

English Language & Literature

Advanced GCE A2 H473

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H073

Reports on the Units

January 2010

HX73/R/10J

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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 specification 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 2010

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE English Language and Literature – H473

Advanced Subsidiary GCE English Language and Literature – H073

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
F671 Speaking Voices [Closed Text]	1
Comments on Individual Questions	3
F672 Changing Texts	7
F673 Dramatic Voices	9
F674 Connections across Texts	11
Grade Thresholds	12

F671 Speaking Voices [Closed Text]

General Comments

Performance on this paper revealed some encouraging signs that Centres and candidates are beginning to adapt to the requirements of what is still a fairly new specification. The make-up of the entry for this session – with small numbers of candidates, some re-taking and others taking the Unit for the first time after only one term’s study – means that it would be unwise to infer too much. However, the most successful work was informed by relevant literary and linguistic approaches, suggesting careful and thorough preparation by Centres and their candidates.

The candidates who seemed to find the paper more difficult were those who were inclined to adopt a formulaic approach, pursuing a prepared agenda with insufficient regard for the question as set. Such an approach is always poor examination technique, and doubly so with this ‘closed-text’ examination paper, since material from the set novels and from supporting texts is provided in order for candidates to be able to respond to what is in front of them.

The question paper has been designed to facilitate the deployment of skills learned through combined literary and linguistic studies. More often than not, though, candidates created difficulties for themselves by treating Passages A and B in the Section A questions as obstacles to be got out of their way rather than as sources of examples to be used for developed analysis. Similarly, despite clear advice in the Principal Examiner Reports of 2009 to use the supporting passage(s) in Section B as sources of ‘contextual’ material and stimulus for discussion, candidates persisted in ‘dumping’ quantities of assertion about the social, economic, political, moral, historical or cultural circumstances in which (or out of which) their chosen novel was written.

It may seem rather easy for the Principal Examiner to counsel teachers and students against *creating difficulties for themselves*, and rather less easy for those teachers and students to avoid doing just that out of anxiety and examination pressure.

The great thing about advice is that you don’t have to take it. But the following might help both teachers in preparation, and students in examination conditions.

In Section A:

- Follow the bullet-prompts, but remember the over-arching question is about *construction* and *effects*. If you’re responding to a prompt but not analysing how voice (and consequently meaning) is constructed, you’re missing the point.
- Try to maintain a reasonable balance of attention to the different prompts. There’s no fixed proportion of marks for each passage or for reference to the whole novel; but clearly an answer which barely acknowledges the rest of the novel is not likely to score highly.

In Section B:

- Highlight key words in the cue-quotation, question-wording and supporting passage(s). Is there (for example) a lexical connection that might be helpful?
- Use the supporting passage(s) as ‘contextual’ material. It may be more obviously similar to or more obviously different from your view of the novel, but at least it will be a starting point of comparison/contrast.

Reports on the Units taken in January 2010

As to trends in the January 2010 session, the pattern of text and question choice was much as it had been for the 2009 examination sessions. The overwhelming majority of candidates chose to answer on *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time* in Section A; and most chose *The Great Gatsby* in Section B. A smaller but significant number did *A Room with a View* or *Wide Sargasso Sea*. The numbers of candidates answering on *Surfacing* or *Hawksmoor* were smaller still; but all texts stimulated interest and engagement.

Most candidates did Section A first – though there is no absolute requirement to do so – but it was interesting also to see groups of candidates who had decided on the opposite strategy. Individual candidates often perform better on one question than the other. This is not surprising in F671: after all, the two Sections of this paper are largely independent of one another. Often such disparate performance is more a matter of time management and examination technique than an indication that they were finding either Section A or Section B more difficult. For early entrants, it may also be a sign that they were simply not ready: some texts need time to sink in, to be assimilated into some kind of mental ‘map’. And in fact those candidates who were re-sitting the paper did perform significantly better, on average, than they had in June 2009.

One further aspect of candidates’ writing needs to be mentioned. There is a worrying (and, for some candidates, disabling) incidence of what amounts almost to *circular argument* in many answers. An aspect of language use is identified – for example, speech overlaps in Passage A of Section A. So far, so good. This is then asserted to be ‘evidence’ of something broader – for example, informality – with no specific exemplification, and no developed analysis. Not so good. And the assertion might equally easily and equally unsatisfactorily have been presented the other way round: this is an informal conversation, so you would expect speech overlaps.

