

# **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2008**

**1928/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

### General Certificate of Secondary Education

### Spanish (1928)

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
2381 01/02 Listening	1
2382/5 01/02 Speaking	3
2383 01/02 Reading	7
2384 01/02 Writing	10
2386 Writing Coursework	12
Grade Thresholds	14

## 2381 01/02 Listening

### General Comments

This year's examination produced some very pleasing responses and teachers are to be congratulated for all their hard work in preparing their candidates. There were relatively few cases of candidates who appeared to be entered for the wrong tier, which is encouraging and shows that centres are applying effective criteria in their own assessments and judging their candidates' abilities accurately. There are clearly some good 'assessment for learning' practices in place

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.

It is worth pointing out here that the marking is now an on-line system which occasionally makes it difficult for examiners to distinguish between candidates' pencilled notes and their answers in ink. Centres are therefore advised to encourage their candidates to cross out clearly any notes lest they should accidentally invalidate otherwise creditable answers  
Candidates made very few mistakes in the interpretation of the rubrics, and 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. This is a perennial problem and, as pointed out last year five minutes' class practice writing block capitals the lesson before the exam could make a difference.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Section 1 Foundation Tier only

- Ex 1** All questions were answered well by most candidates. Question 3 caused the most problems.
- Ex 2** Most candidates answered without difficulty and scored full marks. Questions 9 and 10 caused the most difficulties.
- Ex 3** Most candidates answered well. This is an area of vocabulary that seemed well known.
- Ex 4** The level of difficulty rose slightly in this exercise and the weakest candidates started to struggle, although household chores seemed to be an area of vocabulary which was well known, and the exercise differentiated well.
- Ex 5** This exercise proved a good differentiator. For the weakest candidates parts of the body were not well known, even though they typically come up in role-plays in the speaking test.

## Section 2 Foundation and Higher Tier

- Ex 1** Most candidates at Foundation tier and nearly all at Higher found this exercise accessible, but question 3 caused the most difficulty - many having heard the word *gasolina*. It is worth reminding candidates that at this level they need to do more than understand one word, but also take into account the context of what they hear.
- Ex 2** This question really started to reveal the more able candidates and it was clear that foundation candidates were being stretched by having to deal with a relatively long exercise with a constantly shifting time-frame. The 'present' aspects were understood better than the past, and Question 9 seemed to cause the most difficulties. This said, many candidates dealt with this question very well and gained high marks.
- Ex 3** Candidates dealt well with this exercise and it proved a good differentiator.

## 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 and the need to do 'joined up thinking' to arrive at the answers. 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.
- Ex2** This multiple choice exercise required candidates to understand not just gist but also detail, and, as would be expected at this level, there were distractions which lead some candidates in the wrong direction. This is especially true of Questions 7 and 9.
- Ex 3** Candidates dealt well with the grid format of this question but the pace of the recorded material was closer to normal speed and the themes were quite varied, requiring a good range of vocabulary to deal well with all the questions. It is worth centres pointing out to candidates that it is very important only to tick one box in this kind of exercise, because multiple ticks in a vertical column automatically invalidate a correct answer; this is an example of where it is vital to cross out any tentative answers and make final intentions crystal clear to examiners.
- Ex 4** This exercise proved testing for all but the most able candidates. It is important for candidates to understand that in this exercise the word they need to write will be heard on the tape and will not need to be manipulated in any way. *Pájaro* was not well known, and in Question 20 *pepita* was a common wrong answer.
- Ex 5** At this level we are testing candidates' understanding and interpretation of what they have heard in a longer and extended recorded piece. Many candidates found this exercise difficult, and words like *harta* and *bosques* were not widely known. It is important for centres to continue to offer some 'stretch and challenge' to these most able candidates, and it was noticeable that there were some apparently very able candidates who perhaps hadn't been encouraged to work enough outside their 'comfort-zone' in terms of vocabulary acquisition.

