

GCE

Drama and Theatre

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H059**

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice 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.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on [Interchange](#).

Further support from OCR

activeresults

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

CONTENTS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Drama and Theatre (H059)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
H059/01 and 02 Process to Performance	4
H059/05 Exploring performance	6

H059/01 and 02 Process to Performance

1. General Comments

There was a very significant reduction in entries this session and with smaller numbers, it was more difficult to identify trends in moderation. Several centres had clearly taken the decision to focus on entering candidates at A Level but those who were entered for AS tended to be a relatively able cohort.

The administration of the component ran smoothly and there were no technical problems, except for those who submitted via the OCR repository where there were some challenges as a result of very large files needing be submitted.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

The work from all centres was appropriate and the performance texts well chosen. Most candidate submissions were succinct, although a number produced unwieldy packages of material that were neither focused on the issues nor easy to transport. Such a portmanteau approach was generally unhelpful and, at its worst, made parts of the assessment appear like a scrapbook.

2.1 Research report

The majority of research reports were well written, with research that was appropriately focused on their practical work. There were relatively few submissions that relied on web printouts and the majority made a strong effort to shape and refine their material to reflect the underlying demands of the text. Very few exceeded the maximum word count, and this was helpful in terms of identifying where the centre's marks could be supported.

Weaker candidates did not fully grasp the significance of research and mistook it for investigation. In such cases, this tended to mean that there was a good deal of knowledge regurgitation but little that could be applied to the candidates' performance work. Stronger candidates were able to select from their research that which was of most value and use it as the basis for application.

2.2 Portfolio

Strong portfolios built on the detailed research undertaken and were able to apply it to the performance process. This required a sophisticated ability to stand back from the process and consider the extent to which it was enabling an authentic performance of the chosen performance text. This often meant considering in detail the relationship between performance conventions, previous professional performances available online, and their own directorial and performance decisions.

Weaker candidates found it difficult to see the direction that the process was taking and were often reliant on the advice of their teachers, or other members of the group to help them make sense of how to move from page to stage. Other dangers where were a candidate had taken a very individualised approach to their own role, but this meant that it clashed with that approach

taken by the group as a whole. This was a pitfall for a few strong performers, who struggled to align their work with the group effort.

2.3 Evaluation

Evaluation again proved to be the most challenging aspect of the assessment. Almost all candidates were able to offer a review of the work but far fewer understood the significance of their decisions, which meant they were able to assess their success in achieving their intentions. It is likely that many candidates had been successful in discussing their work in the classroom situation but had struggled to shape and refine their responses for the purpose of assessment.

2.4 Practical work

Performances were generally appropriate in length and were delivered to an enthusiastic and supportive audience. There were some excellent performance theatrical performances, which showed real understanding of the nuances of the performance text chosen, and interpreted it for an audience, taking full account of the size and type of performance space available to them. The quality of work was a little higher than in the previous session and there were several performances that were captivating in their approach to, and rendition of, the performance text.

There were a number of weaknesses in performance, many of them a result of under-rehearsal of acting skills. These included poor diction and articulation; unclear focus; weak use of the performance space, and lack of clarity as to the status of the role vis-à-vis the other parts. Casting also emerged at times as an issue as some candidates appeared to have been given roles to which they were not suited in terms of their acting skills. In other pieces, the setting was not properly accounted for, and the stage pictures created by the performance lacked credibility.

H059/05 Exploring performance

1. General Comments:

Centres had clearly prepared their candidates well and had used the advice given in last year's report and the resources available on line. Candidates were in general able to engage with the questions in a practical manner carrying out practical discussions of their interpretation of the scenes required by the question.

In Section A, many essays were structured skilfully demonstrating a knowledge and understanding of the text, performance and the live performance work seen.