Believing that they have now exhausted this point, candidates then move on to another, which they deal with in the same superficial way. At its worst, this tendency produces answers in which the opposite of each point could equally well have been argued: the occurrence of speech overlaps ‘proves’ that the speakers are friendly and comfortable / cooperative / supportive to each other; OR the occurrence of speech overlaps ‘proves’ that the speakers are hostile, competing for the floor and trying to outdo each other. Either interpretation might well be argued plausibly; but the trouble is that nothing is actually being *argued*, merely *asserted*.

Clearly, citing and then analysing a specific example would avoid this. And while it is perfectly possible for different candidates to come to opposite conclusions, these are only genuine ‘conclusions’ if they come at the end of a developed analysis. Otherwise they are the sort which have been jumped to – and therefore at least unhelpful, and possibly plain wrong.

Careful, precise writing is an advanced skill. The best candidates argue clearly because they write precisely, not asserting that Reference A *proves* Conclusion B if it only *suggests* or *implies* or *illustrates* AO1 skills of clarity and coherence do matter.

Finally, it is always worth remembering the Assessment Objective weightings for the Unit. AO2 is dominant in Section A, AO3 in Section B. However, there will always be significant overlap between the AOs, and a competent integrated linguistic/literary approach is likely to include aspects of AO1, AO2 and AO3 in virtually every relevant comment.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

The question-wording invites candidates to *compare the construction and effects of the speaking voices* in a piece (Passage A) of transcribed spoken English and an extract (Passage B) from their chosen novel. The bullet-prompts remind candidates to consider

- features in Passage A which are characteristic of spoken language
- how features of syntax, lexis and register produce distinctive voices in these two passages
- ways in which the writer uses speaking voices in Passage B and elsewhere in the novel

Construction refers to the key constituents of language – in the words of AO2, *the ways in which structure, form and language shape meanings*. The first two bullet-prompts direct attention particularly to features characteristic of *spoken language* and features of *syntax, lexis and register*.

Effects refers to the impact of language choice on audience – which may be listener, viewer, interlocutor, reader. The third bullet-prompt directs attention particularly to the (variety of) uses of speaking voices in the novel as a whole, and candidates should find plenty of scope to explore both narrative and dialogue.

In Section A, the Passage A spoken language transcriptions are deliberately chosen to match and/or complement the Passage B extracts in content, so that candidates do not waste time trying to find similarities and/or contrasts of subject matter and therefore can get on with the much more productive business of analysing *how* meaning is constructed.

Still, some candidates seemed to feel it necessary to ‘prove’ that Passage A was natural more-or-less spontaneous speech by simply locating, identifying and listing typical features of spoken language. These were often candidates who also struggled to realise (and remember!) that *voice* in Passage B and elsewhere in the chosen novel is a *fictional construct*, whereas the spontaneous speech in Passage A is someone’s natural utterance. So it is not helpful to write of the speaker(s) *using* (for example) fillers, repairs or micro-pauses: these might be features of their spoken language, but *they construct voice* rather than the other way round. Similarly, it is almost always unhelpful to identify ‘errors’ in spoken language as if it were an inferior version of written Standard English.

Since Section A questions are passage-based, it should actually be easier for candidates to maintain a focus on relevant textual detail in this Section than in Section B. A sensible strategy would be to make substantial annotation on the question paper while reading the passages: this would enable candidates more readily to support points with appropriate reference. Many answers, however, made *general* points about the ‘speaking voices’ in the passages and the novel without citing (and therefore without being able to *analyse* and *evaluate*) *specific* features of language.

Question 1: Surfacing

The narrator’s visit to her missing father’s friend Paul (to find out if he has any news) was paired with part of a BBC Radio Cumbria interview in which a group of local people talk about their memories.

Although candidates who do *Surfacing* regularly assert that the narrator’s ‘voice’ bears signs of her (alleged) mental instability, they struggled to find evidence for such a view in either the

dialogue or the narrative here. Her comments on the ring and her 'status' caused problems: some candidates clearly did not know the novel well enough.