## 2382/5 01/02 Speaking

### General Comments

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

Examiners again reported that candidates were generally very well prepared both in terms of their Spanish and also in their understanding of the format of the exam. Very competent performances were in evident in both tiers and some were indeed excellent. The vast majority of 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. There were a few cases, however, of poor conduct of the test on the part of the teacher leading to candidates being disadvantaged.

The administration of the tests and the completion of the mark sheets were again mostly handled very efficiently but there are still some problems and so we take this opportunity to reiterate the value of checking the advice contained at the beginning of the Teachers' Booklet each year as part of the preparation prior to conducting the tests.

Centres which present candidates at 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, since the labels are used to determine their eventual storage location and to facilitate their retrieval should there be any subsequent query regarding results.

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.

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 are reminded to label both the tapes (or disks) and the cassette cases (or disk envelopes) with the details of the centre and the candidates recorded.

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

Teachers are encouraged to share good practice within their centre and, where possible, to attend INSET in order to clarify issues and be aware of the demands of particular sections of the test.

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 3 role play, *regalo* was often rendered as *régalo*, even by a small number of teachers and, in other parts of the test, items such as *me levante* and *me ducho* were offered as Preterite forms, whereas *trabajar* and *visitar* were used when referring to the future. In general terms, teachers' attention is particularly drawn to the Presentation section where a garbled version can be produced as pronunciation deteriorates when candidates over-rehearse or rush.

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

The role play asking for directions to the Town Hall was mostly handled well but a mark may have been lost in the poor or totally anglicised pronunciation of *autobús*.

In the Chilean-cafe role play, pronunciation of *queso* [frequently given as *qüeso*] or *jamón* [sometimes *jambon* offered or no attempt made to produce X/ sound] let some candidates down and some could not produce *la cuenta* or *¿Cuánto es?* in the last task. A common mistake was to offer *billetes*.

Buying an ice-cream in Spain led to many an aspirate /h/ in *helado*; a small number of candidates offered *polo*, which was acceptable. Flavours of ice-cream were not a problem to most although an English or French rendering of *chocolate* lost marks. Some candidates could not produce *¿Cuánto es?* in the third task but asking for the beach was generally adequately done.

Shopping at a grocer's was usually well executed although poor pronunciation may have lost marks in *naranja*; *queso* or *jamón* if these were chosen but poorly produced. As in other role plays, asking the price, in the last task, was sometimes problematic.

There were no obvious problems in the role play based on a telephone conversation, but it must be said that *diga* and *dígame* were almost totally absent, with *hola* used instead.

### Section 2 Role-Plays

Candidates were tested on their ability to produce a past tense of a common verb, to use an infinitive with a construction such as *quiero*; *me gustaría* or *quisiera*; to give two details of something or someone and to respond appropriately to an unprepared question. For weaker candidates, the structure element was challenging. Many candidates at both tiers responded well to some of the unprepared questions; *¿Cuánto tiempo .... ?* proved to be the most difficult.

In the role play about the previous summer's job, most problems arose if candidates could not give *trabajé* accurately. The second task, mentioning the uniform worn, was well done and, after a little hesitation in some cases, candidates were usually successful in the third item. Many struggled to produce *este (año)* in the last task to gain full marks.

In expressing their wish to study Spanish in Costa Rica, some candidates had difficulty in producing the infinitive of *estudiar*, if this was the case, they produced *estudio* instead. The second task was well executed but, in the third, the frequent confusion between *España* and *español* lost a mark for some candidates. *¿Cuándo?*, in the unprepared question was sometimes problematic.

In the situation set in a clothes shop in Peru, some candidates did not know *camiseta*. In the third task, there was frequently confusion with French, candidates producing *arrivé ayer*. The unprepared question, based on *¿Cuánto tiempo ... ?* was the poorest answered of all the unprepared questions.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2008

*Perdí* or *he perdido* was widely known by Higher Tier and by the better Foundation Tier candidates when referring to the lost sibling. A small number used their initiative to produce *no sé dónde está ...* or *no encuentro ...* The other parts of the role play were mostly well done, including the unprepared question.

