

**GCE**

**This Examiners' Report relates to Mark  
Scheme Publication Code: UA013884**

**Examiners' Report**

**GCE  
Drama & Theatre Studies (9113)**

**June 2003**

***Edexcel***  
*Success through qualifications*

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Response Centre on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk)

June 2003

Publications Code UA013884

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© London Qualifications Ltd 2003

## Contents

1.	Unit 4 – 6344 Devising	1
2.	Unit 5 – 6345 Text in Performance II	3
3.	Unit 6 – 6346 Text in Context II	7
4.	Statistics	13



## **Unit 4 - 6344**

### **Devising**

Centres seemed much more at ease with this unit in its second year and the marking of teacher-examiners was more consistent. The work seen at the very top end was superb and many moderators said that it could have been seen on the professional stage. However, most centres produced competent work that fell into the upper middle bands. Very occasionally, work was poor still equating to GCSE standard and it was felt that these students had either seen very little live theatre or not really studied any of the practitioners in sufficient depth to help them with their own work.

#### **Stimulus**

A wide range of thought provoking stimuli was chosen. Clearly, teachers help their candidates most by providing the stimulus even if it does ultimately lead in an unexpected direction. There was strong evidence in Structured Records that when candidates were allowed to control their own choice of stimulus, many weeks were lost in making this initial decision.

There was clear evidence that the framework had allowed the majority of candidates to research and explore relevant resources and issues. This in turn resulted in some wonderful, creative, entertaining performances.

#### **Performance On Video**

As in previous years, weaker performances tended to be those that used a naturalistic approach often based around a series of monologues that were then connected together. Naturalistic work had elements of soap-opera within it and on occasions was muddled up with film.

There was some evidence of this unit not receiving enough guidance from teaching staff. Where students had been 'left to it' both the product and the depth of the written response did not show candidates at their best. Centres need to be mindful of the balance between supporting and guiding candidates while not taking over in a directorial capacity. Centres where candidates had studied a variety of practitioners alongside seeing a variety of live theatre often demonstrated greater maturity in their own devised work.

There were some outstanding examples of multi-media performances with candidates using projected images, I.T., music and audience participation to great effect. Only occasionally had candidates got carried away with technology and lost the essence of the paper which is a devised **drama**.

The strongest work, both performance and written, was a credit to the candidates and their teachers. It was achieved through lively, challenging material, an acknowledgement of how theatre communicates, and an awareness of the need to relate to an audience. Moderators were delighted and amazed by some of the better performances with some truly outstanding work at the top of the range.

#### **Structured Records**

The best Structured Records were an honest reflection of the work students had undertaken and related directly to the process. Greater depth or analysis was the key to success here with candidates writing a personal response.

Some candidates were including photographs or digital images within their notes which, if used carefully, could really enhance what they were communicating. Many of the top Structured Records didn't need to write up to 20 sides of A4 in order to warrant top marks; the emphasis really is on students understanding and communication of the process they have just been through.

As a result of this, some Structured Records were a little more creative this year rather than close-typed essays and both formats are valid if they are appropriate to the objectives.

### **Administration**

As is true of most coursework, there is an added burden for the teacher-examiner and this unit requires a certain amount of organisation on the part of the centre. Teachers were much better this year at helping their students to plan, implement and evaluate the whole process of devising a piece of drama for an audience.

Some centres are still not aware of the importance of the video for this unit. One of the first things a moderator will do is watch the video to gauge the performance mark (AO3). It is vital that the candidates and the performance itself are clearly visible and audible. The camera must be positioned accordingly and there is no substitute for a **rehearsal** including the placing of audience heads, large props and the possibility of the camera sliding towards earth while on the tripod!

Centres need to allow enough time for candidates to clearly identify themselves at the start of the video - at least 5 seconds per candidate is needed. Some centres had embraced digital technology and included a print-out from the initial identification parade with students' names on; this was really appreciated by moderators. It is vital that candidates can be individually identified on this video. Teachers must check the video immediately after the performance, to provide for the unfortunate possibility that it may need to be re-done. Two cameras, if available, may provide the necessary back-up which many teachers wished they had had.

