

Principal Assessor Reports 2002

Assessment Panel:

Modern Languages

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

**French – all levels
German – all levels
Italian – all levels
Russian – all levels
Spanish all levels
Urdu – Standard Grade**

Standard Grade (French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, Urdu)

Entry numbers have remained around the same for several years in French. For the first time in several years, entry numbers in German have fallen. Numbers in Italian also fell with fewer candidates achieving Credit Level grades in Italian than in previous years. In Russian most candidates were native speakers. Numbers of candidates in Spanish increased slightly, although increasing numbers were being presented at Intermediate 1 and Intermediate 2 and ability was perceived to have remained at roughly the same standard as last year.

Speaking

Performance across the subjects generally was either as good or better than in previous years.

French – The percentage of candidates achieving a credit grade continues to increase.

German – Visiting Moderators reported that most candidates responded well to the opportunities provided to demonstrate proficiency.

Spanish – A higher percentage of candidates achieved a Grade 1 award with a corresponding decrease at Grade 2. Similarly a higher percentage achieved a Grade 4 award with a corresponding decrease at Grade 5.

Russian – Most candidates performed very well.

Urdu – Most candidates performed very well.

Reading

Most candidates produced satisfactory or good performances here. For some candidates at General and Foundation Levels dictionary skills could be improved. Poor English expression continues to let some candidates down.

In French the Reading Paper was very much in line with previous years, but with more candidates gaining Grade 1 and Grade 2. Papers were judged testing but fair. Performances at Foundation were in the main good. General and Credit papers produced very fine performances. At General level there were however instances of candidates failing to gain full marks by not giving enough detail. At Credit the actual language caused few problems, however marks were sometimes lost because of a lack of detail, being imprecise or answering from general knowledge rather than the text. The layout of the paper with 7 ‘chunks’ of language rather than the 3 or 4 items appeared to help candidates.

German – A very satisfactory standard was noted at all levels. However as in previous years candidates would have picked up more marks, if they had read in broad phrases rather than focussing on individual words. At Foundation and General Levels candidates coped better with one-word or short answers. Almost all candidates attempted all questions. Performance in the supported questions was of the usual high standard. Non-supported questions proved more difficult. Credit Level answers displayed evidence of strategic reading, and candidates were clearly capable of extracting both gist and detail as required.

Italian – The Reading paper produced better marks than the Listening. Most candidates attempted the majority of questions set. At Foundation and General Levels, the supported questions were especially well done. Some candidates lost marks because they gave extraneous information within responses.

Russian – The main difficulties at Credit level were difficulty with English among some Russian native speaker candidates and poor Russian vocabulary among crash course candidates.

Spanish – In the main candidates tended to perform better in this paper than in the Listening. There was a significant increase in numbers achieving a Credit award and many candidates performed very well, answering accurately and succinctly. At General level standards were in the main very good.

At Foundation level some candidates preferred not to answer some questions rather than consult a dictionary. Numbers and some basic vocabulary proved a problem at all levels.

Urdu – There was a great improvement in the Reading paper especially at Credit level.

Listening

For most languages Listening was generally very satisfactory with some good performances, although it has been noted that in some cases performances were lower relative to Reading. Across most languages misunderstanding of numbers was reported with instances cited at all levels.

French – Candidates coped well at Foundation and General Levels, finding both papers very accessible. Candidates found the Credit paper challenging, however Q2, 9 and 10 were very well answered and fewer candidates than in earlier years gave extraneous information within responses.

German – A very satisfactory standard was noted at all levels. The candidates' ability to cope with the range of language examined was especially commended. Supported questions elicited some very good responses. The previous year's trend in concise and relevant responses was continued, and where difficulty was experienced in comprehension, there were fewer examples of wild guesswork. Few problems arose at Foundation Level, but prepositional phrases proved difficult at General Level. Occasional misinterpretation was the only problem at Credit Level.

Italian – Performance was generally good, especially in the supported questions, although lower relative to reading. At Credit Level identification of tenses and numbers was in some cases a problem, and some candidates failed to distinguish whether nouns were singular or plural.

Russian – Candidates performed less well in this element than in Reading, reversing the trend of previous years.

Spanish – Credit Listening was very well done and performance at General Listening was satisfactory. Allocation of marks remains more or less as it was last year. Extraneous information posed less of a problem than in previous years at Credit Level. Marks were lost at Credit Level through failure to identify tenses. Basic vocabulary and spelling in English were a problem at General Level.

