

# **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2007**

**1928/MS/R/07**

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 mark scheme is 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.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
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	1
2382 01/02 & 2385 01/02	Speaking Speaking	4
2383 01/02	Reading	7
2384 01/02	Writing	9
2386	Writing Coursework	10
*	Grade Thresholds	12

## 2381/01 and 02 – Spanish Listening

### General Comments

It is very pleasing to be able to report that the administration of the examinations appears to have been done very efficiently in the vast majority of centres, with all the scripts in candidate number order and sent to examiners in the correct foundation and higher tier packets. We do understand that in centres with large numbers of candidates this examination may take place in several different rooms simultaneously, and so we are grateful for all your efforts in handling it so well.

The five minutes' reading time before the start of the tape had clearly been well used by candidates who made annotations on their papers. Many centres had clearly trained their candidates in this practice to excellent effect.

Similarly candidates made very few mistakes in the interpretation of the rubrics, and had followed instructions well.

Most candidates made their intended answers clear to the examiner, but it is still worth reminding candidates of the need to write clearly, especially where they are writing single letter answers; an H can all too easily look like an M. It might cause some eye-rolling on the part of candidates, but five minutes' class practice writing block capitals the lesson before the exam could make all the difference.

Comments on individual questions

### Section 1: Foundation Tier only

- Ex 1** All questions were answered well by most candidates. Question 4 caused the most problems.
- Ex 2** Most candidates answered without difficulty and scored full marks. Questions 9 and 13 caused the most difficulties.
- Ex 3** Most candidates answered well. Question 16 was the least well answered and question 19 the best known.
- Ex 4** The level of difficulty rose slightly in this exercise and the weakest candidates started to struggle, although overall the exercise worked well. Questions 3 and 4 were the best answered.
- Ex 5** This exercise proved a good differentiator. For the weakest candidates the weather was not well known, with the exception of *sol*. Questions 21, 22 and 23 were much better answered than 24, 25 and 26. There was a marked difference between centres here: some had revised the weather and others hadn't.

### Section 2: Foundation and Higher Tier

- Ex 1** Most Candidates at foundation tier and nearly all at higher found this exercise accessible, and it was pleasing to see how many had understood *quince días* on the tape and answered correctly in question 2; similarly in question 4 candidates had listened carefully to the entirety of the recorded material and worked out the correct answer. Centres are clearly training candidates well in examination technique.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2007

- Ex 2** Questions 6, 7 and 8 were correctly answered by most candidates. However all but the best stumbled on question 9. *Jabón* was not known by the majority and a common wrong answer was B.  
Questions 10 and 11 also presented difficulty for foundation candidates, although almost everybody got question 12 right.  
It is worth pointing out to teachers that we try to avoid use of the letter I in these exercises to avoid possible confusion with handwriting, so this explains the jump from H to J in the labelling of the pictures. Candidates can do their bit by making sure they always form their letters clearly when they write their answers.
- Ex 3** This exercise presented few problems for higher tier candidates, with the exception of question 18. *La pesca* was not associated with *río*, *cañas* or *truchas* on the tape. Pleasingly many foundation candidates also performed well on this exercise. Candidates dealt well with the grid format of the question.

### Section 3: Higher Tier only

- Ex 1** This exercise proved difficult for some candidates who perhaps struggled with the more abstract nature of the vocabulary relating to emotions and feelings. This is a question targeted at the lower end of grade A and so it does require candidates to listen carefully and make deductions based on several pieces of information. Questions 1 and 2 were answered quite well, while question 3 was the best answered - perhaps the candidates identified with Clara! Similarly question 7 was quite well dealt with. It appeared on many scripts that candidates had written their initial answers in rough next to the names of the speakers and then transferred them to the boxes after the second playing of the recording. This is further evidence of good training in examination technique, as one potential pitfall of this kind of question is that if candidates get the first few questions wrong, confusion sets in, or they feel they have used up their options and so end up guessing.
- Ex2** This exercise was designed to differentiate between the able and the very able and seems to have been effective.  
Question 10 was the most difficult and question.  
Q11 was the most accessible  
Relatively few candidates scored full marks on this exercise. Candidates need to understand that they must listen carefully to everything that is said in section 3 exercises and that at this level they will be expected to be able to separate the information relevant to the answer from that which is there to distract. This is increasingly the case as the paper progresses. The key advice centres can give to their candidates about section 3 is to listen hard, not jump to conclusions and try to find more than one piece of information to confirm their answer.
- Ex 3** Pleasingly many candidates performed well on this exercise; *trajes* and *bufanda* did cause some problems though. Candidates had tried hard to write down what they thought they had heard on the tape but hadn't quite managed it; this implies that they had never come across these words before.  
There are three points worth making here: firstly that candidates need to realise that the word they have to write down will appear on the tape, and that they won't need to change its form; secondly that a little work in centres before the exam on the rules of Spanish spelling: double letters, vowel sounds and so on could just help. And the third more general point is that it is important with higher level candidates to revisit and broaden out areas of vocabulary that are often taught in the first few months of learning a language but may easily never go beyond that initial basic level. Revision and amplification of topics like clothes and colours is still worth doing, even with the most able candidates, because the 'purple track-suit' may always rear its ugly head. The specification's defined vocabulary content is a good starting point.