Understanding of Passage A was more secure. Candidates made useful comments about the non-Standard features in Garth's and Mike's utterances, and were interestingly more comfortable dealing with these than with the grammar/syntax of Paul in Passage B. Less helpful approaches emerged when candidates tried to deal with accent/dialect: they often conflated matters of lexis/syntax with issues of pronunciation, and tended to unprofitable speculation about the speakers' levels of education or social class.

The mark-scheme contains indications of material and issues for relevant discussion.

Question 2: The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time

Christopher's account of his views of 'special needs' was paired with a transcription of an actor (James) describing a film he has recently watched which showed people with Cerebral Palsy.

The main problem was one created by candidates for themselves when they began from notions of – and assumptions about – disability and *then* moved on to the evidence in the passages. Although many pointed out that Haddon never mentions Asperger's Syndrome in the novel, they still argued from that idea instead of looking at what Passage B offered. As a result, few managed to grapple with what Christopher actually says about his fellow pupils – or *how* he says it.

It is difficult to understand what is going on in Christopher's 'Swiss Army knife' utterance, and harder still to analyse the linguistic and contextual elements which construct meaning here. Nevertheless, astute candidates noticed the significance of *I don't listen to what other people say*, and were able to move to other instances in the novel of exactly that trait in Christopher.

Candidates paid careful attention to the pauses, false starts, self-repairs and emphatic stresses of James's utterance. Here as elsewhere they were less good at explaining precisely how these features constructed the meanings they inferred. There were therefore many answers which reached Band 4 competence without moving on to Band 5 development.

The mark-scheme provides many examples of features of language which candidates might with profit have identified and explored.

Question 3: Hawksmoor

There were again very few answers on *Hawksmoor* this session, but the indications are that there will be more in May/June 2010.

Nick Dyer's letter to the Commissioners, ostensibly complaining about the poor quality of his workmen, was paired with a transcription of part of a radio programme in which a young couple showed an investigative reporter the problems they have had since moving into their new house.

Nick Dyer's 'voice' was again rather more accurately characterised than Christopher Boone's. Undoubtedly the disjunctions between his 'public' and 'private' – and narrative and introspective – voices are more pronounced. In any case, there was some intelligent analysis of construction of voice in terms of lexis and syntax. Roddy and Debbie were helpfully seen as a couple as well as individual 'voices'.

The mark-scheme offers examples of potentially fruitful avenues for exploration.

Section B

Most candidates answered on *The Great Gatsby*, but there were also responses on the other two texts. The more general of the following comments on candidates' performance on *The Great Gatsby* apply equally – *mutatis mutandis* – to the other texts.

Question 4: The Great Gatsby

The cue-quotation was Nick's comment about the Buchanans when he 'spies' on them through the pantry window of their house: *Daisy and Tom were sitting opposite each other at the kitchen table, with a plate of cold fried chicken between them, and two bottles of ale ... They weren't happy, and neither of them had touched the chicken or the ale – and yet they weren't unhappy either.*

The question then invited examination of Fitzgerald's presentation of happiness in *The Great Gatsby*.

Some candidates quite reasonably argued that *unhappiness* was more to the point, and proceeded accordingly. This was fine, as was the line of argument which took from Passage A the idea of *abounding accumulation of material things* and explored how materialism corresponded with happiness. Passage B was similarly helpful: Gatsby was seen simply as a man for whom the lines *I want to be happy / But I won't be happy / Till I make you happy too* might have been specifically written.

As in May/June 2009, however, many candidates damaged their answers by over-simplifying: Daisy is purely materialistic, Nick is reliable/un-judgemental (or unreliable/judgemental), Tom treats Myrtle purely as a sex object. The uncertainty suggested in the cue-quotation was largely ignored.

Prepared material tended to be intrusive and awkward, still offered in discrete compartments (American Dream / Jazz Age / Prohibition / First World War) rather than being integrated. The best advice for this question – and both of the others in Section B – is still first to locate *in* the novel and the passage(s) evidence that the social/cultural/historical context is having some kind of influence, and then to argue from there. Section B questions can be made quite simple. Candidates who start their answers by writing a page on the American Dream are making things very hard for themselves.

Question 5: Wide Sargasso Sea

A small but significant number of candidates did this question.