Urdu – Listening at all levels was excellent.

Writing

Performances on the whole were good with some excellent performances at Credit Level, where in excellent or very good pieces; candidates were able to express personal opinions and feelings clearly and with conviction. Some candidates clearly studied a generative framework for their writing, which as a result was often highly individual in content and style. However some candidates at Credit Level had obviously learned essays by heart, and this did not work to their advantage, as memory failed and their level of language was not sufficient to cope with improvisation. This “overpreparation” was to some extent reported across languages. There were also some cases of candidates sitting both Credit and General papers who seemed to have prepared for only one, so those who missed an award at Credit Level failed to obtain a General Level pass.

French – At Credit Level the majority of candidates produced some very fine pieces of work some of which showed variety, accuracy and maturity. Some excellent pieces of work included nicely developed colloquial expressions. At General Level however many responses displayed a lack of preparation, although candidates experienced greatest success in Areas 1, 4 and 5.

German –At General Level, even where there were errors and inaccuracies, candidates managed to write a personal response quite successfully. Problems did arise, however, with question formation.

At Credit Level, a greater degree of “polarisation” of performance was noted, with most pieces in the excellent/very good or very poor categories. In excellent and very good pieces, candidates were able to express themselves using a variety of sentence structure and modal verbs confidently, and showing good control of word order.

Italian – Performance was very good at Credit Level with some candidates producing an excellent performance and a good range of vocabulary, structures, and tenses.

Russian – Performance proved mixed. The Credit Level paper proved very challenging to S6-start candidates, some of whom had a poor vocabulary base and relied heavily on dictionaries. The older native speakers performed well. Younger candidates, had in some cases spent less time in Russian schools and had problems with Russian letters and spelling. In addition there were a couple of cases of misunderstanding of English instructions leading to irrelevant answers.

Spanish – Performance was similar to that of last year with some very good Credit performances. A good proportion of candidates had prepared well and gave good responses. Topic areas at both levels suited candidates well. Most candidates at Credit Level performed well; however in some cases responses were extremely short.

At General Level there were instances where communication was often achieved but with some inaccuracy.

Urdu – There was an improvement in writing at General level.

General advice to centres:

Centres are advised to discourage rote learning of pieces of writing. They should instead encourage candidates to individualise pieces of writing and fully engage in the writing process.

Centres should continue to remind candidates of the extraneous rule.

Intermediate 1 (French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish)

There is a significant increase in the number of candidates in French at the pass mark stage. In German the numbers increased with 50% from Further Education. Numbers in Italian are also higher, and overall ability has improved. There is a healthy increase in candidates in Spanish with performances improving so much that some could have been presented at Intermediate 2. All candidates performed extremely well in Russian.

Speaking

Generally there are no areas of difficulty with improvements in German and Italian from last year.

Reading

Generally performances were relatively good.

French – Candidates coped well with the reading texts and produced very few weak performances. The shorter texts produced higher scores, and only more able candidates were able to cope with the longer and more demanding texts.

German – There were no signs of flagging this year and performance was reasonably good. Some candidates however did not appreciate that the wording of questions was meant to direct them to a particular part of the paper.

Italian – There were many acceptable answers, and candidates clearly coped well with longer passages. However, *più di* with numbers caused problems. General knowledge about Italy was insufficient, leading to frequent misunderstanding of the texts.

Spanish – Candidates performed well.

Russian – The first three questions were well done, but the fourth proved more difficult.

Listening

In some cases there were more difficulties as this paper. Simple question words were sometimes not recognised.

French – The Listening Paper proved more difficult than the Reading, partly because of candidates' inability to provide sufficient detail, and partly due to their problems in recognising questions in the target language.

German – Question words such as *Wo?* *Warum?* caused difficulty in Listening. The first half of the paper was well done however. Centres would be well advised to practice Listening in spite of its apparent unpopularity with some candidates, as very simple phrases were clearly not understood.

Italian – Marks were generally good, but there were some vocabulary problems.

Russian – This paper was extremely well done, although the numbers “5” and “15” caused some confusion.

Writing

In general where candidates had been well prepared they could achieve very good performances.

French – There were a few very poor performances. Many candidates had been well-prepared and wrote accurately at length. Nonetheless, there is still some degree of confusion among candidates as to what constitutes three pieces of information.