**Ex 4** In this exercise candidates were good at identifying the *Tema* but often struggled to link it to the *Opinión*. Only the best candidates scored full marks. Here again there was good use of annotation, although it was noticeable that quite a number of candidates had mistakenly annotated *peligroso*, indicating that they didn't know what it meant.

**Ex 5** As is to be expected, this exercise proved very hard for many candidates. Question 22 was the most difficult and candidates perhaps struggled with the change of time-frame as well as finding a way to express what they had heard in English. It really only needed them to say 'people in the country are better off', but the few correct answers that there were arrived at by quite a circuitous route. It was good to see that so many candidates understood the subtlety of the double negative in question 25 and correctly answered '*not bad*' indicating an element of 'qualified liking'. A common wrong answer for 26 was '*nothing in particular*', and many candidates had picked up on something to do with health but didn't know the word *suerte*.

There were almost no cases of candidates answering in the wrong language, which once again is an indication of all the positive preparation work that is taking place the classroom.

## 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.

As in previous years, examiners reported that candidates were generally very well prepared both in terms of the Spanish they could produce but also in their understanding of the format of the exam. Very competent performances were in evidence in both tiers and some were indeed excellent. Teachers handled students in a sympathetic and supportive manner and used their skill to enable candidates to produce proficient demonstrations of their ability and knowledge.

The administration of the tests and the completion of the mark sheets were mostly handled very efficiently and our thanks are extended to many teachers for their thoughtful and extremely helpful labelling and batching of their candidates' tests, especially where large numbers are concerned. 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. Attention is drawn to the advice contained at the beginning of the Teachers' 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 mark. Teachers are urged to check regularly the quality of their recordings, as the standard can vary even within a centre. For example, examiners reported problems in understanding clearly recordings where the initial part was faint, the start of the recording being 'faded' in; recordings where extraneous noise intruded; those where candidates were restless and hit or kicked the table or moved items around it and those where the microphone was ill-positioned to capture the candidates' utterances. None of these will work to the benefit of the candidates.

The timing of individual sections of the test has greatly improved over time, with many teachers using stop watches. However, this year, as last, examiners reported a number of seemingly deliberately curtailed Discussions, sometimes of under a minute, a feature which will tend to lower the marks awarded.

Candidates sometimes lose marks, especially in discrete role-play tasks, by poor pronunciation of individual sounds, particularly those not a feature of English, or by stressing the wrong syllable within a word. This year, the [X] in *naranja* (suggested in a Section 1 role play) was frequently poorly produced. In a Section 2, and again in a Section 3, role play, *regalo* was often rendered as *régalo* and, in other parts of the test, items such as *me levante* and *me ducho* were offered as preterite forms, whereas *trabajaré* and *visitaré* were used when referring to the future. In general terms, teachers' attention is particularly drawn to the Presentation section which is where pronunciation can deteriorate as candidates over-rehearse or rush, leading to a garbled version being produced.

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 and 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.

In the role play about school, bad pronunciation of some subjects, e.g. *geografía* may have lost some a mark.

In the social-arrangements role play, a number of candidates had trouble asking the price, which, given this item's frequent appearance, was unexpected, and, for some, *sábado*, or at least its pronunciation proved problematic. A small number of candidates confused *¿Cuánto ...?* with *¿Cuándo...?*

In the role play about favourite sports, there were no particular problems unless the candidate chose to ignore the cue in the fourth item and gave anything other than a positive opinion. Teachers are reminded of the guidance at the beginning of the Teachers' Booklet whereby teachers are encouraged to query candidates' utterances without necessarily reducing the marks available; such action may have been usefully employed to redirect candidates and thereby secure the two marks. If "oranges" were chosen in the food-store situation, poor pronunciation may have reduced the mark awarded but, if a problem was encountered, it was usually in the production of *cien gramos*. Following the demise of the *peseta*, perhaps higher numbers are practised less frequently; some candidates used the English or French *grammes*.