The cue-quotation was from the start of the novel, where Antoinette says: *And no one came near us. I got used to a solitary life.* The question-wording then invited an examination of *Rhys's presentation of the experience of being alone*. The supporting passage was the lyric of a song from the 1960s, *The Single Girl*. (As James from Question 2 might have said: *oh, get it, it's a hoot ...*)

A helpful approach to this question – and to future Section B questions – might be to consider lexis and semantics. The cue-quotation, question-wording and passage title use three words in the semantic field of alone-ness – *solitary*, *alone* and *single* – and the song lyric goes on to *lonely*. Such an approach, which begins with language, ensures a combined literary/linguistic focus.

Candidates managed to find some limited help in Passage A, noticing that while both Antoinette and her mother Annette might have needed *a sweet loving man to lean on*, neither of them got one. The loneliness of Antoinette's childhood was discussed, but the instances of *rejection* (by Tia, by her mother, by 'Rochester') suffered by Antoinette diverted some candidates into what seemed to be a re-hash of a different essay – the one on *alienation* from the previous summer's examination.

The mark-scheme contains suggestions of what might have been fruitful areas for discussion.

Question 6: A Room with a View

The question began with Charlotte's lament that *I have been a failure ... Failed to make you happy; failed in my duty to your mother* and went on to invite examination of Forster's presentation of duty and happiness in *A Room with a View*.

Although Passage B offered a significant nudge in positing the importance of *the Duty of Happiness as well as ... the Happiness of Duty*, candidates still struggled to see the inter-relationship of the two, and tended to treat them separately. Certain candidates were inclined to offer a 'prepared' essay, rather pursuing their own agenda – not entirely regardless of the question, but still not directly answering it either. As for Passage A, it was taken very seriously and literally, with candidates trying to apply specific details of Oath and/or Law to the situation of individual characters. Better candidates picked up and explored the social and cultural nuances (for example, *A Scout is a friend to all and a brother to every other Scout, no matter to what social class the other belongs.*)

The context (AO3) was again taken to be the unbending nature of Victorian/Edwardian morality, against which Forster was seen to be fighting. Few candidates were prepared to see the author as being witty or ironic, though some did comment on his presentation of Charlotte's absurdities.

F672 Changing Texts

Understandably the entry for this unit in January 2010 was small as centres prepare the majority of their candidates for submission of work in May. This means that there were only a limited number of scripts on which this report can comment. It may be helpful therefore to look at the comments here alongside those made in the previous report for June 2009.

As stated in that earlier report it is evident that centres are adapting to the challenges of the unit and understanding its requirements. Again candidates produced some very effective work which was both analytical and creative across the different elements of the assessment. It is also evident that the tasks are engaging for students and the ambition of many of the multimodal texts created reflected this enthusiasm.

As was the case in June, it is clear that the majority of centres are opting to teach a core written text and multimodal version and then give students options in terms of their own text production. Whilst this approach has obvious benefits in terms of a shared experience of these texts we would like to stress that the unit could also be undertaken via the use of multiple source texts and a range of multimodal versions. One option might be to choose as the 'substantial written text' one that has generated a number of different versions rather than just, say, a single film. A comparison of the related multimodal texts could be very useful in preparation for Task 1 as it will focus attention on the capacity of the written text for reinterpretation. One of these texts could be focused on in Task 1. This in turn should help students consider the range of possibilities for Task 2 in re-casting the text for different purposes and audiences. The written text can come from any literary genre and while the majority of centres choose to study a novel or a play, in future sessions it would be very interesting to see more examples of poetry and literary non-fiction being considered.