German – Candidates were polarised into the extremely well prepared and those who had difficulty in coping. Some candidates produced excellent work. Those candidates achieving the highest overall grades were clearly also producing excellent work in the Writing paper

Italian – Marks had improved on last year's with some candidates very well prepared. The predictable nature of this element allowed for better preparation, but there is still some confusion as to what constitutes three pieces of information. Some weaker candidates, however, over-extended themselves, and made frequent errors, which impeded communication. Candidates of some centres produced the same "cloned" attempt.

Russian – Candidates used printed Russian letters rather than hand-written ones, and there were some problems with spelling, verbs, cases, and adjective agreement.

Intermediate 2 (French, German, Italian, Spanish)

There is a significant increase in the number of candidates in French at the pass mark stage. German entry numbers are virtually the same as in 2001, with almost the whole presentation consisting of S5 and S6 school candidates. Candidates generally appear to be entered at the correct level with questions in Reading and Speaking much stronger than Listening and Writing. Numbers dropped in Italian, but levels of ability and preparation are higher. In Spanish the general standard of candidates appeared high and it is probable that some of these candidates should have been presented for Higher. Weaknesses in the English of some candidates were noted across some of the languages. There were no entries for Intermediate 2 Russian.

Speaking

In the main speaking marks remained roughly the same as last year, however it was noted in German that candidates are performing noticeably better in Speaking and Reading than in Listening and Writing.

Reading

In general the candidates coped well with the reading texts.

French – Candidates had very few weak performances. However shorter texts produced higher scores and only more able candidates were able to cope with the longer, more demanding texts.

German – Candidates were generally well prepared for this paper and coped well with a Reading paper which was demanding in certain places. However some candidates did not include the detail required.

Italian – Marks were picked up across all questions, and some answers were very well expressed. However, some candidates confused tenses, and others were not aware that their answers did not make sense. A quick dictionary check could have prevented this problem. Some marks were lost simply because candidates did not use sentences.

Spanish – The majority did well in the reading, although some centres should re-enforce the avoidance of too literal a translation when answering reading questions.

Listening

French – The Listening element proved more difficult than the Reading, partly because of candidates' inability to provide sufficient detail in their answers. Nonetheless, all texts were accessible, and candidates benefited from the decision to look for twenty pieces of information for twenty marks, as opposed to fifteen.

German – Candidates appeared to have difficulty in recognising numbers, dates, times., college and world of work. They also appeared to have difficulty in selecting appropriate information.

Italian – Marks were gained in all questions. However, the comparative frequently caused problems, and again some candidates did not re-read answers and failed to realise that they did not make sense.

Writing

Performances ranged from the very good to the not so good across the languages.

French – Performance in the Writing task improved encouragingly, but remained the element in which candidates did least well, in spite of its predictable nature. The range of marks (from Very Good to Very Poor) was the widest of all the papers. Learned material was not incorporated with the required level of accuracy to achieve a satisfactory performance. Failure to address the compulsory bullet points was a common problem, and many candidates could not give adequate reasons for their application. Requesting information about the job and the question formation also caused problems.

German – In Writing there were occasions where some candidates learned prepared responses and were unable to address the task set. Candidates in some centres were responding in learned format to a previous examination stimulus job advertisement and were not able to appreciate that bullet points should all be addressed evenly.

Italian – Some candidates made very good use of learned material and scored highly. Nonetheless, some candidates did not make sufficient effort in the letter of application, resorting to a list format. More could be expected at this level. Although the section requesting information about the job was predictable and could be prepared in this skill in advance, it was poorly done.

Spanish – The majority of candidates were well prepared for the job application letter.

Higher (French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish)

Generally the content of the examinations related well to the prescribed themes and topics and allowed Higher level candidates to demonstrate ability in each skill. The vast majority of candidates knew what was expected of them in each element. All aspects were accessible to the majority of candidates. Generally across the languages candidates were being presented at the correct level although there were still some cases of candidates who would have been presented more appropriately at Intermediate 2. Writing tasks in the main were the element of the exam where candidates performed least well and produced the greatest range of performance.