Talking about their studies was largely straightforward for most. Some mispronunciation of *historia* (*historía* or a strongly aspirated /h/) lost some marks as did a poorly-pronounced *geografía*, if selected in the third task. The unprepared question was very well answered.

### Section 3 Role-Plays

A balance needs to be struck in this section. At one extreme, some candidates are allowed to narrate events as a monologue with no participation from the teacher at all. These candidates lose marks because they are not allowed to meet the criteria (see reference to 'interjections' in Mark Scheme). At the other extreme, some teachers adopt a smothering question-and-answer approach, which means that candidates lose marks because they are not allowed the opportunity to display their ability to develop points. These extremes are outlined as guidance; fortunately most teachers do strike a balance and some very pleasing work is produced; some accounts from able, thoughtful candidates are indeed superb.

Candidates often 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.

Centres are reminded that the verbal cues in each box are presented as stimuli to the candidates to indicate possible areas for exploration and exploitation. Teachers do not need to slavishly pursue candidates to address each and every verbal or visual cue. A balanced storyline is sought so that, provided that the candidate refers to one main point in each picture box, along with some other detail, an appropriate narrative should result.

The only specific problems encountered were a difficulty on the part of some to produce *jugué* accurately, *juegue* (sic) usually being offered; some reluctance to outline the specific domestic tasks carried out and often a problem in producing weather expressions in the Preterite and Imperfect tenses. It is disappointing when candidates do not take the opportunity to employ judiciously the vocabulary given to them, for example: *premio*; *concurso* and *subir la montaña*.

### Presentation

Candidates had prepared well for this section and a wide variety of topics was discussed. Some excellent work was produced. The topics were usually well chosen and were within the candidates' experience and ability but care should be taken with certain topics, for example that of a famous person, to ensure that the presentation is not wholly factual as, in order to access the higher marks, candidates need to include some opinions and justifications. Teachers' attention is drawn to the criterion of 'delivery of material', mentioned in the Mark Scheme as well as to comments earlier in this report regarding poor pronunciation and intonation. The timing of this part of the test was largely accurate.

### Discussion and General Conversation

In both the Discussion and the General Conversation, the weakest candidates found it hard to include an accurate verb in their responses: verbs were either omitted, unclear, wrong or parroted from the question offered to them. The highest scoring of the Higher Tier candidates produced a range of verb forms in a variety of lexis, structure and tense and regularly expressed themselves with



*Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

more than a simple response to the question asked. The teacher's role in ensuring appropriate questioning of candidates is paramount if the latter are to be allowed to demonstrate their ability. As in previous years, a few teachers seemed to have a prepared 'script' with questions and answers recited by each party. On occasions, teachers put questions to candidates without taking into account the information already given by the candidate, making any discussion or conversation very disjointed and, presumably, confusing to the candidate. A further problem is a much truncated discussion or conversation. It must be stressed that all of these techniques can reduce the marks available to candidates.

On the whole, however, the great majority of tests were well conducted and 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, demonstrated 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 Reading

### General comments

The general impression of Examiners was that the paper was appropriate in terms of difficulty, and differentiated well between Foundation and Higher candidates. Overall, candidates were generally entered for the correct level and managed to find the paper accessible. There were few instances of Foundation candidates who should have been entered for Higher Tier or vice versa.

However, as in previous years, Examiners mentioned the importance of learning key vocabulary which, particularly at Foundation level, can mean the difference between gaining or losing a mark. Words such as *carta* in Section 1 Exercise 1, and *maleta*, *dinero* and *gafas* in Section 1 Exercise 2 were not well known. Similarly some candidates had difficulty copying words from lists. Some candidates also failed to write their answer on the line which caused one or two marking problems and may lead to the loss of marks.