In the final role play, set at the train station, a good number of candidates offered *trece* rather than the required *tres*, whilst an attempt to request a single ticket was often in the form of *single* or *simple* (both offered with Spanish pronunciation) or *individual*. Once again, asking the price was difficult for some.

### Section 2: Role-plays

In the role play centred on hiring a bike, some candidates, mostly Foundation, did not know *alquilar*. In the situation set in the travel agency, *billete*, or a suitable alternative, was often forgotten or sometimes poorly pronounced. Similarly unknown by some was *cambiar* and many were unable to produce *reservé* in the last task, with some offering *tengo un taxi ayer*.

General expressions of being unwell proved difficult for some to produce in the Cuban chemist's shop.

In the gift-shop role play, most mistakes were made, as mentioned above, in the pronunciation of *regalo* or in candidates' failure to produce it at all.

*Perdí* or *he perdido* was widely known by Higher Tier and better Foundation Tier candidates but some then had difficulty with *chaqueta*. In this same role play, *hasta* was frequently unknown for the third task as was *viernes* by even some Higher Tier candidates. The unprepared question *¿De dónde ...?* is still often unrecognised by candidates; many believed the question to be *¿Dónde ...?* and replied accordingly.

### 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 (see reference to 'interjections' in Mark Scheme) and losing the candidates marks. At the other extreme, some teachers adopt a question-and-answer approach, which denies candidates the opportunity to display their ability to develop points, again losing the candidates marks. 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 that candidates generally launch into their account without a general statement outlining the situation which would serve to set the scene. If candidates were encouraged to do this, their narrative would, in most cases, get off to a better start.

No specific problems were encountered other than, as in previous years, candidates struggled to produce weather expressions in the Preterite and Imperfect tenses.

### **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. Some centres appear to operate a 'template' approach with all presentations following the same format and subsequent discussions being based on the very same questions. Examiners reported that this approach failed to differentiate adequately between candidates and often did not allow some candidates the opportunity to produce original work, thus again losing marks. Candidates should be encouraged to include some opinions and, if possible, justifications in order to access higher marks. Teachers' attention is drawn to the criterion of 'delivery of material', mentioned in the Mark Scheme and to comments earlier in this report regarding poor pronunciation and intonation. The timing of this part of the test was largely accurate.

### **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 stimulates the candidate to reiterate material already produced in the presentation. A feature commented upon by many examiners was the brevity of a number of Discussions; one minute, rather than the requisite (approximately) two, was common. Such a shortfall will tend to lose marks when finalising the Communication mark for the Discussion and General Conversation.

### **General Conversation**

The most 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. Some candidates acquit themselves well and are accurate, but the range of language they use is fairly limited and they tend to repeat or 'recycle' whole sections throughout the test, for example in the Section 3 Role Play and the Discussion or General Conversation. They therefore lose the opportunity to demonstrate a wider range of language, which could improve their overall quality of language mark. 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' items (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 over-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 great majority of tests were well conducted in such a fashion as to allow candidates to produce of their best and acquit themselves well. There was evidence of some excellent preparatory work on the part of teachers and candidates, exploited to good effect by skilful questioning in the test, which elicited in some cases a high standard of Spanish with some candidates producing a mature exposition of their opinions and ideas.

## 2383/01 & 02 – Spanish Reading

### General comments

As in previous years, Examiners reported that the need to learn basic vocabulary should not be underestimated, particularly in the Foundation Tier. Examiners were surprised at the lack of understanding of key words such as *saco de dormir*, *sombrero* and *tienda* in Section 1 Exercise 2, *pasar la aspiradora* and *cortar el césped* in Section 1 Exercise 5, and for both Foundation and Higher candidates *revista* and *sello* in Section 2 Exercise 2.

Examiners reported that very few candidates were entered at an inappropriate level. The majority of candidates found the papers accessible and achieved accordingly.

At each Tier, candidates tended to score well in their first section whilst the second section provided a broader range of marks..

There was evidence of good time management, with the vast majority of candidates managing to complete the paper. There were very few instances of candidates leaving blanks in any section or over-ticking in Section 2 Exercise 1, and there was evidence of many candidates making sensible annotations, crossing out options used, or using highlighters on text. There was a high level of understanding of rubrics, though a small number of candidates did use their own choice of vocabulary in the gap-filling exercise in Section 2 rather than selecting from the choices given.