Administratively, the work was much easier for moderators to handle with very few plastic wallets and attachments, which was a considerable help. It was particularly useful where teachers had left their own marks/annotations on students work as this gave the moderator a clear indication as to where the teacher had got some of the marks from.

There was a lot of good work seen here and moderators were hugely impressed with a few centres right at the top of the mark range whose candidates not only produced excellent Structured Records, but performances worthy of a wider audience.

## Unit 5 – 6345

### Text in Performance II

Examiners report on seeing a full range of achievement in the Unit. There was an improved standard at the top end of the mark range but also an increase in candidates not producing work that meets the assessment criteria for this Unit at A2 level. Centres are reminded that the focus of Unit 5 is for candidates to work independently to produce their own individual interpretation of a full length play text lasting no more than 30 minutes for 6 performance candidates.

The strongest work was produced where the choice of the text(s) had been carefully chosen by the centre and taught to the candidates who could then build on the skills and knowledge gained throughout the course to produce a new performance piece based on an existing play text. There was a real sense of ensemble with the focus on exploration, adaptation and presentation. As in Unit 2 the choice of text was seen as crucial to success in this Unit.

It was felt where candidates did less well not enough time had been given to the preparation and rehearsal of the performances and candidates had not developed their vocal or movement skills to A2 levels. There were examples of too much emphasis on lighting, costume and effects to the detriment of individual performances. Candidates must explore the whole text and then find their “take” for performance. Whole texts that were simply edited down, or poorly linked extracts, disadvantaged candidates. In some cases candidates had chosen interpretations that were so at odds with the original texts that marks for interpretation and communication were difficult to award.

There was still concern that some centres had not fully understood the difference between Unit 2 and 5 and that candidates were producing work that had too much teacher direction (and involvement) and was, in essence, another shorter Unit 2.

Centres are reminded it is the candidate’s responsibility to produce the script of the text as performed and the interpretation notes. There was still evidence of the teacher writing the notes and having adapted the script. **This must not happen in future series.**

Candidates did best where the centre had carefully considered the audience for the examination performances. Some centres provided no audience except the examiner and teacher operating the video camera. This clearly disadvantaged candidates. There was more concern from examiners where candidates were disadvantaged by over-large and inappropriate audiences. There was good practice in giving audiences detailed programme notes or introductions by teachers or student directors.

It is clear in the specification and ICE document that for Unit 5 each performance must last no more than 30 minutes for 6 performance candidates. Performance times this year ranged between 10 minutes for 6 candidates to 60 minutes for 3 candidates. Centres must ensure that candidates work towards performances that meet the time requirements of the Unit. The best practice was felt to be where all candidates in the centre had explored the same text, theme or genre. This provided candidates with the depth of understanding needed to achieve at A2 level.

It was felt that many centres understood the holistic nature of the A2 course and there was much evidence that candidates explored Greek texts for Unit 5 to support work on Trojan Women or Shakespeare and his contemporaries to support Section B of Unit 6. Challenging texts explored with a clear focus on moments or key lines from the original to support the thematic perspective chosen by the group produced the strongest work. A strong concept that provided the basis for a coherent

interpretation that used theatre form in imaginative and creative ways enable candidates to do very well in this Unit.

For this Unit more established texts tended to be chosen but examiners report on excellent work based on the following texts: *Machinal*, *Night Heron*, *Angels in America*, *Mojo* and *Three Lives of Lucy Calstol*.

Deconstructing and reconstructing “the well made play” produced some vibrant and exciting work. Edited versions of the complete text were less successful. All centres are reminded that candidates can only perform words from the text as published. No new dialogue or characters can be created for this Unit. In future series this work will **not** be awarded marks by examiners.

### **Performance Candidates**

Candidates did best where they had real opportunities to show their vocal and movement skills as these both have 25% of the marks for this Unit. Centres are reminded that it is vital for this Unit that examiners can clearly identify all candidates. They must be discouraged from all wearing “drama student black” as, due to the time scale and nature of this Unit, examiners must not be over concerned with the identification of individuals. Many examiners comment on the high standard of performance candidates from roaring with laughter at a version of *Absurd Person Singular*, in genuine tears at a version of *Tissue*, to having (almost) look away at the violence communicated in a version of *Troilus and Cressida*. In all strong performances there was a real sense of ownership.