Task 1

The June 2009 report deals in some detail with the most effective approach to Task 1. This part of the assessment is an opportunity for candidates to analyse both the original written text and the multimodal version in some detail. The best work submitted this January was sharply focused on the language, form and structure of the written text before moving on to consider how the multimodal text is adapted to meet the needs of a new audience and modes. The AS Performance Descriptions on page 39 of the Specification are very helpful in exploring how the AOs for this task can be approached. As stressed previously, analysis of a section of both texts is perfectly acceptable and will probably result in a more detailed study than trying to convey the impact of the whole text. A03 is the weighted Assessment Objective for this task and the exploration of the relationship between the texts is clearly central. The first two bullet points in the description of Task 1 on Page 11 of the Specification summarise a good approach to fulfilling this requirement. Consideration should be given to:

- scope of the original text for different types of multimodal text production;
- factors that have shaped the multimodal version/text (such as audience, purpose, viewpoint, interpretation)

Task 2

General comments about approaches to this element were made in the previous report and as was pointed out there the best work submitted for this task is extremely creative and imaginative. A problem can arise, however, when candidates use Task 2 as an opportunity to describe a multimodal text they “would” produce - but have not actually submitted. This can be the case with texts such as computer game treatments of a novel, for example, where the candidate explains what form the game would take and how it would utilise different communicative modes to recast the story but offers no evidence in the form of a storyboard or screenshot of how the game would be realised. This approach fails to fulfil the requirement in the specification that candidates produce their own multimodal text and in a description of the text the crucial significance of the visual mode is not demonstrated. Task 2 is an opportunity to create a text and if technical or other obstacles prevent a candidate actually producing the text then it would be better to choose a different outcome that can be presented for moderation.

The best commentaries to Task 2 are detailed and language specific. The choices made in the production of their own multimodal text are implicit evidence of the A04 requirement for 'insights from linguistic and literary study' and the commentary is an opportunity to make explicit this knowledge utilising some appropriate terminology. Task 2 text and commentary can be viewed holistically by centres and the 1500 to 2000 words for the task can be balanced between the two elements.

F673 Dramatic Voices

General Comments

Whilst the entry for this January's session was relatively small, it was gratifying to see how well centres had assimilated the specific requirements of the new Paper. It was very pleasing, too, to note a variety of interpretations and well-judged approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study. Candidates had clearly prepared well and often demonstrated a very good knowledge and understanding of their selected texts. Analytical rigour was very much in evidence across the Paper; equally the majority of answers showed a secure contextual awareness. The best answers (and there were some outstanding responses at the top end) focused on the key assessment objectives, were able to examine relevant linguistic detail with precision, and advanced convincing, well-supported arguments. Weaker answers tended to be less substantial in terms of content, and offered a more superficial knowledge of relevant contextual factors. The quality of written expression was competent in overall terms.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1) This question was very popular, and prompted some thoughtful, probing analyses. The best answers engaged with the central theme of temptation very intelligently and elucidated fruitful comparative links and contrasts - lexical and semantic, in particular. There were some complex and thoughtful assessments of Faustus' position: metaphysical, emotional and moral; these were grounded in a sensitive appreciation of his use of language and his relationship with Mephistophilis. The presentation of the dynamics of Proctor's relationship with Abigail - sexual, linguistic and psychological - was examined with real sophistication at the top end. Weaker responses to both passages tended to be characterised by unsupported assertion and indiscriminating and/or undigested use of contextual information.
- 2) A relatively popular choice, this question was answered a touch less knowledgeably and confidently. The best answers demonstrated an astute grasp of both the linguistic content of the language games and of the psychological/existential impetuses behind them. These tended to approach Hamlet's intelligence (political, strategic and linguistic) fairly respectfully, and were attentive both to the presentation his highly developed verbal repertoire and sense of humour. They appreciated too, the importance of inter-textual resonances and generic indebtedness when approaching the Stoppard passage. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of critical depth in the analysis of voices created.
- 3) Less frequently chosen, this question was answered moderately well. Candidates' responses were sometimes characterised by an imbalance; there was, in general terms, a confident recognition of the Duchess's active topic management and agenda setting, but (because of a less than developed understanding of contextual factors) an element of imprecision in assessing the extent to which and (more importantly) the 'ways in which' gender roles might be considered to have been broken. In formal terms, tone, register and grammar (and even imagery) were not given due attention. Passage B was given cursory consideration in the main.