There was a significant increase in the number of candidates in French at the pass mark stage and there were some excellent performances from very able and well-prepared candidates. Presentations were the highest for some time in German, possibly due to the increased number of candidates at Intermediate 2 in 2001. The examination appeared to be a very fair test. There was however an indication that the presentation of weaker candidates was reflected in the increase in candidates failing the examination. Numbers have also risen in Italian, as has performance, although Paper 1 seemed more difficult and depressed marks slightly. In Spanish there has been a healthy increase in numbers especially among the more able candidates. Numbers in Russian are similar to last year with a high proportion of native speakers, however performance of some non-native speakers showed benefits of good preparation and appropriate use of learned material.

Speaking – Candidates were for the most part presented at the correct level and were accurately and consistently assessed. Teachers were aware of standards and were awarding correctly. The effect of the skills and attitudes of the interlocutor on the performance of the candidate was noted and concerns were raised in some cases about over-preparation and /or lack of spontaneity.

French – Concerns were raised about poor pronunciation on the part of many candidates. Generally many moderators raised concern at the interpretation of the role of interlocutor.

German – While the majority of performances were either good or satisfactory there were few outstanding performances. There were even fewer candidates in the ‘poor’ category. The major issue for moderators was that some discussions and presentations were shorter than the recommended time. Fewer candidates were however now overprepared.

Italian – The presentation was generally thoroughly prepared and well executed.

Russian – There were no language difficulties in the main as the majority of candidates were native speakers / bilingual. Non native speakers also performed well.

Spanish – In general interlocutors had a helpful attitude and candidates performed to potential, although as in other languages some discussions did lack interaction, resulting in interlocutor asking a small number of questions and candidate responding at great length.

Recommendations to be considered for the future – In many cases it is felt that there is a clear need for clarification of the role of the teacher/interlocutor in the conduct of the discussion section of the test, including drawing attention yet again to the time parameters laid down in the National Qualifications 2002 Modern Languages document. In some subjects comment was made that overpreparation resulted in the discussion taking the form of a monologue interspersed with the occasional question from the teacher.

Moderator Report forms for all previous years should be available to all centres selected for moderation. This would enable both moderators and senior moderators to identify any issues raised in previous moderation and also any action taken by centres to implement recommendations made. Re-enforcement of guidelines would generally help both interlocutor and candidate.

Paper 1 – Reading and Directed Writing

On the whole candidates performed well in the Reading although weaknesses in depth of knowledge of a language manifested themselves for some candidates in Translation. There has been general comment on candidates not addressing bullet points in the Directed Writing.

French – Performance at Reading was very encouraging with the content of the passages clearly accessible. Candidates responded accurately to Reading comprehension questions. Word for word translation however remains a problem in response to comprehension questions, resulting in incomprehensible use of English. Marks were often lost in the Translation element, through failure to translate the first two sense units, in spite of line references. The beginning of the third sense unit (“Ce qui”) proved problematic, and often rendered a correct translation of the remainder of the fourth sense unit impossible. Candidates’ weakness in the use of English was noticeable here, and awkward or inappropriate use of English was penalised. There were some excellent performances in the Directed Writing.

German – Candidates coped well with the Reading paper, both comprehension and translation. Some questions were clearly designed to test the best candidates and they rose to the challenge. There were however clear indications that some candidates in some centres were not being trained to address the task of Directed Writing. Such candidates did not address bullet points set, presenting work, which was irrelevant, or in some cases writing less than the minimum 150 words.

Italian – Response was generally good or very good, and some clear, concise answers to the reading passage showed both sound understanding of Italian and excellent preparation in exam technique. However, some candidates had difficulty in recognising tenses, especially in the conditional. In the translation passage, some weaker candidates produced a literal translation which often resulted in them contradicting themselves. The person of the verb was not always recognised, usually because candidates mistook object for subject pronouns. In the Directed Writing there was some excellent use of learned material. However for some candidates there were frequent basic errors, perhaps indicating a lack of real knowledge of the language system.

Some marks were lost because candidates did not always address all three elements of the first bullet point.

Spanish – The majority of candidates performed well in Reading and Directed Writing. Performance in Translation was improving and candidates only encountered difficulty with the most challenging phrases.

Russian – In the main the Directed Writing was well performed by native speakers except in one case where bullet points were not addressed. The Reading and particularly the Translation was less successfully completed. The precise nature of the Translation into English is clearly beyond the skill of some candidates. It would appear that some candidates were unaware of the demands of all the papers.