There was concern that for some candidates there was a sense of the work not developing beyond cutting text, learning the lines and performing them. A minority of candidates had failed to even learn their lines and this clearly disadvantaged them and others in their group.

Some centres had considerable difficulties this year with poor candidate attendance and candidates leaving the course during the preparation of Unit 5, some just weeks or days before the performance. It is greatly to the credit of these centres that non-examination candidates were prepared to put in a great deal of extra work to enable the examination to take place.

### **Design Candidates**

Each performance group can have up to 3 design candidates, however this year the majority of groups had one design candidate who took responsibility for the overall concept whilst focusing on one or two skill areas. Centres are reminded design candidates can be examined in **one** performance only and no design skill can be shared between two or more candidates.

Candidates did best when they were fully involved in the ensemble and therefore the whole Unit 5 process. Often, if not required to operate equipment, they took part in the performance although they were not marked for this. It was clear many candidates have the knowledge and technical skill to use the new technologies in their work. There was excellent use made of Microsoft Powerpoint, both to provide settings in performance and for presentation to examiners.

Many portfolios were commented on by examiners for reflecting the depth of knowledge of the play, the importance of design and research undertaken by candidates. Some strong candidates found the presentation difficult and centres are encouraged to work with these candidates to give them confidence in presenting their work. Equally candidates must not give overlong presentations, no matter how enthusiastic and passionate they are. The major concern was that some design candidates are not making this a positive choice, but choosing it because they do not wish to

perform. Often these candidates seemed to have been somewhat sidelined from the performers and this had impacted on their achievement.

Some centres do not have the resources to enable candidates to achieve at A2 level. This is not a question of budgets or equipment, as much of the good work seen was achieved with limited resources, but rather the centres ability to enable candidates to achieve the level of skills needed for A2.

In large centres where technical support staff are employed, it is important that they support candidates and do not do the work the candidates need to do for the unit.

### **Directing Candidates**

It was noticeable there were far fewer directing candidates this year. Centres are clearly considering offering this option. It is clear to examiners that a candidate who lacks the knowledge and maturity to direct their peers in work that is worth 30% of their A2 marks can have a real impact on the achievement of both performance and design candidates.

The majority of directing candidates seen this year were highly committed and spoke with enthusiasm and at times passion. They produced work that was intelligent, exciting, insightful and excellent. Some presentations were far too long again this year and centres must ensure candidates prepare to speak for no more than 10 minutes. A minority of candidates were ill prepared for the presentation and had little or no support materials.

It is the responsibility of directing candidates to produce the interpretation notes and script as performed. They must make it clear to the examiner their own input to the performance. The notes must focus on them and not refer to "we decided/chose to do".

As with design candidates, many directing candidates appeared as part of the ensemble or provided backstage support to performance candidates. This was good practice.

### **Administration**

The written documentation required for performance examinations is to ensure that examiners can arrive at the centre well prepared for the wide range of work presented in a content free specification.

It is understood that some work may have some changes in the last days prior to the examination; however documentation must be with examiners 10 days prior to the examination date. Examiners can be given any changes nearer the performance date. It is vital that the examiner has a clear copy of the script as performed with all candidates' roles clearly identified. This is of paramount importance if a role is being played by two or more candidates for example Verity in Find Me or an adaptation of Medea with 3 Medea's and 2 Jasons. Also, if lines are reallocated to other characters or chorus work is divided up this must be clear.

The Cast List must be completed giving the names of all role(s) played by each performance candidate. For design candidates the skill or skills must be stated clearly. For directing candidates the director must be clearly indicated.

The description for performance candidates must be as they appear in the performance detailing their physical appearance and costume(s) worn. Full length photographs of candidates as they appear in the play are the most useful. Many centres provided excellent digital photographs. Some

centres provided excellent whole cast photographs and this was particularly valued by examiners. Candidates must complete these description forms but they should be checked by centres for accuracy.

