18** Many did not understand *la gente mayor* and erroneously offered *sus vivos colores*. Many wrote *sus vivos colores y es fácil cuidarlo* and this was accepted.
- 19** The correct answer was *14 años*. *Entre 12 y 14 años* did not score.
- 20** The following scored: *se pelean, se pelean entre si*. *Se pelean entre* did not score.
- 21** *Los machos* and *90% de los machos* both scored here.
- 22** Markers were instructed to ignore the ending of *pas...* *Mucho tiempo en casa* and *Si, al revés, pasas mucho tiempo en casa* were both rejected.

Exercise 3 Part B was generally well-answered.

- Exercise 4** Only a handful left this exercise blank. The best candidates wrote the shortest answers. Many candidates could not understand the questions. Precise answers were required. Long lifts from the text which contained the correct answer were rejected.

*Corazón* and *peso* caused major problems for many. *Escaparate* was almost universally unknown as was *calzado*. Question 29 required the answer *good rhythm* or *good (steady) pace*. The spelling of *rhythm* caused problems: examiners were asked to be lenient but *rhyme* was marked wrong.

## 2384/01 and 02 - Spanish Writing

### General Comments

The best candidates continue to write to a very high standard, but examiners have reported an increase this year in the number of candidates who greatly exceed the word limit in Section 2 and in Section 3. It is rarely to the candidates' advantage to write over-long answers. The questions are designed to fit the required number of words and candidates who get carried away often introduce irrelevant material and sometimes even omit some of the required information. In addition, accuracy, which is an important element of the mark scheme, often suffers when a candidate writes at too great a length.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Section 1

**Exercise 1** As usual most candidates scored well in this exercise. The confusion of French and Spanish vocabulary continues to be a problem for some and a very few were unable to find more than three or four words of Spanish.

**Exercise 2** This proved to be a high scoring exercise for many candidates. The communication mark was given to any reference to the given icon, for example *beber* in number 5 or *cama* in number 4. Accuracy marks were awarded for the correct spelling of the verb in numbers 1 to 3 and for the correct spelling of the main word (usually a noun) in numbers 2 to 6.

**Exercise 3** There were many excellent answers to this exercise, but a number of candidates still persist in treating it as a series of questions to be answered, giving simply the basic facts without writing a full sentence. This results in incomplete answers, often omitting a verb and often essential information such as 'the evenings' in number 3. Examiners noted that a great many candidates did not know the word for 'postcards'. As in all parts of the paper candidates should be aware of the importance of reading instructions carefully and they should model their answers on the example given.

#### Section 2

The best answers and the ones most likely to score full marks are typically around 100 words in length and give roughly equal weighting to each of the bullet points. They should also take care not to omit any of the required information and to look out for opportunities to use past, present and future tenses and to express an opinion, all of which are part of the grade description of grade 'C'.

- 1 There were some excellent answers to this option with many candidates scoring full marks. The personal details were usually well done and the jobs at home, but the opinion about the work was sometimes omitted. The free time in Spain was sometimes turned into a list of hobbies with no reference to Spain or the future. On the whole, however, this option proved popular with candidates and gave them ample scope to demonstrate their knowledge.
- 2 This was a popular choice as many candidates are well prepared on the topic of holidays and there were many excellent answers. Communication marks were sometimes lost however, as the candidates did not read the question carefully enough. They would typically begin with last year's holiday and a journey to a place which is not asked for in the rubric. This led to only a very brief description of the place and sometimes total omission of the first bullet point. The general reference to holiday eating preferences was sometimes incorporated into last year's

holiday, resulting in further loss of communication marks. It is especially important in Section 2 that candidates should cover all the information in the bullet points.

### Section 3

As in Section 2 it is important for candidates to read the question carefully and cover the main points of reference. The best answers were a pleasure to read and examiners were impressed by the work of the best candidates who produced well-written answers with an excellent range of structure and appropriate vocabulary.

- 1 Some candidates did not understand the meaning of *pensabas ir* and *quieras* in this context and consequently launched into a narrative of a past event, sometimes even ignoring the change of plan. There was little imagination shown in the reason for the change of plan, most favouring a car accident leading to a hospital visit. This was not a good choice for some who lacked the skill to describe any sort of injury and called the hospital *hopital*.
- 2 This proved very popular, especially with girls although many boys wrote about shopping with obvious pleasure. Weaker candidates made too much use of *me gusta* and *no me gusta* and sometimes omitted to say where or with whom they preferred to go shopping. The 'problem' was all too often a lost purse and the opportunity to write something more unusual or interesting was not taken. The better candidates however, wrote interesting and varied responses, often giving good reasons for their choice of shopping companion, such as parents for their spending power or friends for their entertainment value.

The range of vocabulary and structure was most impressive in the best scripts which also contained examples of natural use of the subjunctive and many subordinate clauses, all of which show good practice in the teaching of Spanish.

## 2386 - Writing Coursework

### Introduction

The full details and conditions applying to Writing Coursework are set out in the Coursework Guidance section (*Appendix E*) of the current Specification, and all teachers should naturally expect to make themselves fully conversant with these regulations and with all aspects of the criteria. Furthermore, it is recommended that the requirements and marking criteria be also made clear to candidates, so that a good understanding of what is required of them and how to interpret their own progress may help towards increased motivation.