There were very few instances of candidates answering Section 3 Exercise 5 in the wrong language. As in previous years, those who did so lost marks.

Centres should remind candidates that their final choices should be written clearly. This is particularly important when the answer is a letter such as in Section 1 Exercises 2 and 5 or Section 3 Exercises 1 and 2. Examiners should not expect to have to choose between two letters given, nor have to decipher hastily altered letters. The need for answers being written in good, clear English in Section 3 Exercise 5 should also be emphasized.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Section 1

- Exercise 1** Almost all candidates scored full marks.
- Exercise 2** Some candidates did not know the words *saco de dormir* or *sombrero*, and many failed to identify correctly *tienda* in the context of camping.
- Exercise 3** This exercise was generally well answered, with only a small number of candidates confusing *este* and *oeste*. Surprisingly many candidates who got question 18 wrong gave B (*geografía*) as their answer, despite this being a near-cognate.
- Exercise 4** This exercise was well done, with the main error being on questions 23 and 24 – candidates appeared to have difficulties with the meaning of *peluquería* and *desayuno*.
- Exercise 5** The main words here which caused problems were *Pasar la aspiradora* and *Cortar el césped*.

## Section 2

- Exercise 1** This exercise was done well, with the majority of candidates achieving full marks. Where inaccuracies were present, these were generally when candidates opted for A or K as one of the ticks. Very few candidates were reported as having over-ticked the boxes.
- Exercise 2** Foundation candidates found this exercise difficult and frequently did not know the word *cajero automático* or failed to link the word *sello* with *Correos*. Many candidates opted for *Isabel* as the answer to question 10.
- Exercise 3** This exercise was generally well answered, but *principios*, *finales*, *doce* and *seis* all commonly appeared as answers to Question 17 (the latter two presumably because candidates felt this question was requiring a date). A minority of candidates failed to read the rubrics correctly and thus inserted their own answers rather than choosing from the options given.

## Section 3

- Exercise 1** This exercise was generally well answered.
- Exercise 2** This exercise was disappointing, with many candidates having problems in particular with *vela*, *cartera*, *fontanero* and *ahorrar*.
- Exercise 3** This exercise was answered well by the majority of candidates. The only frequent error was amongst candidates who failed to associate *sólida* with *dura: suave* was a common but incorrect answer.
- Exercise 4** Many candidates lost marks through writing answers which were too long and therefore contradicted themselves, or through simply 'lifting' inappropriately from the text.
- Exercise 5** The most successful candidates tended to write the most succinct answers. Question 26 was answered well, but in question 27 many candidates missed the superlative idea of what Pedro 'most' wanted to do. Many also translated *hago* as 'I have'. In question 28 some candidates missed the point that he was proud that his records had sold so well 'in Spanish' in a predominantly English-speaking country. For question 29 *aprovechar* was often rendered as 'approve' or 'appreciate'. In response to question 30 only the very best managed to successfully translate *probarse* and *superarse*, with many guessing the latter to be something to do with a 'super army' or 'superstar'.

## 2384/01 and 02 – Spanish Writing

### General Comments

The best candidates displayed a wide range of vocabulary and use of tenses. However, some candidates tried to use pre-learnt idioms at the expense of accuracy of verbs and more straightforward vocabulary.

Examiners reported an increasing number of candidates writing over-long answers. Accuracy suffers when a candidate writes a lengthy answer and the quality rarely improves. And the result is often the writing of gratuitous and irrelevant material.

Examiners requested that centres should emphasise the importance of clear handwriting and paragraphs.

Comments on individual questions

### Section 1 Foundation Tier only

- Ex 1** Most candidates managed this exercise well and were successful in producing a list of 8 words. However, there is still confusion between Spanish and French vocabulary.
- Ex 2** There was an overall improvement, with many more candidates correctly spelling the verb.
- Ex 3** This exercise was dealt with more adequately this year. There were fewer incidents of sentences with no verb though some candidates still continue to treat this exercise as a series of answers to questions. Nevertheless, there seemed to be more answers scoring full marks than in previous years.

### Section 2 Foundation and Higher Tier

Question 2 was more popular than Question 1.

Those who chose Question 1 coped well with the description of the hospital and gave a clear opinion of their stay. However, they sometimes lacked the vocabulary to cope with why they were in hospital. There were a few instances of 'pre-learnt' material to do with accidents.