Reports on the Units taken in January 2010

- 4) The most frequently chosen in Section B, this question was answered well. Candidates' responses showed real knowledge and depth of understanding. Arguments were developed effectively and were usually well supported. There was a strong sense of personal engagement, and often sophisticated, subtle lines of interpretation were in evidence. The best answers showed a very good contextual awareness and used approaches from integrated literary and linguistic study convincingly. Candidates seemed comfortable and confident in exploring a range of perspectives and ideas in relation to 'justice' in both plays. The relatively few weak responses to this question tended to be narrow in interpretation and superficial as arguments.
- 5) The relatively few candidates who answered this question focused almost exclusively on humour in *Hamlet*. Candidates experienced little difficulty in identifying examples of humour, but were less adept at examining its effects and significance. There was rarely more than a rather vague or generalised awareness of some of the generic and dramatic implications. Where there was a lack of critical understanding, so the arguments developed tended to be rather sketchy and lacking coherent development. Some candidates successfully incorporated textual materials from Section A of the Paper and constructed thoughtful discussions; the weakest responses, however, simply recycled such materials with scant regard for the specific terms and requirements of the question.
- 6) This question was frequently chosen and, almost without exception, candidates opted to write about *Top Girls*. A range of material was discussed but gender-based, social, political and family conflicts tended to form the foundation of most answers. The Marlene/Angie/Joyce relationships were foregrounded more than those of the 'office' or 'historical' characters. The best answers demonstrated an excellent understanding of the text and developed detailed, knowledgeable, cogent, arguments. Few candidates were able to refer to relevant contextual materials with any authority, however, and there were some very under-developed responses at the lower end. Weaker answers tended to be characterised by flawed written expression, anodyne/unsupported over-assertion or non-engagement with appropriate features of language.

F674 Connections across Texts

General Comments

Task 1 Analytical Study

With a limited range of work, trends are hard to discern. It is obvious that some centres have had all candidates deal with the same material, and, whilst this is within the rules, it does mean that the work comes across as rather 'taught' in feel. Arguments are often repeated by all candidates, and examples given are often the same, so the only discriminator is the way in which a thought is expressed. It is to be hoped that, as the unit becomes more familiar, centres will be able to relax more about this because it tends to head off performance at the top end. Other centres give their candidates free rein, and they choose all texts for themselves. These pieces allow candidates fuller scope for individual exploration.

Candidates have chosen a wide variety of 'non-canonical' texts; as yet, however, we are not seeing quite enough exploration of textual status, so the folders seen this session were slightly thin on the specification's requirement for candidates to 'consider ways in which orthodoxies and attitudes which have grown up around texts may be open to question'.

There were also some concerns about how substantial some of the texts on offer actually were: as a rough guideline, a text should take about the same time to study as might be devoted to an examination literature text: in other words, three brief speeches may be within the rules, and obviously it is important that candidates do not allow quantity to outweigh quality. However, bearing in mind that this is 40% of an A2 specification, there needs to be some sense of whole texts studied, not just extracts from the speeches addressed to the crowd in *Coriolanus* as a means of setting up discussion of other speeches.

Task 2 Original Creative Writing

Many of this session's candidates chose to write speeches or dramatic monologues. Most understood the conventions of the genre they had attempted, and they were usually able to show insight and critical evaluation through the structural, grammatical and syntactical choices they had made.

Task 2 Commentary

Centres need to stress to candidates the importance of loading this section with AO1 material, though of course there will often be evidence in the first part of application of insights and approaches from 'integrated linguistic and literary study. 'Critical terminology,' by definition, has to be highlighted here. On the whole, centres will need to make a judgement across the whole task about written expression and the application of relevant concepts and approaches. Having said that, in order to reflect a wider variety of these, centres should reflect upon the whole of Task 2 when considering the mark for Task 2.

Administration

As always, it is worth stressing the importance of getting the rank order right, particularly in cases where a number of teaching sets are being co-ordinated. Moderators may only see a limited range of the folders produced from a big centre.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE English Language and Literature (H073 H473)
January 2010 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit Maximum		Mark	A B C D				E U	
F671	Raw	60	45	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
F672	Raw	40	33	28	23	19	15	0
	UMS	80	64	56	48	40	32	0
F673	Raw	60	48	42	36	30	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
F674	Raw	40	33	29	25	21	17	0
	UMS	80	64	56	48	40	32	

Specification Aggregation Results

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

	Maximum Mark	A B		C	D	E	U
H073	200	160	140	120	100	80	0

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

	A B		C D		E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H073	5.8	9.6	42.3	90.4	100	100	54

54 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
<http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums/index.html>

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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 2010