Paper 2 – Listening/Writing

Although there were some excellent performances in Writing a marked difference was noted in some languages between performances in the Directed Writing and the Personal Response Essay, perhaps as the Personal Response Essay calls more on candidates to manipulate the language. Learned material without any real linguistic understanding was sometimes incorporated with insufficient accuracy.

French – The topic of the Listening passage was familiar to most candidates, and there was a very satisfactory level of response to the comprehension questions. Although there were some excellent performances, the Writing element produced the lowest marks, despite its predictable nature. A relatively small number of candidates displayed little or no control of basic grammar and verb formation and serious misuse of dictionaries and other tongue interference continue to be a problem.

Some essays were wholly irrelevant to the question set.

German – In the Listening/Writing there were further indications from some candidates that they were not reading carefully the task set and were not responding appropriately to topics covered within the course. A lack of training in clear structuring of writing tasks could be in some cases impeding candidates in performance. For some candidates the Writing tasks clearly indicate that Intermediate 2 would be more appropriate

Italian – In the Listening section, the main problem which candidates encountered was in comprehending the wording of one particular question (question 4). There were some good performances in Writing, where there was appropriate use of learned material, but this Writing exercise posed more of a problem, as it is obviously less predictable than the Directed Writing and calls more on candidates to manipulate language. There were some very poor performances, with candidates unable to manipulate language sufficiently to convey meaning. There were widespread errors in gender, agreement, and the partitive. “Gente” was again frequently followed by plural verb forms. Some candidates did not appear to read the essay context correctly and were often penalised for irrelevance.

Spanish – Candidates performed well in this paper.

Russian – The Listening paper was comparatively easy and candidates performed correspondingly well.

Recommendation

Centres should train candidates to avoid too literal translation when answering reading questions.

Advanced Higher (French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish)

Numbers have increased in French and Italian, although in French this may have led to a subsequent increase in the number of weaker candidates. Numbers have also increased slightly in German, with a larger number of native speakers, and concern was expressed at possible over-presentation at this level. There seems to have been some unrealistic optimism in centres about ability of candidates to cope at this level. Although only 3 candidates in Russian, the quality of candidates was high. Numbers in Spanish have increased.

Speaking – Performance was in the main good. Visiting Examiners in French were generally very enthusiastic about candidates' performance, most of whom coped very well although some were a little over-prepared. In German, Visiting Examiners praised the candidates' ability and willingness to communicate. In Italian, performances were generally very good, and an interesting range of subjects was covered with considerable fluency. However, some candidates had clearly learned an essay by heart and proceeded to recite it. This caused problems among the more nervous of them who faltered and often lost the thread of their argument. All Russian candidates were fluent native Russian speakers. In Spanish the vast majority of candidates contributed well to the oral.

Paper 1 – Reading

The time factor continues to be a problem.

French – The translation in French was disappointing because of a poor grasp of English, and candidates who began the paper with the Translation left themselves too little time to complete the rest of the paper. Paragraphs were also a problem in French, with some candidates failing to identify the correct paragraph from which to answer questions.

German – Many candidates were poorly equipped to translate with the degree of accuracy required at this level. Centres should be advised that translation requires attention to detail and is not an exercise in 'gist' rendering.

Italian – The translation was particularly well done, and none of the questions caused specific problems.

Russian – Although they were native Russian speakers all candidates had good written English.

Spanish – The inference item within Reading/Translation remains a little difficult. There were occasional literal translations.

Paper 2 Listening and Writing

In general terms performance was satisfactory, however some candidates manifested difficulties in writing in target language.

French – There was a considerable degree of misunderstanding in some sections, but many candidates performed otherwise satisfactorily. The Discursive Writing section produced some essays which seemed to have been prepared in class and which were not relevant to the questions set. Candidates were penalised appropriately, and there were several fairly weak answers.

German – Writing accurately in the target language at this level is a problem for many candidates.

Italian – Most candidates displayed a level of understanding appropriate to Advanced Higher. All essays in the Discursive Writing section were relevant to the topic being discussed, and there was some evidence of flair and sophistication.

Spanish – The summary in Spanish of the taped conversation was better done in general this year than last year. Some candidates lacked paragraphing skills in the summary exercise, although there was a fairly noticeable improvement in general. The five essay topics in Paper 2 were all pursued reasonably well. The most popular topics were racism, computer technology and the environment. However in written Spanish the same basic errors are repeated every year.

Folio

In the main folios were well done.