In Question 2, candidates often failed to emphasise what they liked about the trip and just gave a description of what they did.

In both questions, Tasks 2 and 3 often tended to merge and at times it was difficult to deduce which task the candidate was attempting.

### Section 3 Higher Tier only

Question 2 was more popular than Question 1.

In Question 1, candidates coped well with Tasks 1, 2 and 4, but were a little more uncertain with Task 3.

In Question 2, Task 2 confused candidates and many failed to comment on what they liked the most. Task 3 was not always answered with a suitable tense, and many candidates resorted to listing differences.

## 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:

### Marking Criteria

OCR has noted a significant number of Centres erring on the side of generosity when awarding marks for Communication and Quality of Language. Centres that have been marking over-leniently are advised to make every effort to rectify the problem to avoid having their marks reduced in a future session. Centres should particularly avoid the temptation to add extra marks up to the limit of what they believe to be a current margin of tolerance.

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.
- When writing under *Controlled Conditions*, a candidate may have recourse to a **dictionary only**. *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 overall submission in order to merit consideration for a *Communication* mark of **7** and above in *any* of the three pieces submitted. This reflects the notional requirement stated as signal grade descriptor for Grade C and above.
- **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, para. 6.*). Thus: -
- If the overall word count is less than 400 words, a piece of **less than 140 words** may not score more than **7** marks for Communication.
- If the overall word count is less than 250 words, a piece of **less than 90 words** not score more than **5** for Communication.
- If the overall word count is less than 100 words, a piece of **less than 40 words** may not score more than **3** for Communication.

*Quality of Language* marks are not as such 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.

*The Moderator must be in receipt of the coursework marks no later than May 15. Teachers are urged to submit their marks earlier, if at all possible.*

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.

Task details, with clear assigning 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.

Internal moderation is a crucial part of the process. Centres must ensure that it is carried out rigorously and regularly as discrepancies within teaching groups may result in the centre being asked to re-assess the work of all their candidates.

Whilst it is understood that candidates perform less well under pressure and so their mark for their controlled piece may be inferior to their independent pieces, Teachers should always investigate cases where there is a discrepancy of 10 marks or more and give an explanation for the disparity on the candidate's coversheet.

### **Advice specific to Spanish Coursework**

Again 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. Subject teachers should 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. Internal moderation should be given a high priority in order to avoid order of merit problems.

Excessively long pieces of coursework rarely earn better marks and are a headache for the Moderator. 'Longer sequences' in the mark scheme should not engender longer essays. More able Candidates need to be set tasks which require them to describe and explain their views and reactions rather than just narrate events with the occasional basic opinion and justification thrown in. To gain top marks in *Quality of Language*, ambitious, complex vocabulary and grammar are required. On the other hand, setting a task which is too challenging penalises

## *Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

weaker Candidates, who feel out of their depth as they do not have the level of language to express their ideas successfully. Some E-F-G Candidates would have achieved better results had they been set tasks appropriate to their ability.

A number of centres set 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 of confirming the Communication mark very difficult.

Whilst very weak Candidates can benefit from the use of a template or a writing frame, as it allows them to substitute words and phrases, this is not acceptable for more able Candidates, who should be encouraged to develop their own ideas and language. Moderators soon become aware that templates are being used, as Candidates' work follows the same format and uses the same phrases. Candidates cannot be expected to achieve high marks for Communication and Quality of Language when they have merely completed a gap-filling exercise, since in effect they are merely substituting words and phrases. Centres are reminded that is a national descriptor for grade F.

Moderators reported that the word processing of coursework was often counter-productive: candidates frequently omitted accents.

### **Conclusion**

The most successful Centres were those where the Teachers had carefully read the specification and read the coursework reports of previous years and who had been able to attend INSET sessions. These were able to guide their Candidates through the whole process more effectively, and the work submitted by their Candidates, at all levels, was a credit to them.



## General Certificate of Secondary Education Spanish 1928 June 2007 Assessment Session

### 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	40	32	25	18	11	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2381/02</b>	Raw	50	43	38	31	24	18	15	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	43	37	31	25	19	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2383/02</b>	Raw	50	43	39	33	28	22	19	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	40	31	23	15	7	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
<b>2384/02</b>	Raw	50	44	36	27	19	11	7	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	59	48	37	26	15	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)

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

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

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total No. of Cands</b>
<b>1928</b>	16.5	36.6	56.4	77.8	91.5	97.5	99.7	100.0	100.0	9036

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 Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

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**

© OCR 2007