It is vital to inform examiners of the start time of the first performance or design presentation. Examiners will then arrive approximately 30 minutes before the given time. There was some confusion this year between when centres expected examiners to arrive and the start of the examination.

Centres must inform examiners not only of the centre/venue but also where the performance is to take place or where the examiners should initially report to such as the centre office. All examiners must be provided with a private area to consider their marking between performances. There was concern this year that some centres failed to do this or provided one at such a distance from the performance space that considerable time was wasted.

### **Video Evidence**

Due to the ephemeral nature of the performance examinations the video evidence of the performances is vital. It is in effect the candidates' "scripts" for this Unit. Centres must ensure that a clear video record is made of all performances and that the video is the best possible recording.

Candidates must identify themselves clearly on the video by name, candidate number and role(s) played before each performance, and also indicate any costume changes. Candidates should be filmed fully as they appear – not just head and shoulders. This is best done immediately before the performance, in the performance space. However, candidates could be filmed earlier, and then edited on to the video before the relevant performance - but candidates must appear as they do in performance. Candidates must still identify themselves to the visiting examiner in attendance before the performance.

Design and Directing candidates must be prepared to make their presentations to camera. These can be done in the performance space before the performance or in another room. Both work well and the centre should choose the best option for candidates, performers and audience. The centre must check the video recording before sending to the examiner. Examiners have received incomplete recordings, silent recordings or those of such poor quality that it was impossible to identify candidates. It is essential when transferring to a standard VHS tape that a new tape is used. In the case of an E.A.R. for any candidate this has to be done on the video evidence and examiners notes so the quality of the video is vital. Centres are required to keep a copy of all performances.

## **Unit 6 – 6346**

### **Text in Context II**

Candidates are required to respond to three questions, two from Section A and one from Section B.

Section A requires the evaluation of the chosen text : either *The Beggar's Opera* or *The Trojan Women*, with candidates supporting responses from annotated copies of the appropriate script.

Section B requires the evaluation of a live performance of a play written between 1575 and 1720, with candidates supporting responses from Research Notes connecting the performance seen and previous time periods. Only the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Notes must refer specifically to the same play with Notes for the original performance conditions and the 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> Century being more general in their background information on performance conditions. Evidence is showing, however, that a large number of candidates are connecting the same play with the earlier time periods, generally to good effect. There is no requirement, however, for candidates to refer to the same play specifically except when connecting with the 20<sup>th</sup> Century conditions.

Question One is divided into three parts, with the mark for each part indicated alongside the question. This question refers to an extract from the text which is published below the question and candidates are instructed that they are “planning a rehearsal.” There is no choice for candidates in this question but there is an intention of a stepped response leading candidates into the demands of the paper.

Question Two is concerned with the play as a whole and therefore with an overall understanding of the way it works as theatre. Responses to this question may or may not develop ideas outlined in Question One but there needs to be an overall concept evident in the response, based upon a detailed study of the text and upon an understanding of how it might work in performance. There is a choice of question for candidates. An attempt was made again this year to keep the questions on the two texts as similar as possible for candidates.

Question Three is concerned with connecting the live performance seen with one previous time period in the play's history. The starting point for responses is the play seen by the candidates in performance; it is not the historical context of the play. The difference in approach should be clear.

Although the A2 year is student-centred it was clear again this year, across the range of responses, which centres had spent sufficient time preparing candidates for this unit. Meaningful, well-structured practical lessons had informed discussions and decisions made by candidates about their overall understanding of the play for Section A and assisted a relevant approach to the play seen in performance and its historical context for Section B.

Background research was evident, and candidates who offered meaningful and focussed responses to the paper were able to do so from a position of strength gained from a well-structured course that started in the AS year and guided them through the demands of the A2 year. Preparation for writing about drama is something that needs to be signposted throughout the course for candidates, with the language of drama explored regularly in vocal and written form.

Where the focus was lacking it tended to be where candidates were not able to effectively discriminate in their responses - and offered information which was not relevant to the question (although it was clearly part of an overall research programme) - or provided information which was simply a regurgitation of a prepared concept, without due referral to the demands of the question.