A small number of candidates opted to write their own answers to Section 2 Exercise 2 rather than selecting words from the options given, and there were several cases of candidates 'over-ticking' in Section 2 Exercise 3 and a very few who completed Section 3 Exercises 3 and 4 in the wrong language.

There was evidence of good time management with almost all candidates managing to complete the paper. Rubrics were generally well understood and there were very few 'no responses'. As last year there was evidence that candidates were making sensible annotations and crossing out incorrect answers, so employing a process of elimination to the multi-choice exercises. However, candidates should be reminded to take care when 'lifting' answers from the text, as those which do not serve as an accurate response are marked as incorrect. Similarly a number of candidates wrote alternatives when the question demanded one answer. Again, candidates are reminded that it is not in their interest to present the Examiner with a 'list' of possible answers instead of making a decision on what is or is not the correct answer.

Finally, the need to write legible answers should once again be highlighted. Hand-writing was at times poor, and on occasions letters in multi-choice exercises were unclear. Candidates should also be reminded to write their answers clearly in the box.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section 1

- Exercise 1** Almost all candidates scored full marks.
- Exercise 2** Again, very good responses, with Questions 6, 7 and 8 almost always correct. Questions 9, 10 (frequently given as E) and 11 gave the most problems.
- Exercise 3** This exercise was completed well.
- Exercise 4** Again, a well answered exercise, though some candidates confused Pablo and Dolores. The final four names were nearly always correct.

**Exercise 5** Candidates seldom scored full marks on this exercise. Vocabulary consisted of straightforward shopping and everyday vocabulary and yet many failed to show an understanding of *coche* or to associate *aparcar* with *aparcamiento*. Only Question 30 was done uniformly well.

## Section 2

**Exercise 1** This activity was completed well by Higher tier candidates, but significantly less so by Foundation tier candidates. Questions 4 and 6 were often swapped, as were Questions 7 and 8. Question 5 was often answered incorrectly as 12.

**Exercise 2** Candidates found this activity difficult. Question 9 was usually correct, but in Question 10 candidates frequently gave *fácil* as the incorrect response. *Madre* was often given incorrectly as the answer to Question 13, *peligro* and *campo* were frequently written for Question 14, and Question 15 often received *peligro* as the answer instead of *interés*. In the case of the latter, where the correct response was chosen it was frequently spelt incorrectly (though candidates were not penalised for this).

**Exercise 3** This activity was generally done well, with very few candidates over-ticking.

## Section 3

**Exercise 1** This exercise was generally well done.

**Exercise 2** This exercise was well done. Common errors were where candidates gave L as the incorrect answer to Question 11, and in Questions 16-19 the answers 'K', 'B' and 'J' were often interchanged.

**Exercise 3** This exercise gave mixed results. Stronger candidates coped well. However, a significant number of candidates failed to understand *aprendizaje* and offered *lluvia*, *duro* and *sucio* in its place. Having given the *elefantes* as a correct answer to Question 22 some candidates then failed to add those three animals to the 100 monkeys and 20 lions so 120 was a frequent answer. In answer to Question 24 some candidates incorrectly wrote *cinco días* or *a las ocho* (referring to the number of days Manolo works, or the time at which he starts work). For question 25 most candidates wrote *se ducha* in one form or another (incorrect spelling, as long as the answer was recognisable, was not penalised). Only short responses were required here, as the example indicated. However, some candidates tried to write longer sentences and occasionally contradicted themselves in the process, thus losing the mark. Others lifted parts of sentences from the text which were often grammatically incorrect (for instance *y eso es muy duro* in answer to Question 21 or *aunque el zoo se abre todos los días* to Question 24) and consequently failed to score a mark.

**Exercise 4** This exercise was done quite well. For Question 26 most errors involved the use of 'adult' rather than 'adolescent'. Occasionally candidates wrote that the bungee jump was to demonstrate 'to' young people 'how' to become brave adolescents rather than emphasizing it was in fact showing that a boy had now become an adolescent. Question 27 tended to be answered well, though common errors were 'neck', 'back' or 'head'. A large number of candidates gave the correct answer of 'wind' or 'wind speed' to Question 28, though weaker candidates gave answers such as 'fires', 'the speed of the fall' and 'trees in the way' employing guesswork or perhaps inferring these answers from the mention of *accidentales graves* in the text.

*Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

For Question 29 the majority of candidates correctly identified 'parental permission' as the correct response. However, a substantial number failed to explain the term 'monitor' appropriately; many vaguely wrote 'monitor' (in some cases 'heart monitor'). Some candidates also provided a list here, offering the Examiner two or more definitions of 'monitor'.

## 2384 01/02 Writing

### General Comments

The better candidates displayed a wide range of vocabulary, idiom and tenses. However, the use of pre-learnt idioms was often at the expense of the accuracy of verbs and more straightforward vocabulary.

Examiners noted that pre-learnt complex phrases were often learned by a whole class and then introduced regardless of coherence and appropriateness to the question. A number of candidates are still unable to use all three time frames and at times there is little awareness of exam technique, leading to tasks being omitted. Candidates continue to struggle with *gustar* and its agreement in gender and number.

The importance of clear handwriting and paragraphs cannot be overemphasised.

### Section 1

#### Exercise 1

Candidates managed this exercise well though there is still an issue with French words being used.

#### Exercise 2

Overall there seems to be a general improvement.

#### Exercise 3

Some candidates are still treating this exercise as a series of questions to be answered. Candidates need further practice in answering this question as an email which stands on its own.

### Section 2

Examiners reported that more candidates attempted Question 2 than Question 1. It was felt that candidates lacked the appropriate vocabulary to convey the job they were doing. Many candidates found point 3 particularly difficult, which was to describe an incident that happened while they were babysitting.

The majority of candidates did Question 2 preferring to compare the city to the countryside. This may have proved popular because of topics covered in the Speaking exam.

However, many candidates failed to use the past in point 1 merely saying what they like about living in the city. Some candidates failed to use all three time frames.

**Section 3**

Question 1 was not so popular though there were some interesting descriptions of incidents that happened during the shooting of the film. There were fewer instances of pre-learnt material regarding accidents in this topic. The first point in Question 2 was frequently omitted and candidates often launched straight into a description of their last holiday. Many candidates struggled with the use of the conditional tense in point 3.

## 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

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* pieces may not be word-processed.
- A candidate must cover successfully all three principal tenses or time frames - present, past and future - within the coursework submission as a whole. Otherwise they may not score a *Communication* mark of more than 6 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, any piece of **fewer than 140 words** may not score more than **7** marks for Communication.
- If the overall word count is less than 250 words, any piece of **fewer than 90 words** may not score more than **5** for Communication.
- If the overall word count is less than 100 words, any piece of **fewer than 40 words** may not score more than **3** for Communication.

*Quality of Language* marks are not similarly reduced, but short work is likely to be self-penalising.

**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.

Each candidate's work should be properly collated and treasury-tagged work is greatly preferred by Moderators, this being much easier to work with. .

Task details, clearly assigned to different teaching groups where appropriate, should be included with the samples. Without these it is not easy for the Moderator to consider this element of the *Communication* mark..

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.



# Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education  
 Spanish (Specification Code 1928)  
 June 2008 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a*	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	u
2381/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	35	28	22	16	10	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2381/02	Raw	50	41	35	28	21	15	12	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
2382/01	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
2382/02	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
2383/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	38	32	27	22	17	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2383/02	Raw	50	46	41	35	30	24	21	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
2384/01	Raw	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	38	29	21	13	5	0
	UMS	59	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	40	30	20	10	0
2384/02	Raw	50	42	34	25	17	9	5	N/A	N/A	0
	UMS	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	N/A	N/A	0
2385/01	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
2385/02	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
2386/01	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>	16.8	38.1	57.1	78.4	92.7	97.8	99.6	100.0	100.0	9043

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**

**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**