French – Many essays exceeded the required length. Candidates were not penalised, but this problem must be addressed.

Italian – The standard was good overall, and the extended essay benefited the more able candidates. The written Italian was good and well prepared. In particular the extended essay gave scope for the more intelligent candidates to shine.

Spanish – The folios in Spanish were an enjoyable read, especially on modern Spanish theatre and poetry, although it might be wise for centres to cull some of the more trivial topics. In addition some schools are submitting folios in the old format.

Intermediate 1 Subjects - Pass Mark Stage Grade Boundaries 2002

	Max Mark	A <i>Mark</i>	B Mark	C Mark	%A	%B	%C
C059 French	100	70	60	50	70	60	50
C060 German	100	68	58	48	68	58	48
C061 Italian	100	70	60	50	70	60	50
C062 Russian	100	70	60	50	70	60	50
C063 Spanish	100	70	60	50	70	60	50

German – a careful analysis of the candidates' scores in the examination revealed that irrespective of ability, they had scored very poorly in one Listening question which was worth 2 points. While the language in question was not too difficult this level, the question clearly did not result in any discrimination among candidates and it was therefore considered fair to all candidates to reduce the grade boundaries in 2002 by 2.

**Intermediate 2 Subjects - Pass Mark Stage Grade
Boundaries 2002**

	Max Mark	A Mark	B Mark	C Mark	%A	%B	%C
C0 French 59	100	70	60	50	70	60	50
C0 German 60	100	69	59	49	69	59	49
C0 Italian 61	100	70	60	50	70	60	50
C0 Spanish 63	100	70	60	50	70	60	50

German – while the examination as a whole proved to be a fair test for the candidates, one question in the Listening examination proved to defeat virtually all the candidates. It was possible that the candidates had been unable to pick out a key word from those surrounding it. It was considered fairest to all candidates therefore to reduce the grade boundaries by 1 mark to compensate for this question.

**Higher Level Subjects - Pass Mark Stage Grade
Boundaries 2002**

	Max Mark	A Mark	B Mark	C Mark	%A	%B	%C
C0 French 59	100	70	60	50	70	60	50
C0 German 60	100	70	60	50	70	60	50
C0 Italian 61	100	69	58	48	69	58	48
C0 Russian 62	100	72	62	52	72	62	52
C0 Spanish 63	100	70	60	50	70	60	50

Italian – The papers appeared to be set at an appropriate level. The increase in the Mean Mark in Paper 2 indicates that appropriate adjustments had to be made to take account of the difficulties encountered in the section last year. Nonetheless, despite some very good performances, there appears to have been some undefined element of difficulty in Paper 1 that has depressed marks slightly. It was decided therefore to maintain the pass mark at 48 as last year to take account of this.

Russian – A slight tightening of the A and B boundaries took place to counteract the relative easiness of the Listening Paper.

Advanced Higher Grade Subjects – Pass Mark Stage Grade Distributions 2002

	Max Mark	A Mark	B Mark	C Mark	%A	%B	%C
C0 French 59	200	140	119	99	70	60	50
C0 German 60	200	140	120	100	70	60	50
C0 Italian 61	200	140	120	100	70	60	50
C0 Russian 62	200	140	120	100	70	60	50
C0 Spanish 63	200	140	120	100	70	60	50

Standard Grade Subjects - Cut-off marks for each element 2002

		% for Grades					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
100 French 0	Reading	73	50	78	56	64	45
	Listening	64	40	73	58	70	52
100 French 1	Writing	Directly Graded					
130 German 0	Reading	73	54	78	59	70	45
	Listening	68	44	77	62	78	63
130 German 1	Writing	Directly Graded					
190 Italian 0	Reading	69	50	75	59	70	55
	Listening	80	56	69	50	63	48
190 Italian 1	Writing	Directly Graded					
342 Russian 0	Reading	65	46	63	50	70	52
	Listening	72	44	62	50	67	48
342 Russian 1	Writing	Directly Graded					
380 Spanish 0	Reading	81	62	88	69	73	52
	Listening	76	48	65	50	63	44
380 Spanish 1	Writing	Directly Graded					
410 Urdu 0	Reading	81	62	75	63	55	42
	Listening	84	68	62	50	59	48
410 Urdu 1	Writing	Directly Graded					

Grade boundaries were agreed within the above ranges following careful analysis of candidates' scores. The speaking and writing elements were directly graded.