Less secure responses were again this year unable to move successfully away from the prepared notes and to offer clear analysis to support decisions and/or observations. The language of drama was often lacking from candidates but where it was used appropriately there was clear understanding and excitement shown within the responses.

This year there were far more Centres offering Trojan Women than The Beggar's Opera. 2ai was more popular than 2aii. 2bii was slightly more popular than 2bi. 3b was more popular than 3a.

## **General**

It was clear that candidates in general had been well prepared for the overall demands of the paper and the evidence is that, where this was the case those candidates were able to respond positively and creatively to the questions. The overall impression from examiners was that candidates in general had performed slightly better this year than they did last year. There is evidence from the marks awarded of candidates having explored the Section A text in much more detail and of them being able to respond with the Primary Source at the heart of the Section B response.

There were a very few candidates again this year who presented an integrated answer to question 1 and did not divide the response to take into account the mark allocation for each aspect of the question. Whilst these candidates were not penalised by the examiner, they effectively penalised themselves by not allowing the progression the question demanded across the thinking behind their concept to take place.

Similarly there were candidates who did not take into account the opening statement for the question which instructed them that they were "planning a rehearsal...." and they therefore presented ideas in answer to the question which did not fully explore the elements of the processes involved in working with actors as a director. There were far fewer candidates doing this than last year, which was pleasing to see. Some candidates did not take into account the mark allocation for each section of the question and wrote a disproportionate amount for i), for up to 4 marks, in some cases writing more than they wrote for iii) for 10 marks.

The notion of director appeared to be clear to the majority of the candidates. What was not so clear at times was the role of the director in the rehearsal process and the decisions the director had to make in working with others to create performances. There was a sense that some candidates did not have enough detailed knowledge of the play as a whole to help them make informed decisions about aspects of the extract, and rehearsal techniques were often vague and did not always connect with either the question or the extract. It is not enough for candidates at this level to simply describe the rehearsal techniques without connecting their purpose to the question and the extract. Where the connections were made there was a clear and strong sense of ownership of the ideas. There was, however, often a sense of prepared notes to these responses, rather than an attempt at answering the question.

In Section A there was again a tendency to want to update the plays and this was not always helpful as the ideas were not always supported by sound theatrical reasoning and, more importantly perhaps, background knowledge. There were a few examples again this year of little or no regard for Health and Safety issues where candidates wrote about flooding the acting space as Trojan Women progressed, with the actors clinging to bars above the water, or of having the city collapsing around the actors at the end of the play. Responses to The Beggar's Opera generally showed much more awareness of what is and is not possible within a staged performance. Whilst the examination encourages creativity - and there was evidence in Section A of candidates being highly imaginative in their approach to the chosen text – ideas must be realistic and practical. In the majority of cases

this year the evidence was that candidates were able to explore the chosen play in relation to the question, with a clear understanding of how their concept might work in performance. Some candidates this year were not able to develop their interpretation in relation to the question and presented answers that did not connect sufficiently to earn a higher mark.

Candidates who earned the higher marks for question 1 were those who were able to connect with the process and give clear supported examples. A number of candidates were not able to relate their answers to the director working with a cast and crew in preparing the play for performance. This is fundamental for candidates being able to respond meaningfully to this unit. For question 2, candidates who were able to develop their concepts in relation to the question were able to earn the higher marks. As already stated there were a minority of cases where candidates were not able to present ideas that were practical in terms of staging or concept. Some candidates presented interpretations that were not in keeping with the performance values or historical heritage of the chosen text. The majority of candidates, however, were able to explore the texts in a way that reflected the way we live now but remain faithful to themes, issues, style and theatrical heritage.

For *The Trojan Women*, Iraq featured heavily in the responses. It was sometimes difficult for candidates to connect a specific conflict with the text in its entirety and concepts did not always logically carry through the text. A number of candidates returned to Ancient Greece in their concepts and were able to do so to some success. It appeared that the most successful candidates again this year were those who chose to be much less specific about the conflict or the location and presented a timeless vision of the aftermath of conflict.