### Assessment

The following points are a reminder of the mandatory requirements of the current Specification:

- A candidate's submission must be drawn from **3 different Contexts** (and therefore not sub-Contexts). The five *Contexts* offered in total, with their *sub-Contexts*, are listed in *Appendix A* of the Specification (p.27) and are subsequently glossed in considerable detail (pp.42 - 48). It will be realised that this differentiation of *Contexts* is designed to lead candidates to explore different fields of vocabulary and phrasing and to offer greater potential for different task-related structures. Implicit here is therefore also the prompt to sample more widely from within the *Defined Content* for the language.
- Each candidate's submission must include a minimum of **one** item completed under *Controlled Conditions*. Teachers are urged to 'over-insure' where candidate attendance is known to be poor.
- A candidate may have recourse to **a dictionary only** when writing under *Controlled Conditions*. *Controlled* items may under no circumstances be word-processed.
- A candidate must cover successfully all 3 principal tenses or time frames - present, past and future - within the three pieces of the overall submission. Failure to do so will mean that the candidate cannot score a *Communication* mark higher than 6 for *any* of the three pieces submitted.
- **Length:** the directives here are generous, but teachers are reminded that particularly short items within a short overall word count may not be entitled to the full range of **Communication** marks. This reflects the standard length recommendations for the different grade levels. (*Ref: Appendix E, para. 5.2, and the Notes following the Communication mark-scheme, paragraph 6.*). Thus: -
  - an item of **less than 140 words** within an overall word count of less than 400 words may not score more than **7** marks for Communication.
  - an item of **less than 90 words** within an overall word count of less than 250 words may not score more than **5** for Communication.
  - an item of **less than 40 words** within an overall word count of less than 100 words may not score more than **3** for Communication.

*Quality of Language* marks are not similarly reduced, but the outcome is likely to be self-penalising within both mark-schemes.



## Administration

- Centres are required to submit a 'Centre Authentication Statement' (form CCS160) **signed by all teachers** involved in the assessments. *Candidate* Authentication Statements need not be submitted. However, candidates are required to verify for the Moderator the authenticity of their own work by signing the individual Coursework Coversheet as indicated.
- Centres need not wait for the 15th May Coursework deadline to submit marks to the Moderator. Early receipt should in fact help to speed up the return of the request for samples.
- Centres with fewer than 11 candidates should send all their candidates' work, with the authorized list of marks as soon as possible, and without waiting for a request.
- Addition of marks and their transcription should be very carefully checked, to reduce the time-consuming administrative procedures for errors.
- Treasury-tagged work is greatly preferred by Moderators, this being much easier to work with. However, each candidate's work should be properly collated.
- Details of tasks set, with these clearly assigned to different teachers where appropriate, should be included with the samples. Without these it is not possible for the Moderator to consider this element of the *Communication* mark, except to some extent eventually – but clearly rather unsatisfactorily - by comparison with other candidates' items.
- Candidates' work should not be annotated in any way.
- Candidates' work should show accurate word counts and all relevant sources should be listed.
- An explanation of any obvious discrepancy between *Independent* items and *Controlled* should always be given.

### Advice specific to Spanish Coursework

This year moderators found a great number of arithmetic errors in the submissions. These errors, if not rectified, could lead to a wrong grade being awarded. Hard-pressed subject teachers might like to ask someone to check that the 6 figures on the front cover have been totalled correctly and that the correct total has been transferred to the OCR Mark Sheet.

- Excessively long pieces of coursework only serve to irritate the moderator. Pieces of coursework of thousands of words were not uncommon. 'Longer sequences' in the mark scheme should not engender longer essays.
- For more able pupils, more challenging tasks should be set. It is not in the interests of more able candidates to be set just tasks like '*lo que hiciste*'. Tasks which encourage the candidates to compare and contrast, say, would be more appropriate.
- Adaptation of a model (e.g. a letter of complaint to a hotel) should be avoided by all but the least able of candidates.
- To gain top marks in Quality of Language, ambitious, complex vocabulary and grammar are required.
- Internal moderation should be given a high priority in order to avoid order of merit problems.
- Moderators reported that the word processing of coursework was often counter-productive: candidates frequently omitted accents.
- A number of centres were setting tasks and sub-tasks in English rather than in Spanish. **Some centres gave only the title and not the sub-tasks, making the moderator's task impossible.**

**General Certificate of Secondary Education Spanish 1928**

**June 2006 Assessment Series**

**Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a*	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	u
<b>2381/01</b>	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	41	34	27	20	13	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2381/02</b>	Raw	50	45	40	33	26	20	17	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
<b>2382/01</b>	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	27	21	15	9	3	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2382/02</b>	Raw	50	40	34	29	25	19	16	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
<b>2383/01</b>	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	35	29	24	19	14	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2383/02</b>	Raw	50	40	35	28	22	17	14	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
<b>2384/01</b>	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	37	29	21	13	5	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2384/02</b>	Raw	50	43	34	25	16	9	5	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
<b>2385/01</b>	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	27	21	15	9	3	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2385/02</b>	Raw	50	40	34	29	25	19	16	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
<b>2386/01</b>	Raw	90	82	76	67	58	47	36	26	16	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10	0

### Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
<b>1928</b>	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	40	0

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

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U	Total No. of Cands
<b>1928</b>	15.9	34.8	54.1	78.5	92.6	97.9	99.6	100.0	100.0	8862

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication







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

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@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**

© OCR 2006