In Section B, live performance productions seen were effective in terms of answering Question 7 and allowed the candidates to discuss a range of suitable production and performance elements. Centres should continue to ensure that live performance work seen engages with the candidates and provides them with enough to evaluate and discuss in the examination. A particularly good example of live performance work seen was Frantic Assembly's Things I Know To Be True and this provided candidates with opportunities to explore and evaluate a range of both realistic performance skills and physical theatre conventions as well as a range of production skills.

Many candidates demonstrated a good knowledge and understanding of the texts studied. The ability to discuss and analyse specific moments within the text is a vital part of the mark scheme. There were fewer examples of candidates with insufficient or inaccurate knowledge of the text than seen in the last series however, there were still examples of candidates simply retelling the plot of the play and not analysing the play or providing a theatrical interpretation.

Unfortunately, some references to the text lacked accuracy or detail to be effective in supporting the points made. Whilst it is not a requirement to use specific quotes from the text – there is a need to engage with the text and specific moments within the text in order to allow the candidate to refer in sufficient practical and performance detail. Centres are reminded that the specification for the qualification does require candidates to study the opening 10 minutes of the play and then at least a further three scenes within the play. Even though questions on the paper will only refer to the opening scenes or three scenes from within the text, it is necessary for candidates to understand the full text in order to interpret individual scenes effectively.

This series, the majority of candidates stayed within these parameters.

When studying these scenes, candidates should be encouraged to refer to specific performance and production skills and to develop the technical language in referring to performance and production skills and should be encouraged to explore those skills in-depth. Centres are reminded that the answers should focus on theatrical interpretation and presentation and not simply analysis of texts.

There is still a lack of detail in terms of performance work and what should be happening on stage or what an actor should be doing. Candidates must be encouraged within teaching and learning to explore the range of performance and production skills, which create theatre. When talking about facial expression for example a candidate is required to break down what that facial expression looks like, why that facial expression is appropriate and what the impact would

be in relation to the question being answered. Answers seen did vary in their response to this requirement and the approach in many essays did reflect a more practical engagement with the work, which is good. There were some essays, which are still simply providing the plot or discussing the text with a more literary approach.

Candidates are still writing large introductions, which reflect knowledge of the play but often appear to be pre-prepared. This should be avoided and introductions like this do not necessarily engage with the mark scheme. An introduction should relate to the question and demonstrate an understanding of social, historical and political context of the play to be useful or an effective use of time.

There is a need to focus on the requirements of the question and there were some essays seen which did not respond appropriately to the question. There were one or two examples of candidates not using the right text for the questions answered and some examples of candidates answering more than the question required under the rubric. The number of candidates, which did not state what question they were answering, was small but at least one candidate did not indicate what essay they were answering.

There were some examples of candidates complicating the questions by providing more than one idea for specific moments and although credit will be given for all relevant and appropriate ideas, it is an essential part of directorial interpretation to focus on one overall concept.

Unlike last year, none of the questions specifically requested rehearsal techniques. Some candidates did discuss what they would do in rehearsal and this was credited by examiners if there was a clear impact or link to the performance of the text in relation to the questions being answered. What is done in rehearsal must have an impact on the end product on stage.

The practical interpretation of the text must be clear to the examiner and there are still some examples of performance ideas that were not clear. Candidates must always be encouraged to think in terms of providing a clear and concise picture in their written work.

Some variation in the length of answers was seen and clearly at times candidates had spent longer on one question than another. On the other hand, some candidates had clearly considered the timing of the examination and had allotted time to each essay and on the whole, this meant that their approach to all three essays was comparable. Those candidates who spent more time on one essay were often self-penalising. There were some examples of candidates writing and then crossing out the written work. There were few examples of candidates planning their work. All candidates identified the performance details required for Section B. There were no examples of defaced papers. Handwriting is still an issue with some candidates' work making the examiner's work harder when they have to struggle to read writing. There were one or two examples of candidates writing on too many questions and one example of a candidate writing on the wrong text for the question chosen.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)

The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018