For *The Beggar's Opera* the time periods and concepts were much more open, with the present day featuring heavily. The majority of candidates were able to retain the spirit of the original in the concept, with only a very few deciding to cut the songs altogether. There appeared to be less television influences on concepts this year, with a number of centres looking at physical theatre in their approach. A disappointing aspect of responses to this play was the number of candidates who wrote about updating music and lyrics to help make their production appeal to a modern audience but did not then offer examples in support.

There was evidence of the Centre Concept for both plays and, whilst candidates were not penalised for this it tended to lead to a less creative response to the questions. Some centres had clearly set out to avoid this, with every concept different from the others. Whilst this approach is also interesting for the candidates, not all of the concepts actually developed to suit the demands of the play and candidates struggled to develop their ideas, particularly in question 2.

Across the paper as a whole this year there was clear evidence of candidates understanding particular texts but often this understanding was still not appropriately applied to the question and there was still a general lack of analysis across the board. Candidates who were able to address the demands of the questions and offer an individual response based upon knowledge gained throughout the course were able to gain more marks than those who relied too heavily upon prepared notes and annotated scripts. As for Unit 3, the notes are the thinking for the candidate and it is the way that thinking is applied to the questions that gains the marks. It was clear that the preparation for this Unit had been so thorough in some cases that candidates were unable to be flexible in their approach to the questions and therefore responses, although detailed and interesting, lacked focus in terms of what was demanded from the candidates. A few candidates again this year were not able to look at the Section A text in relation to its performance, having been guided towards its structure as a text rather than as a play, leading to a literary rather than theatrical response. This was sometimes true of Section B as well.

Examiners were interested to note the number of candidates who were inaccurately spelling the drama vocabulary at this level (eg 'rehearsa'l and 'theatre'). Drama terms were not always used appropriately and there was a general sense of some practitioners being used in ways that did not clearly indicate ownership or understanding. The overall evidence was that there was less unfocussed work from candidates this year than last.

In Section B examiners reported a mixed profile of responses from candidates who had seen performances close to the original performance conditions (eg at The Globe). Some examiners felt that this had inhibited responses to the questions, whilst others felt that candidates had benefited from the experience. As with all experiences, the teaching and learning in relation to the kind of questions that are likely to be set is the key to candidates' achievement. There was evidence from a minority of candidates – but more than last year – of a play from outside the stipulated time period for Section B having been studied. The time period and dates are very clear and are published in a number of Edexcel sources.

The vast majority of candidates related their response to the play's original performance conditions, with Shakespeare featuring heavily again in the responses. Very few candidates this year chose to connect with the 20<sup>th</sup> Century experience. For 3a examiners accepted answers which covered the time periods rather than just one as there was an ambiguity in the question, picked up by some candidates, which implied this was acceptable.

Candidates who earned the higher marks in Section B tended to be those who rooted their answers in the Primary Source and supported this with appropriate examples from the chosen time period. Those who presented a history lesson – however accurate it was – were not able to meet the demands of the question in the same way.

There were some excellent responses based upon a whole range of performances from around the world, with candidates clearly having been inspired by the theatrical experience. It is surprising, however, that candidates as already mentioned, are not able to name key figures connected to the performance they have seen.

### **Question 1a) and 1b)**

(i) Candidates did not always address the question in terms of the process, involving the director (the candidate) working with performers/designer and planning a rehearsal. There were a lot of imaginative responses from candidates who had clearly defined ideas for their chosen text but some candidates were not able to focus on the specific moment asked for within the extracts. Some responses were performance-based, not process-based.

(ii) For *The Beggar's Opera* few candidates were able to separate performers into individual characters in relation to the question, having "the gang" and Macheath almost as two characters. Some candidates offered clear ideas supported by helpful sketches, using levels to good effect. For *The Trojan Women* some candidates did not offer an approach to two challenges and others were very much performance- not process-based. There was a range of challenges but most centred around the body and the lighting of the scene. Some candidates picked up on the use of the shield. Some candidates outlined areas over which the designer had no control like, for example, the choral speaking.

(iii) Responses to this question were generally very descriptive and were not always linked to the question and/or the extract in enough specific detail. Off-text work and/or rehearsal work were not always linked to the play or justified in terms of the extract. A large proportion of the responses

looked at the character(s) rather than work to be done by the director with the actors. There were some imaginative and detailed line-by-line responses to this question, particularly for *The Trojan Women*, in some cases supported by a clear director's overview and input. These were a pleasure to read and gave an indication of joined-up thinking and the overall holistic concept of this specification. There were some interesting and unexpected approaches to the portrayal of Talthybius and, where these were supported by sound reasoning within the concept they were a real credit to the candidates. The *Beggar's Opera* responses were not always able to recognise the gang members as individuals, but where this did happen there was a clear imaginative response to the question.

### **Question 2a) and 2b)**

Candidates were clear and confident about how they might make their production appeal to a modern audience. Responses tended to be very general at times however, and lacked some sense of connecting with the question. Candidates often seemed to struggle beyond their prepared ideas and were not always able to offer examples that were specific enough in relation to the question. The difficult aspect of the question for a large number of candidates was the giving of reasons in support of the decisions.

Where candidates focussed on only one specific moment or concept to illustrate their attempt at appealing to a modern audience this did not always give a sense of the production as a whole which was, in some cases, a pity as the moment or concept was not contextualised enough in terms of the question. A lot of candidates attempted this question and a number of them were not able to be specific enough in their response to it. What became something of a stock response was that the play was old and therefore needed to be completely updated to make it appeal. To do this, many candidates took away the essential essence of the play in an attempt to make it appeal, instead of looking at the material and deciding what it was about it which was of universal appeal and finding ways of presenting that to their audience. Where the connections were made, the answers were highly imaginative and full of confidence and knowledge.

Not many candidates answered the alternative question for *The Beggar's Opera* and it is difficult therefore to assess the response. There was evidence, however, of some imaginative approaches to costume, mixing time periods in an interesting way. A number of answers were supported by helpful sketches which the candidates were able to use effectively in support of their discussion.

The question on Chorus was popular with candidates, and generally answered well. Some candidates focussed on an aspect of the chorus rather than an overall approach and were therefore not able to meet the demands of the question. The balance in the answer of costume, movement, speech, style, individuality and relationships was achieved very well by some candidates and supported by examples from the prepared concept.

### **Question 3a and 3b**

Responses overall were very general, but less so than last year. The links with the questions were not always in place or always clear, particularly in response to 3(b). Very few candidates used research from time periods other than the 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> Century but the 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> Century was more popular this year than last.

Knowledge of the 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> Century was generally very good and often applied appropriately, with candidates having a clear understanding of performance style and conditions. There were some

curious references from some candidates, which, although lacking substance were presented with confidence.

3b was the more popular choice and was generally tackled well by candidates referring closely to aspects of the Primary Source and using these to make the connections. The more successful candidates balanced the response and used the Primary Source (the live performance seen) as their starting point. This was an effective way of tackling the questions in this Section as it placed the focus of the response within the candidate's own experience.

Some candidates did not concentrate enough in their responses on one other time period, describing in detail the primary source and then adding some historical context almost as an afterthought.

A large number of candidates were undecided about the statement in 3a and set out to offer a balanced view, sometimes to very good effect. Some candidates discussed the statement at some length but did not then connect it to either the Primary Source or any previous source.

## Statistics

### Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation	% Contribution to Award
6344	80	62.1	12.3	100
6345	60	46.1	10	100
6346	60	30.5	9.7	100

### Unit 4

#### 6344 Devising

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	80	71	60	49	39	29
UMS boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

### Unit 5

#### 6345 Text in Performance II

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	55	48	41	34	28
UMS boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### Unit 6

#### 6346 Text in Context II

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	40	32	24	17
UMS boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

### Advanced Award

Provisional statistics for the award (7822 candidates)

	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	12.3	42.6	78.7	96.0	99.7

### Advanced UMS grade boundaries

Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E
600	480	420	360	300	240

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4LN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Order Code UA013884 June 2003

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact our  
Customer Response Centre on 0870 240 9800  
or email: [enquiries@edexcel.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@edexcel.org.uk)  
or visit our website: [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk)

London Qualifications Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 4496750  
Registered Office: Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN