

GCE

Edexcel GCE

Drama and Theatre Studies  
(8113/9113)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark  
Scheme Publication code: UA017849

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

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 Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

Summer 2006

Publications Code UA017849

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

## Contents

1.	Unit 1 (6341) Moderators' Report	5
2.	Unit 2 (6342) Examiners' Report	9
3.	Unit 3 (6343) Examiners' Report	17
4.	AS Statistics	24
5.	Unit 4 (6344) Moderators' Report	25
6.	Unit 5 (6345) Examiners' Report	27
7.	Unit 6 (6346) Examiners' Report	36
8.	A2 Statistics	44

Edexcel Ltd holds the copyright for this publication. Further copies of the **Mark Schemes** may be obtained from Edexcel Publication.



## Unit 1 (6341) - Exploration

This well established unit produced work that was very similar to previous series in terms of content and standard. Many familiar texts were used to good effect although it was exciting to see some new, more challenging texts used, with centres successfully combining a more 'classic' choice of play with something more avant garde for example, 'Ubu Roi' and 'Six Degrees of Separation'. There is an emerging discrepancy between work that is extremely well organised, presented and administered with that which is poorly structured in terms of the course covered and the teacher-examiner administration.

The best Exploration Notes referred to practical work that the candidates had actually completed to further their understanding of the theory. Successful centres regard this unit as an **exploration** unit both in the written and the practical element. Moderators welcomed this personal insight, particularly when they could see how candidate's practical work related to the theory. There was slightly more work seen at the lower end of the assessment criteria this year which may reflect the calibre of candidates choosing to stay on to 6<sup>th</sup> form study.

Concerns were raised about the growing number of candidates who completed the practical work but submitted no exploration notes. A candidate with **no notes** is only able to achieve half of the available marks on this unit.

Popular texts this year were 'Our Country's Good', 'Metamorphosis', and 'A Doll's House'. Texts by playwrights such as Brian Friel, Jim Cartwright and Shakespeare were also widely used. The choice of text can have an impact on candidate achievement, as the text/s must provide adequate opportunity for all of the assessment objectives to be met. There was also evidence of plays being taught that were currently on in London or in repertory theatres. Candidates do not have to see either of the texts they study for this unit but it is evident that a lot do. Some centres use texts that teach genre while others use unit 1 to also study particular practitioners, though this is usually Brecht or Stanislavski. In a minority of centres, two texts by the same playwright were studied, clearly limiting candidates' opportunities for significant exploration.

Overall, there is some super work seen in this unit and it is evident that it makes an excellent foundation for the rest of the course.

### Presentation Of Notes

Most teachers have a sound understanding of both the requirements for this unit and the standard. The Exploration Notes are worth half of the available marks for this unit. Teachers are obviously structuring tasks to meet the full range of criteria.

There appeared to be more evidence this year that teachers were having a greater influence on some of the notes. Writing frames were often supplied that at best kept candidates' work relevant and focussed, at worst, produced formulaic notes with little originality and personal response. It was helpful when teacher-examiners included writing frames they had used with the Record of Work as this gave the moderator further evidence of the learning that had taken place.

There is a published guide to the presentation of the Exploration Notes available in

the Instructions for the Conduct of the Examination (ICE) booklet. It is still frustrating that despite reference to it in all previous Examiners' reports, some centres are still submitting notes that are not fastened securely together, that are on card, in plastic wallets, without signatures, with teacher comment sheets separate from the notes and even in hard bound notebooks. This significantly increases the time taken to moderate the work. A considerable number of centres had to be contacted to rectify many of these basic administrative tasks.

A very small number of centres submitted work where there was evidence of plagiarism. This tended to be obvious with whole sections lifted directly from the internet. Moderators could not understand why teacher-examiners had not identified this. The most frequently plagiarised elements were Plot and Sub-plot and Social, Cultural and Historical. However, most notes were presented on A4 paper in close typed prose. Visual, Aural and Spatial was often beautifully presented on either A4 or A3 paper.

### Records Of Work

Records of Work allow the moderator to see the practical activities that the candidates have engaged in, in order to **explore** the two texts. It is essential that a Record of Work for each text studied is supplied.

Most Records of Work were excellent documents showing detailed lesson plans and imaginative activities that allowed the candidates to succeed in all of the assessment objectives. The best examples gave a session by session breakdown with an indication of which of the assessment objectives the teacher intended to cover. These contrasted with a minority of Records Of Work that were very brief and appeared to be written retrospectively. Candidates achieved well when clear links could be seen between the teacher's Record of Work and the practical work referred to in the candidate's notes. This shared purpose and understanding, enabling candidates of all abilities to meet the assessment criteria.

### Recording

About a quarter of centres submitted the practical evidence on DVD for the first time this year.

The evidence should be of two workshop sessions, one for each of the texts studied, and show the candidates engaged in a number of activities. This gives the moderator a feel for the work of the centre, not for individual candidates. Least helpful are those that show candidates reading the play for an hour or those that show a performance of the chosen text. This is an **exploration** unit and exploration activities should be shown on the recording.

It is in the centre's interest to send a recording that shows their candidates in a positive light. Centres are reminded to check the quality of the recording before submitting it as there were still a number with intermittent sound/no sound/ totally fuzzy pictures.

## Teacher-Examiner Comment Sheets

When candidates are entered for a coursework unit that means that initially, the work is marked/examined by appropriate staff within the centre. Standardisation meetings to train new staff or staff new to this specification are held throughout the Autumn term. There is also a postal standardisation pack available .

Most teacher-examiners had gone to great lengths to write up detailed, specific notes on all of their candidates to support the marks awarded. It is perfectly acceptable to use continuation sheets if this suits the centre. The important thing is to write comments that allow the moderator to visualise exactly why each candidate has been awarded a certain mark. Comments such as 'natural performer' do not help unless they are substantiated with specific examples.

Well organised centres provided teacher-examiner comments that gave specific examples of how and why candidates had achieved throughout the unit.

## Administration

For most centres, the administration was good with teachers putting considerable time aside to support this coursework unit. There was also evidence of internal cross-moderation taking place, with centres supporting this vital procedure. Unfortunately, there were perhaps more centres this year that did not address the administration of this teacher-examined unit as well as they should. A checklist is provided in the ICE document that methodically lists all the procedures necessary to ensure the smooth running of this unit.

## Exploration Notes

### Plot

Traditionally, this is the strongest of all the elements and, apart from the aforementioned instances of plagiarism, remains so. Many candidates gave an account of the plot and then detailed the sub-plot under a separate heading. Alternatively, some provided detailed illustrated storyboards which, as long as they met the assessment criteria, did prove very effective. Successful work shows an awareness of implication of action and may often mention elements such as exposition and foreshadowing.

### Language

This also tends to be very well done with candidates able to show their **personal** exploration particularly well on this element. It is increasingly common for candidates to include a photocopied extract from the text that is then carefully annotated with both highlighter pens and notes. Some candidates had been encouraged to see this element as a character analysis exercise which did not always allow the candidates to achieve, as focus could be distracted from the actual use of language.

Successful candidates respected the playwright's intentions while writing in the first person to show how they had explored particular aspects of the language.

## **Form and structure**

Weaker candidates still really struggle with this element and do not show sufficient knowledge and understanding to warrant higher marks.

Candidates are making excellent use of tension graphs when they are clearly labelled and describe what each particular moment connects to. Again, candidates who were able to draw on their practical exploration of the play did much better on this element. An awareness of audience is essential if the candidate is to fully understand the impact of the form and structure.

## **Visual Aural and Spatial**

Generally, this element is done really well with original sketches, diagrams and real creativity being shown. Candidates do not do well if they just recreate or review a production they have seen and many centres are completing this element before going to see a production of the play to stop this happening.

For candidates to show practical work they have created either on stage or in model form, the use of photos and scanned images is proving to be very effective. A successful formula can be to divide this section into three headings and to deal with visual, aural and spatial aspects respectively but candidates' own creativity is to be commended here.

## **Contextualising The Play (Social, Cultural & Historical)**

Again, for weaker candidates this element proves difficult and even stronger candidates do not always appreciate the need to connect this element to the play they have studied and its relevance in society. Biographical details and lists of other plays by the playwright are used as 'filling' unless they can be justified in the context of the play studied. If candidates have seen a contemporary production of the text, it is in this section where they can make most use of it, detailing the audience response to the play which helps to give a cultural relevance to a contemporary audience.

## Unit 2 ( 6342 ) - Text in Performance 1

### Introduction

This is an externally examined unit but the assessment objectives and criteria do not change from those printed in the specification. In preparing candidates for this unit the specification must be read with close reference to the Instructions for the Conduct of the Examination (ICE) for the current examination series. Each centre chooses the playtexts, the option taken by candidates and the audience. This unit has elements of both an examined and coursework unit.

Overall, the examining team reported that the standards of previous series had been maintained. There is a high level of understanding of the requirements of this unit and the majority of candidates are well prepared to both achieve in the examination and enjoy the experience of live theatre performance.

Some examiners felt that there was an increase in candidates being poorly prepared for this unit and producing work that did not meet AS standard. However, as in previous series there were many candidates who not only produced work that met the requirements of the unit but exceeded the AS standard. These candidates were awarded full marks and often examiners noted that in fact they were '80 plus' marks.

### Requirements

There remains some issues of concern reported by the majority of the examining team and it must be stated that most of these have been reported on in previous examiners' reports. Centres must ensure that they put in place the requirements for this unit as detailed in the ICE. This is revised each year in the light of both examiners and teachers suggestions to ensure that the administration of the unit is clear to all centres. It also includes all the documentation needed for this unit. Centres can download copies of this and the specification from the Edexcel website.

### Group Size and Performance Time

Both group size and performance time are now clearly stated in both the ICE and on the DTS2b form that must be signed by the teacher. If centres do not comply with this requirement it may disadvantage candidates. Examiners are clearly instructed to only award marks within the set time limits. They are not required to remain in the examination after the maximum time for each performance.

The main concern was when performances were clearly overlong and some candidates had not appeared at all until after the maximum time limit. This was most often when smaller groups were performing for an hour or more.

Centres are reminded that this is an examination and that very short and overlong performances do not meet the requirements of this unit.

There was increased concern that Unit 2 performances were being used in other contexts, for example NT Connections or larger music and drama evenings. Centres

must ensure that the performance the examiner attends meets examination requirements.

It is also a requirement to provide a copy of the text as performed. Examiners report that there was an increase in centres not including the text. Often because they felt the examiner would know it, or sending the complete uncut text. In a content free unit it is important that examiners are well prepared.

### **Timing of the Examination**

This year those centres that had made entries in 2005 were allocated an examiner in January and most contacted the centres as quickly as possible. Many examiners report that some centres did not contact them for some time despite several repeat phone calls or emails. This often led to the first choice of date or time for the centre not being possible. Centres need to have some flexibility in arranging the examination date and time.

Again this year many Unit 2 exams took place in mid to late May. As Unit 2 is the basis of 50% of the marks in Unit 3 examiners were concerned that candidates had little time to prepare thoroughly for Unit 3.

The vast majority of performances took place in the evenings giving a sense of occasion and enabling an appropriate audience to attend. Most examiners report that the concerns raised in last year's report regarding audience suitability had been addressed by most centres.

### **Choice of Texts**

The choice of text to enable candidates to meet the requirements of the examination and their skills and interests is the foundation for achievement in this unit. Many centres have now been preparing candidates for this exam since 2001 and it is clear there are a number of texts that work very well and centres are returning to them but giving them a new and unique interpretation. Examiners also report again this year that much new and exciting contemporary work both written in English and in translation was seen. Teachers from other countries are to be commended for introducing candidates and examiners to new texts.

Plays that have the episodic form worked particularly well giving the teacher director the flexibility to choose episodes that supported all candidates. However, it was equally true that there were many examples of more formally structured texts. For example, Greek tragedy or the three act well made play given exciting and innovative interpretations that engaged audiences and candidates. There was very little musical theatre seen this year but examiners report on excellent performances of 'Oh What a Lovely War' and 'Godspell'.

As in previous years, stylised, physical and ensemble approach to performance work was felt to advantage candidates at this level. More naturalistic performances often started well but could lack pace and dynamism. This may be due to candidates not rising to the challenge of this style of performance within a live theatre context.

Centres are reminded that the choice of text is their responsibility. Some examiners overheard comments or were questioned by audience members regarding the suitability of the content or the language of the text. Examiners cannot enter into any dialogue with candidates, teachers or members of the audience but some centres may need to consider this 'parent perspective' in future.

It was felt that there was a decrease in texts that lacked sufficient challenge or were beyond the skill level or understanding of ideas or emotions of most 17 year olds.

A major concern is centres that choose a full length play and cast each act or group of scenes with a different performance group. There is no doubt that this disadvantages candidates in both Units 2 and 3, as they are unable to show an understanding of the complete text. It is also felt that taking a role that limits their achievement disadvantages some candidates and it can also be a rather unsatisfactory experience for the audience. There are a few centres that have candidates involved throughout a full-length play but designate in which section candidates must be awarded marks. This is not good practice as it is a challenge for examiners to have the correct focus on the examined candidates and makes too great a demand on candidates to be involved in performance work for which they cannot be awarded marks.

### **The Teacher Director's Interpretation Notes**

Most examiners report that the majority of centres understand that along with the choice of text this is a key aspect of success in this unit. It is very disappointing to report again a number of centres that do not provide written notes for this or submit notes that do not make clear their intentions. The most useful notes are written by the candidates and director and provide a foundation for the notes written by the candidates for their Unit 5 work in the A2 year.

Centres should consider that the notes are used by the examiner to look for the key elements in each performance. Notes may refer to understanding of style, the work of practitioners or influences from performances seen. Many refer to the effect they hope to have on the audience and give reasons for the choices made in the staging. Some detail how roles are to be shown in performance.

### **Performance Candidates**

It remains true that this is the option taken by the majority of candidates. Work was seen across the mark range. Many candidates work with such skill, enthusiasm and commitment that many performances are seen that fully deserve marks in the top bands.

It is good to report again this year that all examiners comment on the great pleasure they have experienced examining the majority of performances again this year. Their teachers and centres have given the majority of candidates a well-structured preparation period and a final examination that had a real sense of both occasion and theatre.

The main concern of examiners is that it seemed at times as though not enough teaching of performance skills had taken place in preparation for the exam. This year it was felt that many candidates had poor or underdeveloped vocal skills. There was too often a sense of them talking to each other rather than understanding the importance of projection in live theatre. In contrast, physical theatre skills were felt to often be of a very high standard.

### **Design Candidates**

These candidates were felt to be fewer in number this year and marks were more polarised. There was some excellent work but some candidates had not understood the requirements of this option and produced poorly considered and executed work that failed to add anything to the overall performance. There was evidence that a very small number of candidates attempted to pass off as their own, work that had been produced by others in the performance group. This issue was addressed in this year's examiner training and examiners dealt with this situation appropriately. Most performance groups had one design candidate who took on one or more design element. It was felt that there was no advantage in either approach.

The presentations to the examiner varied greatly, ranging from some candidates who failed to attend the performance and others who were unprepared and either refused to make a presentation or improvised one. These candidates often had poor documentation. Some candidates gave poor presentations but their work was effective in performance. In future, centres may be given the option of pre-recording the presentations for the examiner to view prior to the performance. This may advantage candidates who are actively involved with the performance, for example, lighting or costume candidates.

It must be noted that the vast majority of performance groups have no design candidates but work with the teacher/director to ensure that the performance values enhance the work.

All options are fairly equally represented as there was an increase in make up/mask work this year.

There remain a few centres that fail to understand this is most importantly an examination, and by over elaborate staging actually disadvantage performance candidates.

### **Administration**

The overwhelming concern from examiners this year was the poor administration by too many centres throughout the process. A great deal of the required paperwork was incomplete, inaccurate, late or non-existent until the examiner's arrival in the centre. Examiners wish to come well prepared for the examination and cannot do so without this vital information. Examiners are instructed to arrive 30 minutes prior to the first performance/presentation so that any changes can be considered during that time. Many centres did not send maps, expecting examiners to find the centre directions on the Internet. This was unhelpful as, particularly in the evening, examiners could not easily locate the actual venue of the examination on the site. More than one centre held the exam at another venue but had not informed the examiner.

There was also concern that the time management of the examination by the centres was poor at times. Examiners expect to examine at least 18 candidates in a 3-hour session. Some examiners arrived at the centre at the agreed time and were waiting for up to 90 minutes before meeting the candidates. Overlong performances and late running again meant that some examiners and candidates were completing an examination around midnight. There was equal concern that some examiners were given very little time to consider their marking between performances and also a private place to mark was not provided.

It would be unfair to give the impression that this lack of thought applied to the majority of centres. Most completed all administration very well and the examination was run with professionalism throughout.

Again this year, thanks must be given to the centres that had an accompanied visit from members of the senior team. This is an important part of the ongoing monitoring of examiners for the practical performance units. At all times this extra requirement was dealt with by centres with understanding.

### **The Importance of the Recording of the Performances/Presentations**

It is felt that some centres do not understand the importance of the very best possible recording being made of all performances and presentations. In order to maintain the standards of the examination and that examiners work is monitored throughout the process a great deal of centres' work is viewed by the senior team, alongside examiner notes. Centres should be aware that the senior team may randomly check a centre's work and if examiners have any concerns they must seek another opinion.

Unfortunately, this year it was felt that the quality of the recorded work was less good than in previous series. Too often the camera was not placed close to the examiner and was frequently so far back from the performance that the candidates could not be identified. Another common mistake was the examiner and audience heads taking up most of the frame. If there is a large performance space and scenes are performed in different areas the camera may pan to record the work. If the person operating the camera knows the piece, some judicious use of close ups can be useful in capturing individual performances.

Design presentations must be made to the camera and the examiner will sit next to the camera. Some examiners felt that candidates expected them to ask them questions as they looked at the documentation. Examiners will look at this evidence after the presentation but not question candidates.

Centres must keep a copy of the recorded examination work. The recording sent to Edexcel via the examiner is the basis of any Enquiries About Results.

Most centres completed the Video/DVD time sheet well. This is most important for the ease of finding performances or presentations when looking for candidates' work. Also, it is important that centres comment on the quality of the recording. Many centres realised that the recording did not capture the performance well or had incomplete recordings. Some centres did not complete this at all.

This year centres could submit work on DVD. Examiners and centres welcomed this but there were considerable problems. In future, centres must ensure that the DVD

can be played on a standard domestic player. Examiners are not required to use a computer to view the work. Also, each presentation/performance must be given a chapter.

The main problem was that many centres failed to send the recording to the visiting examiner within seven working days of the examination. Examiners spent much time contacting centres trying to get the recording and many were never sent at all. Written documentation had to be sent to Edexcel without the recording and for these centres no Enquiries About Results will be possible.

### **Identification of Candidates on the Recordings**

Centres must ensure that all candidates introduce themselves immediately before their performance or presentation, as it will appear on the recording. This can be pre-recorded and edited in to the recording by the centre.

Design candidates must state clearly and slowly the centre name and number followed by their name, candidate number, chosen skill(s), the performance title and group number. It can be helpful if they have the centre name and number, their name and candidate number written clearly on paper and held up to camera.

Performance candidates must line up in their performance group. It can be helpful if this is done in order of appearance. The first candidate must state clearly and slowly the centre name and number, the date of the performance followed by the performance title and group number. All candidates must then state clearly and slowly their name and candidate number, role(s) played and give a verbal description of all costumes worn in the performance. It is helpful, if there are costume changes, if costumes worn later are shown to the camera. It can be helpful if their name and candidate number and role(s) played are written clearly on paper and held up to the camera.

The camera must then record them as a group in long shot. It can be helpful if they repeat their name and roles played. The group shot must be held for enough time for someone watching the recording to clearly identify all candidates in the group. This is the equivalent of completing the front sheet of a written examination paper.

Centres are strongly encouraged to provide the visiting examiner with a group colour photograph for each performance on arrival prior to the examination.

On the candidate mark sheets, candidates should give detailed written descriptions of how they will appear in the performance, both physical appearance and costume. Small head and shoulder shots must not be attached to the form as they have proved to be of limited use in aiding identification and can be time consuming for centres.

## The Performance of Candidates in this Unit

High scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Candidates had been well taught with close reference to the specification and ICE 2006.
- Candidates had been taught performance skills.
- The teacher understood the importance of the director's role.
- There was a clear and detailed overall concept, often a collaboration between candidates and teacher/director.
- Candidates had been well directed.
- Candidates made reference to their understanding of how theatre works from Unit 1 and sometimes GCSE drama performance work.
- Candidates had gained knowledge from seeing a range of theatre performances as a member of the audience.
- The text was appropriate for AS standards, challenging and engaged their interest.
- An appropriate and supportive audience engaged with the performance.
- Candidates produced work that met the assessment objectives and criteria for this unit.
- Candidates were given enough but not too much to achieve in performance.
- The examination had a sense of occasion.
- Performances met the time requirements.
- Candidates were very well prepared and had experienced a well structured rehearsal process.
- Candidates demonstrated commitment, enthusiasm and passion.
- The performance reflected 40% of their AS year in terms of preparation time.

Middle scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Well taught but candidates had not given enough individual commitment.
- Erratic attendance hampered group achievement.
- Texts were too simplistic or too challenging for candidates' ability.
- Preparation and rehearsal time was not used effectively possibly, too little or too much.
- Performances were too long or too short.
- Candidates had less secure performance skills.
- Candidates' understanding of how live theatre works was somewhat limited.
- Performance space did not support the live performance.
- Audience was not fully supportive or aware of the examination element.

Low scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Work was under prepared.
- Little understanding of the demands of creating live performance work.
- Performances were very brief.
- Lack of security with lines, cues and moves. Some candidates read from scripts.
- Candidates had not been given clear direction.
- Candidates were over or under confident.

- Inappropriate texts were chosen for candidate and AS skill level.
- Performances did not meet at AS level the objectives or criteria of this unit.
- Inappropriate or small audience (only examiner and teacher ) present.

### Consortium Centres

Again this year there were some difficulties with centres that had not completed the Consortium Information Forms available in the ICE document. The completed forms must be sent to Edexcel as early as possible in the academic year. For all candidates not being examined in their registered home centre, the examiner must be informed beforehand and 2 copies of a separate register must be provided giving full details of ' home' centre name, number, candidate name and number. This information must also be detailed on the DVD or videotape.

### Conclusion

As in previous reports the concerns detailed in this report could be addressed if all centres referred closely to the Specification and ICE documentation.

Centres are reminded that Edexcel offers a national programme of Inset courses led by members of the Senior Examining Team. Details have been sent to centres or are available with booking details on the Edexcel website.

This remains a highly successful unit that achieves a great deal beyond its requirements as the AS Text in Performance I. Examiners continue to comment on the excellence, excitement, power and professionalism of much of the work presented by candidates. Examiners and audiences have again this year been amused, moved, made to think and even reconsider their views of plays and the messages they bring to us in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Much of the credit for this work, that will long be remembered after the AS results are published, is due to the commitment, knowledge, understanding and passion of the teacher directors who work with dedication to enable a still growing number of candidates to have a rich and creative experience preparing for and completing this unit.

## Unit 3 (6343) - Text in Context I

Candidates are required to respond to three questions in Section A and three questions in Section B. Section A requires the evaluation of the Unit 2 Performance with candidates supporting responses with Context Summary Notes. Section B requires the evaluation of a live performance, with candidates supporting responses with Performance Analysis Notes.

Each question in each section is divided into an a) or b) choice. In total candidates answer 6 questions, with each answer gaining up to 10 marks. This Unit requires candidates to answer 'critically and analytically about drama'.

Centres entering candidates for retakes of Unit 3 are reminded that Section A must be written in relation to the Unit 2 performance. Whilst Unit 4 or Unit 5 may be more immediate for those candidates, they do not give the same experience as Unit 2.

### General

Section A responses were generally better than Section B again this year, although there were some notable exceptions to this with candidates clearly inspired by outstanding and/or stimulating performances of, amongst others, 'Measure For Measure', 'A Midsummer Night's Dream', 'Macbeth', 'East is East', 'Nights At the Circus', 'The History Boys', 'The Woman in Black' and 'Endgame'.

There was evidence again this year of a sense of distancing and objectivity from candidates in Section A, which reflected the experience from previous years where candidates removed themselves from the sense of being part of the company creating Unit 2.

There were, again, exceptions to this with candidates putting themselves into the centre of their responses and reflecting upon their experiences with their groups. The more successful answers from candidates balanced personal and group, putting the 'I' within the 'we' of the experience.

Critical/analytical skills were once again clearly not in place for a large number of candidates however and a large number of responses were well presented but descriptive and did not always focus upon the demands of the question or, indeed, offer any evidence that the Context Summary Notes at the disposal of the candidates had been utilised.

Responses in Section A often lacked a sense of a Director's Concept/Interpretation at times, even, in some cases, with candidates apparently operating in isolation in the creation of Unit 2. Some candidates wrote about 'self-directing' and about how they 'did not have a director for this unit'. There was unfortunately clear evidence of this and centres are reminded that Section A is written in response to the candidate's Unit 2 experience within a Director's Interpretation of a text in performance.

There was welcome evidence, however, of centres where candidates had been clearly involved with the director in the process of creating Unit 2 within a Director's Concept/Interpretation, enabling them to offer constructive responses

to Section A. Where the process of Unit 2 was positively used as a preparation for this section in Unit 3, candidates appreciably performed better and were able to reflect upon the process as well as the performance.

There were clear examples of exciting and interesting work on a range of texts that included 'Metamorphosis', 'The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich', 'The Crucible', 'Grimm Tales', 'The Government Inspector', 'Blood Wedding', 'Two', 'Too Much Punch For Judy', 'Vinegar Tom', 'Godspell', 'Our Country's Good', 'A Clockwork Orange' and 'Blood Brothers' amongst many others.

The attention of centres is drawn once again this year to two specific sections of the specification with reference in particular to Section A of Unit 3.

Page 26 states that:

*'Unit 3 is linked with the play performed in Unit 2 and teaching for the unit needs to happen before, during and after the practical performance.'*

Page 43/44 details the Unit and its focus and states, in part:

*'Section A on the paper will require students to be aware of how the characters were presented in the play performed in Unit 2 and be able to discuss other ways in which they might be portrayed and to what effect.'*

*Similarly, students will be able to discuss the ideas that appeared to be central to the play and show an awareness that different interpretations of these ideas may be made in the process of moving from text to performance.'*

There was greater evidence of candidates being able to respond to these two points this year. It is often the first word of the question that shapes the awarding of marks: **discuss**, **evaluate**, **analyse**, and it is often this word that candidates do not pick up on in their responses which immediately has an effect on their ability to earn marks at the higher level.

Section B responses often did not offer enough of an overview of the performance under discussion, with little evidence again this year of the notes being fully utilised to answer the questions.

Candidates in general still seem to be struggling with the idea that this unit requires more than for them to use their Context Summary Notes and Performance Analysis Notes to **report** on the drama experience. Worryingly, very few candidates appear to have been encouraged to reflect upon the Unit 2 experience after the event to enable them to have a sense of understanding of how the performance actually worked in relation to their audience. Section A, in part, asks for this reflection on the process and performance of Unit 2 in relation to the audience, in the same way as Section B asks for a reflection of the performance seen as a member of the audience.

It is always a difficult balance for centres to make appropriate judgements for Unit 2 performance dates. The evidence for this series is that a significant number of centres performed Unit 2 towards the end of the examination period which did not appear to leave sufficient time for preparation for Unit 3. Ideally, within the holistic structure of the specification Unit 3 should be a feature of work across the whole of the AS year.

The short burst of answers requires a particular skill from candidates if responses are to be creative and uninhibited within the overall structure of the Unit. Some overlap of ideas across the responses in each section is inevitable, which is why those candidates who were able to focus upon the demands of the particular questions were more successful than those who tried to write at length about everything.

Candidates who did write at length on each question were not always focussed and therefore did not necessarily gain the most marks for their responses. It is difficult to decide how long an answer needs to be within the context of the time allowed for each question within the paper as a whole and it is a skill that candidates will need to develop as they go through the course to enable them to meet the demands of this Unit.

There is a clear place for preparation for this unit, with candidates tackling similar questions on a regular basis, perhaps in 20 minute bursts of time to help develop analytical, evaluative and discussion skills.

Candidates were generally able to describe effectively the contribution they made to the Unit 2 performance and to offer observations on the live performance seen. Where there were major deficits within the unit they appeared to come from the inability of candidates to write 'critically and analytically about drama' or to 'discuss' in relation to the questions asked, particularly in Section A, leading to responses which were unable to gain the higher marks.

Where candidates were unable to achieve marks it tended to be where they did not appear to understand the demands of the question and simply presented information from the support material. Some candidates did not appear to pick up on the specific demands of the question in terms of 'one example of...' or 'two examples of...'. At times there was a sense of them answering the question that they wished they had been asked, rather than the question that was actually set.

Once again this year the vast majority of candidates wrote in continuous prose and only a tiny proportion of candidates did not finish the paper. There is a lot for candidates to cover in the time allowed for this unit. Some candidates wrote 5 or 6 sides, others wrote 20 and more. The vast majority were somewhere between these two extremes with a 12 page booklet being around the norm. However, there is no easy way to quantify this. An answer which addresses the question does not have to be lengthy but it does have to expand from the notes to allow the examiner to see that the candidate has understood the experience in relation to the question.

Choices of questions by candidates appeared to be more centre based again this year, reflecting perhaps approaches to this paper from centres that were more group than individual based. There is nothing wrong with this and there were exceptions to this approach but there is nothing to preclude centres from preparing candidates in this way. The choice of play for each section does, in some cases, have an impact on the questions the candidates choose to answer.

Examiners reported specifically, and particularly this year, an increase in the number of candidates not completing the grid on the front of the answer booklet either accurately or at all. In some instances this meant examiners had difficulty identifying which question a candidate was answering and in other instances

candidates did not put the correct letter in the box on the front page or next to the response, answering, for example 3b but writing 3a in the grid. Examiners will always try to award marks for the question the candidate answers but if the number and letter is either not there or not correct then it often becomes extremely difficult for the examiner to make an accurate assessment of the work in relation to the question.

Centres are reminded once again that Context Summary Notes and Performance Analysis Notes should not be sent to the examiner but retained in a secure place by the centre. A few each year are still being sent with the scripts.

The most popular questions in the 2006 series were: 1b and 4b, with the other questions receiving a fair balance of responses.

## Section A

It was easier to identify performances in this series of examinations as the majority of centres had reminded candidates to include details of performance at the start of Section A. Some candidates, however, did not name either the performance or their role within it throughout the response to Section A, making it more difficult for examiners to draw conclusions about their responses.

In a large number of cases there was little or no sense of a Director's Interpretation within which the candidate was working for Unit 2. In some cases, as already mentioned, candidates stated that they did not have a director for Unit 2. This appeared to have a major impact at times upon the ability of the candidate to offer a response to Section A to meet the assessment objectives. The evidence is that candidates still appeared to struggle with the process aspects of the questions and with the social, cultural and historical angle. Where centres had clearly 'taught' Unit 2 there was evidence of candidates being able to respond better to the questions of this section.

Design candidates were less in evidence this year than in previous years, but more candidates seemed to be more confident about aspects of design in both Section A and Section B.

In some cases there was little sense of working with a director to create a performance for Unit 2 and, for others, the impact upon the audience was not evaluated to show understanding. There is a lot of reporting in this section, with candidates not always able to achieve top marks because of this.

Candidates who gained the higher marks in this section had clearly been part of the overall process and had been 'directed' and taught within the performance and during the creating of it. Context Summary Notes had formed part of the whole Unit 2 ethos and these appear to have been prepared with Unit 3 in mind, as well as a useful record of the process of creating Unit 2. Once again, these candidates were not in the majority but there was again this year more welcome evidence of centres preparing Unit 2 with Unit 3 in mind.

As mentioned in previous years, Unit 2 must be about preparing candidates for Section A of Unit 3 and must take them through the rehearsal processes to offer them an opportunity to consider alternative approaches to the process and the performance. What might have happened if the play had been performed in a

different style? How might the play have been viewed differently with no lighting changes or some incidental music? Would an end-on performance space have made any difference to the impact on the audience? What about approaches to characters at specific moments in the performance? Exploring to answer these kinds of questions during the rehearsal process does not have to mean holding up the process, it should form an integrated part of the preparation for Unit 2. The AS Year is teacher led, and this includes the preparation for Unit 2 with Unit 3 in mind.

The most successful answers had a sense of ownership and a sense of belonging, with Context Summary Notes clearly guiding responses that focussed on the demands of the question. Candidates were comfortable in their sharing of understanding of their part in the creating of the Unit 2 performance and they were aware of the basis for the work within a wider drama context, informed by Unit 1 and practitioners explored to enhance Unit 2. The answers from these candidates were confidently focused on the demands of the questions and gave clear and supported examples from their experience to support their responses. The understanding was clear and evident.

## The Questions

### Question One

1b was more popular than 1a. Where candidates responded to 1a there was not always a sense of 'the rehearsal' processes in the answer and a number of candidates wrote about the 'what' rather than the 'how' in relation to the director. Successful candidates were able to trace the creation of the performance and evaluate specific moments of developing and shaping in the process.

Successful candidates responding to question 1b not only named the 'the two specific examples' but were able to evaluate the way in which their understanding was developed. The importance of hotseating, emotional memory or thought-tracking, for example, was traced within the response in relation to rehearsal to indicate an understanding.

### Question Two

Of these two questions b) was attempted by more candidates than a). There were some interesting ideas about design and some analysis about the use of space. A number of candidates did not pick up on the second part of the question and did not refer to their audience in the response. Some others did refer to the audience, and almost named them all and where they were sitting, without then referring back to the performance. Candidates struggled more with question a), often describing the contribution of two members of the group but not offering alternatives in discussion. In some cases the 'contributions' were people turning up to every rehearsal or people helping others to learn lines or to paint the set. There were of course exceptions to this with some refreshingly honest accounts from some candidates based on an understanding of drama in performance and based on clear contributions of design and/or acting skills.

### Question Three

There was a balance in choice between these two questions, with a) proving a little more problematic for some candidates who wrote about the play and its themes and what was made relevant to the audience without reference to 'how successful' it was. There was some interesting analysis for question b) by candidates who had clearly been given a sound understanding of both how to analyse and how design elements may engage, or not, an audience.

### Section B

Again this year there was a range of responses to a range of quality performances. At times, candidates appeared not to be able to name actor/director/designer in relation to specific responses in this section. This was particularly noticeable this year but it was also noticeable that other centres had found ways of addressing this with candidates.

A number of candidates are still discussing 'character' when they should be discussing 'actor'. There was a general lack of analysis of what was seen and written about. The Performance Analysis Notes should provide the thinking for this section, enabling the candidate to use that thinking to respond to the questions. A number of responses, for example, could have been written by candidates who had not actually seen the live performance but had merely been given access to the notes or to the script. There was nothing in this section that was beyond the brief of the notes as outlined in the specification and candidates should have been prepared for the areas to be covered.

Section B looks at the play in performance, not the play as text. It is sometimes a difficult balance for candidates and some were not always able to distinguish between the text they had studied (perhaps in English) and the play they had seen in performance. The section is on 'performance analysis' and this needs to be further emphasised with candidates.

There was again little, if any, evidence of candidates struggling with the questions because of the performance they had seen. Some were clearly not engaged by the performance they had seen but in the vast majority of cases they were still able to respond in a critical way that showed knowledge of drama. It was particularly refreshing this year to see the range of performances teachers were able to take candidates to see, often new and experimental work alongside some more traditional work.

Responses in this section are based upon opinions formed through being a member of an audience. The opinions need to be based upon the understanding gained throughout the course of the way drama works in performance. Candidates who achieved the higher end of the marks tended to be those who had understood what they had seen and were able to effectively convey that understanding using the language of drama in an appropriate way.

Where candidates responded to performances by other groups in centres (either unit 2 or unit 5) as a member of the audience there was not always a real feel of the candidate having been a critical member of the audience and this was not always to the candidate's advantage. There were, as always, notable exceptions to this.

The general thinking is that Section B responds to live theatre seen as a member of the audience, ideally theatre performed by other than those in the centre.

#### Question Four

Of the two questions b) was the more popular and the responses were balanced between those who wrote about actor and those who wrote about character. There was an understanding of 'skills' from stronger answers and this was pleasing to see. Weaker candidates, however, described what they had seen and/or gave character studies. For a) some candidates described the use of space at two specific times but were then not able to evaluate it. There were however some well chosen moments and candidates had clearly understood the use of space in relation to the characters and the audience at those moments.

#### Question Five

There was a balance between these two question and some strong answers to both of them, sometimes from productions that had very little in terms of 'design elements', for example 'The Woman In Black'. There was a lot of reporting in this answer but some candidates were able to evaluate and discuss based on a wider drama experience. Sometimes the 'play's ideas' dominated the response, rather than the 'how' of the production.

#### Question Six

Both these questions were rooted in the performance, not the play. However, a number of candidates wrote at length about the play and did not relate the response to the performance seen. There were exceptions to this, with a) attempted more successfully than b) with, for some candidates, the experience as a student of drama understood in sufficient detail by those students. The two questions were about audience and there was an expectation of candidates connecting into the experience as a member of the audience and being able to reflect on that as an active participant rather than a passive observer.

## Statistics

### Unit 1

#### 6341 Exploration of Drama and Theatre

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw boundary mark	60	52	46	40	35	30	0
UMS boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

### Unit 2

#### 6342 Text in Performance I

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw boundary mark	80	72	62	53	44	35	0
UMS boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

### Unit 3

#### 6343 Text in Context I

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw boundary mark	60	45	39	33	28	23	0
UMS boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

#### Advanced Subsidiary UMS grade boundaries

Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E
300	240	210	180	150	120

## Unit 4 (6344) - Devising

Moderators reported an impressive variety of work on this unit with candidates giving strong performances backed up with detailed notes and supportive teacher comments. Candidates who gain high marks are producing stunning work while candidates scoring lower marks appear to really struggle with the theatrical devices, the structure of a devised piece and the production values.

It is possible to see candidates across the ability range all within the same performance group, although centres or candidates themselves tend to split themselves into similar groups where numbers allow. So in larger centres there can often be a particularly weak group. This is acknowledged by teacher-examiners in their comments where problems are often to do with attendance and commitment issues.

Moderators saw a wide variety of devised theatre ranging from the cutting edge to pedestrian. The most successful performances tended to be non-naturalistic though not exclusively so. The weaker pieces were under prepared and, at times, self indulgent, lacking any sense of form, structure or purpose. It was disappointing to see quite a lot of pieces played to camera but no live audience. Candidates invariably perform at their best when in front of a live, appropriate audience. The lack of an appropriate audience can also make some aspects of the Structured Record very difficult to comment on.

This is a challenging unit and there is plenty of evidence that, with the right input, candidates of all abilities are able to produce work that truly is a pleasure to moderate.

### Stimulus

The teacher led stimulus seems to make a considerable difference to the quality of the work overall. Many candidates had lost weeks of time before they settled on a stimulus and this lack of focus early on often led to a weaker performance.

A range of contemporary issues were used such as the 7/7 bombings and the availability of the drug Herceptin. Disappointingly, there were a great number of performances where the candidates were all dressed in black and all dealt with issues of trauma and angst. Too many pieces were coming to rely on emotive music played in long extracts while the candidates did very little, or lengthy dance/movement extracts which seemed to forget that this is a **drama** exam.

Many of these violent or 'cruel' pieces justified it in their Structured Records as Artaudian when in fact many students had only a fleeting knowledge of the practitioners they alluded to. Candidates were most successful when they had a challenging, lively and often provocative stimulus that meant they could start devising with purpose early on in the process.

## Structured Records

Structured Records seem to have improved overall, with moderators reporting a real sense of ownership and personal response to the challenges of devising a piece of theatre. Clearly, those that are completed alongside the devising process give a more honest and accurate account than those completed retrospectively.

Teacher annotation on the Structured Records is to be encouraged as this is a working dialogue and moderators find it helpful to see the teacher's thoughts on specific moments/comments. In some centres, candidates failed to use the ten structured headings. This made moderation difficult and did not always allow the candidates to fulfil the assessment criteria.

It was disappointing to see an increase in the number of candidates not handing in any notes or a very brief document. Study at A2 level necessitates written work in support of the practical. Overall, teacher-examiners compensated for this by being over generous on the practical marks and there was a feeling that some centres had inflated their candidates' marks across all three of the assessment objectives. Overall, successful candidates produced personal, thoughtful Structured Records that gave an honest account of what they had achieved during the devising process. They nearly always put the heading/question at the top of each new page and tended to make good use of the volume of paper this unit allows (20 sides of A4).

## Performance On Video/DVD

The video/DVD for this unit provides an **essential** piece of evidence for Assessment Objective A03. Therefore, **it is essential** that all candidates clearly identify themselves at the start of the recording wearing the costume they will appear in in performance. The performances themselves varied in length, quality and location. There seemed to be fewer site specific pieces and more were performed very simply in studio conditions. Most performances were polished with roles well sustained and some excellent design elements were used. Candidates who had seen a lot of live theatre were clearly at an advantage and there were reported influences from recent productions by Complicite, Kneehigh and DV8.

DVDs as opposed to videos were fine as long as they were compatible with a DVD player and not for use only in a PC. The recording of the performance should be given as much importance as the camera in Unit 2 and 5 performances and centres should always check the recording before submitting it. Overall, there was a tendency for centres to over mark A03, the performance, and moderators have noted this in their reports to centres.

## Administration

Many of the same problems arose in this unit as those for Unit 1. Structured Records not stapled together, forms not signed, incomplete Optems, late work and candidates not identified on the video/DVD.

Successful centres and candidates alike, submitted coursework that was well organised, clearly structured and accurately marked by the teacher-examiners.

## Unit 5 (6345) - Text in Performance II

This is an externally examined unit but the assessment objectives and criteria do not change from those printed in the specification. In preparing candidates for this unit the specification must be read with close reference to the Instructions for Conduct of the Examination (ICE) for the current examination series. Each centre chooses the playtexts, options taken by candidates and audience. This unit has elements of both an examined and coursework unit. The focus of this unit is on candidates working to create a performance with teacher guidance but not direction.

Overall, the examining team reported that the standards of previous series had been maintained. There is still some concern that some centres did not fully understand the requirements of this unit and spent inappropriate amounts of time on unnecessary activities that may disadvantage candidates. However, the majority of candidates are well prepared to both achieve in the examination and enjoy their final experience of live theatre performance for this examination.

Some examiners felt that there was an increase in candidates being poorly prepared for this unit and producing work that did not meet A2 standards or the specific requirements of this unit. However, as in previous series, there were many candidates who produced work that exceeded the requirements of the unit and A2 standard. These candidates were awarded full marks and often examiners noted that in fact they were '60 plus'.

### Requirements

There remain some issues of concern reported by the majority of the examining team and it must be stated that most of these have been reported on in previous examiner reports. Centres must ensure they put in place the requirements for this unit as detailed in the Specification and ICE. This is revised each year in the light of both examiners and teachers suggestions to ensure that the administration of the unit is clear to all centres. It also includes all the documentation needed for this unit. Centres can download copies of this and the specification from the Edexcel website.

In the 2005 report the requirements of this unit were clarified in response to concerns from examiners and centres that the Specification was somewhat lacking in clarity.

**Unit 5 is not a second even shorter Unit 2 with less teacher input.**

For Unit 2 the performance must be directed by the teacher, show knowledge of the complete text and reflect the original structure of the text. The form of the original text must remain in place although lines, scenes and roles can be edited.

For Unit 5 candidates must have knowledge of the complete text before they begin practical work on creating Unit 5.

The candidates then choose one element/ theme/ idea to be the focus of their interpretation.

Only the words of the original text can be vocalised but they can be reordered and reassigned. The narrative structure and designated roles of the original do not have to remain in place. Centres must ensure that no additional or improvised dialogue is included.

### Group Size and Performance Time

Both group size and performance time are now clearly stated in both the ICE and on the DTS5b form that must be signed by the teacher. If centres do not comply with this requirement it may disadvantage candidates. Examiners are clearly instructed to only award marks within the set time limits. They are not required to remain in the examination after the maximum time for each performance.

The main concern was when performances were clearly overlong and some candidates had not appeared at all until after the maximum time limit. This was most often when smaller groups were performing for over 30 minutes. Very few performances were too short.

Centres are reminded that this is an examination and that very short and overlong performances do not meet the requirements of this unit. Centres must ensure that the performance the examiner attends meets examination requirements. Many examiners were concerned that they were not provided with a private place to consider their marking or enough time between performances. These short, frequently ensemble and often intense performances need adequate time for first consideration of the marks.

### The Text

As in Unit 2 the choice of text is crucial. There was an increase in texts this year which examiners felt did not have opportunities for in depth exploration or enough depth and resonance for A2 achievement. These tended to be where the structure and content of the text makes it difficult to explore and adapt.

It is a requirement to provide a copy of the text as performed. Many examiners report that there was an increase in centres including a well-prepared and word-processed text alongside detailed interpretation notes.

Some centres sent nothing in advance because they felt that the examiner would know the original text, or sent the complete uncut text. This is unacceptable for this unit as each Unit 5 performance is a unique and new text based on the original. If the centre feels candidates have chosen a new or not well known text it is advisable to send a copy of the complete text. It is of vital importance in this unit that examiners are well prepared.

Copied and edited texts by crossing out sections were often very difficult to follow. Centres must ensure it is clear which candidate is saying which lines. There is no doubt this is best done by using highlighter pens. This is a candidate task.

The titles given to the Unit 5 performances were often commented on for their originality and clear indication of the interpretation. Wit, intelligence and knowledge were in evidence.

## Timing of the Examination

This year those centres that had made entries in 2005 were allocated an examiner in January and most contacted the centres as quickly as possible. Many examiners report that some centres did not contact them for some time despite several repeat phone calls or emails. This often led to the first choice of date or time for the centre not being possible. Centres need to have some flexibility in arranging the examination date and time.

Again this year, Unit 5 exams took place right up until the end of May. There was an increase in centres completing Unit 5 before Easter and this was felt to be good practice allowing ample time for final preparation for Unit 6. Edexcel realises that for centres with an AS and A2 cohort of 18 or fewer candidates it is a constraint to perform both units in one session. However, many examiners made positive comments on the good use of two performance spaces or the thought with which one space was swiftly adapted.

## Performance Candidates

As in Unit 2, the vast majority of candidates offered performance. In most centres they worked throughout the process as an ensemble, taking shared responsibility for all aspects of the final performance.

The overall opinion of these candidates by the examining team was that the range of work seen this year was broadly in line with that of previous series. It was felt that in some centres work was seen that exceeded the requirements and standard of this A2 unit and examiners had no doubt that full marks were appropriately awarded to these candidates. These candidates were often commented on in the examiner individual comment sheets and overall performance sheets. These candidates were often felt to have used their experience, particularly in Unit 4 Devising. There were also candidates whose work fully deserved top band one marks.

Some examiners felt that there was a small increase in less effective work usually because candidates either performed on pieces that did not meet the requirements of the unit or their vocal and movement skills had not been developed to A2 standard.

In all previous series it has been difficult to find candidates producing work at the bottom of the mark range. This is felt to be because of the focus, in both this unit and Unit 4, on group performance candidates who have not done well in Unit 2 and therefore do not continue to the A2 year.

## Design Candidates

There were fewer candidates offering design this year. This was felt to be due to the fact that centres sometimes felt they could not provide the resources or expertise to support candidates at A2 level. The majority of candidates took responsibility for all or most of the design elements. Some focussed on a single skill. Although neither choice was felt to advantage candidates, some examiners felt they did not see the depth of response required to achieve at A2 if only one

element was offered. There was some concern that in centres that have a theatre technician it was difficult for examiners to be clear regarding the candidate's contribution. For example, if the candidate had designed a set but not been involved in any of the construction or working with it and the performers during the examination performance.

There was also concern that some student directors or performers had such a clear vision of their piece that the design candidate almost became a technician, with little evidence of their individual input. Some performances had clearly made considerable changes towards the end of the rehearsal process. This may not have disadvantaged performers but it could mean that much of the work done by design candidates could not be seen in performance.

Presentations and supporting evidence were much stronger at this level and it was clear that some of this work was being used for interviews for college places.

There was certainly an increase in new technologies being used, particularly with sound and projection. Some examiners felt that some performance candidates were disadvantaged as they had too little time to show their contribution. The centre should ensure there is a fair balance for all candidates. Much of this work was described as exciting and innovative.

### **Directing Candidates**

There were considerably fewer directing candidates this year. Centres that have in previous series had student directors, in some cases nearly one per performance, had few or none this year. In some cases this was due to no candidates wishing to take this option. In others, centres felt that if the potential student director lacked the complex theatrical and personal skills to work effectively with their peers it could have considerable impact on their level of achievement and final result.

Most directing candidates seen produced some very creditable performances and some were outstanding. Many had taken responsibility for all aspects of the performance including costume, set effects, lighting, programmes and in one case refreshments and hospitality. Several also appeared in an acting role in the performance.

The standard of the presentations and supporting documentation was in general of good quality. One frequent concern from examiners was that candidates were so enthusiastic and passionate about their work that the presentations far exceeded the 10 minutes and had an effect on the running time of the performances.

### **Administration**

Concerns regarding administration are in the majority of cases the same as Unit 2. The overwhelming concern from examiners this year was the poor administration by too many centres throughout the process. A great deal of the required paperwork was incomplete, inaccurate, late or non-existent until the examiner's arrival in the centre.

For this Unit it is vital that examiners come well prepared for the examination and cannot do so without this vital information. Examiners are instructed to arrive 30

minutes prior to the first performance/presentation so that any changes can be considered during that time. Many centres did not send maps, expecting examiners to find the centre directions on the Internet. This was unhelpful as, particularly in the evening, examiners could not easily locate the actual venue of the examination on the site. More than one centre held the exam at another venue but had not informed the examiner.

There was also concern that the time management of the examination by centres was poor at times. Examiners expect to examine at least 18 candidates in a 3-hour session. Some examiners arrived at the centre at the agreed time and were waiting for some considerable time before meeting the candidates. Overlong performances and late running meant that some examiners and candidates were completing an examination after midnight. It was disappointing when poor time management meant that some groups had virtually no audience due to transport arrangements. There was equal concern that some examiners were given very little time to consider their marking between performances and also when a private place to mark was not provided.

It would be unfair to give the impression that this lack of thought applied to the majority of centres. Most centres completed all administration very well and the examination was run with professionalism throughout.

Again this year, thanks must be given to the centres which had an accompanied visit from members of the senior team. This is an important part of the ongoing monitoring of examiners for the practical performance units. At all times, centres dealt with this extra requirement with understanding.

Most members of the examining team commented gratefully on the amount and quality of refreshments provided by centres.

### **The Importance of the Recording of the Performances/Presentations**

It is felt that some centres do not understand the importance of the very best possible recording being made of all performances and presentations. In order to maintain the standards of the examination and that examiners work is monitored throughout the process, a great deal of centres' work is viewed by the senior team alongside examiner notes. Centres should be aware that the senior team may check a centre's work and if examiners have any concerns they must seek another opinion.

Unfortunately, this year it was felt that the quality of the recorded work was less good than in previous series. Too often the camera was not placed close to the examiner and was frequently so far back from the performance that the candidates could not be identified. Another common mistake was examiner and audience heads taking up most of the frame. If there is a large performance space and scenes are performed in different areas the camera must pan to record the work. If the person operating the camera knows the piece, some judicious use of close ups can be useful in capturing individual performances.

Although in no way would Edexcel wish to deter exciting promenade or site specific work for this unit it often proved to be an enormous challenge to mark and much of these performances were not captured in the recordings.

Design presentations must be made to the camera and the examiner will sit next to the camera. Some examiners felt that candidates expected them to ask questions as they looked at the documentation. Examiners will look at this evidence after the presentation and not ask questions.

Centres must keep a copy of the recorded examination work. The recording sent to Edexcel via the examiner is the basis of any Enquiries About Results.

Most centres completed the Video/DVD time sheet well. This is most important for the ease of finding the performance or presentation when looking for candidates' work. It is important that centres comment on the quality of the recording. Many centres realised that the recording did not capture the performance well or had incomplete recordings. Some did not complete the form at all.

This year centres could submit work on DVD. Examiners and centres welcomed this but there were considerable problems. In future, centres must ensure that the DVD can be played on a standard domestic player. Examiners are not required to use a computer to view the work. Also, each presentation/performance must be given a chapter.

The main problem was that many centres failed to send the recording to the visiting examiner within seven working days. Examiners spent much time contacting centres trying to get the recording and many were never sent at all. Work had to be sent to Edexcel without the recording and no Enquiries About Results will be possible for these centres.

All centres are reminded that Unit 5 work must be sent on a separate videotape or DVD as the work is stored in separate AS and A2 script libraries.

### **Identification of Candidates on the Recordings**

Centres must ensure that all candidates introduce themselves immediately before their performance or presentation, as it will appear on the recording. This can be pre-recorded and edited in by the centre.

Design candidates must state clearly and slowly the centre name and number followed by their name, candidate number, chosen skill(s), the performance title and group number. It can be helpful if they have the centre name and number, their name and candidate number written clearly on paper and held up to camera.

Performance candidates must line up in their performance group. It can be helpful if this is done in order of appearance. The first candidate must state clearly and slowly the centre name and number, the date of the performance followed by the performance title and group number.

All candidates must then state clearly and slowly their name and candidate number, role(s) played and give verbal description of all costumes worn in the performance. It is helpful, if there are costume changes, if any costumes worn later are shown to the camera. It can be helpful if the candidate's name, candidate number and role(s) played are written clearly on paper and held up to the camera.

The camera must then record them as a group in long shot. It can be helpful if they repeat their name and roles played. The group shot must be held for enough time for someone watching the recording to clearly identify the whole group. This is the equivalent of completing the front sheet of a written examination paper.

Centres are strongly encouraged to provide the visiting examiner with a group colour photograph for each performance on arrival prior to the examination.

On the candidate mark sheets, candidates should give detailed written descriptions of how they will appear in the performance, both physical appearance and costume. Small head and shoulder shots must not be attached to the form as they have proved to be of limited use in aiding identification and can be time consuming for centres.

High scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Candidates had been well taught with close reference to the specification, ICE 2006 and Examiners' Report 2005.
- Candidate's performance skills had been developed to A2 standard.
- Texts had been chosen that had the challenge and opportunities for exploration at A2 level.
- The teacher understood the importance of the candidates having knowledge and understanding of the complete text chosen.
- There was a clear and detailed overall concept, which was a collaboration between all candidates, whatever option they had chosen.
- Candidates had undergone a well structured preparation process.
- Candidates made use of their understanding of how theatre works from all previous learning particularly Unit 4.
- Candidates had gained in depth knowledge from seeing a range of theatre performances as a member of the audience.
- The chosen text was appropriate for A2 standards, challenging and engaging their interest.
- An appropriate and supportive audience engaged with the performance. This was felt to be of greater importance than at AS due to the demands of this unit.
- Candidates produced work that met the assessment objectives and criteria for this unit.
- Only the words of the text were spoken.
- Candidates were given enough but not too much to achieve in performance.
- The examination had a sense of occasion.
- Performances met the time requirements.
- Candidates were very well prepared and had experienced a well structured rehearsal process.
- Candidates demonstrated commitment, enthusiasm and passion.
- The performance reflected 30% of their A2 year in terms of preparation time.

Middle scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Candidates had not given enough individual commitment.
- Erratic attendance hampered group achievement.
- Texts were too simplistic or too challenging for candidate's ability and demands of the unit.
- Preparation and rehearsal time was not used effectively, possibly too little or too much.
- Performances were too long or occasionally too short.
- Candidates had performance skills were not fully developed to A2 standard.
- Candidates' understanding of how live theatre works was somewhat limited.
- Performance space did not support the live performance.
- Audience was not fully supportive or aware of the examination element.
- Candidates were unable to meet all 4 assessment requirements.
- The work had too many elements of a brief Unit 2 rather than Unit 5 focus.
- There was an imbalance of performance time or design elements between candidates.
- Candidates and their contribution could not be clearly identified for examination purposes.

Low scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Work was under prepared.
- Little understanding of the demands of creating a unique performance based on an existing text.
- Performances very brief or far too long.
- Lack of security with lines, cues and moves.
- Candidates did not demonstrate knowledge of the complete text.
- Candidates were over or under confident.
- Inappropriate texts were chosen for candidate and A2 skill level.
- Performances did not meet at A2 level the objectives or criteria of this unit.
- Inappropriate or small audience (only examiner and teacher) present.
- Candidates performed extracts or heavily cut versions following the narrative of the complete text.
- The performance was incoherent and failed to communicate to the audience.

### Consortium Centres

Again this year there were some difficulties with centres that had not completed the Consortium Information Forms available in the ICE document. The completed forms must be sent to Edexcel as early as possible in the academic year. For all candidates being examined not in their registered home centre, the examiner must be informed beforehand and 2 copies of a separate register must be provided giving full details of 'home' centre name, number, candidate name and number. This information must also be detailed on the DVD or videotape.

## Conclusion

As in previous reports, the concerns detailed in this report could be addressed if all centres referred closely to the Specification and ICE documentation.

Centres are reminded that Edexcel offers a national programme of Inset courses led by members of the Senior Examining Team. Details have been sent to centres or are available with booking details on the Edexcel website.

This remains a highly successful unit that achieves a great deal beyond its requirements as the A2 Text in Performance II. Examiners continue to comment on the excellence, excitement, power and professionalism of much of the work presented by candidates. Examiners and audiences have again this year been amused, moved, made to think and even reconsider their views of plays and the messages they bring to us in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This is often the unit that can be defined as the synoptic unit as it brings together and demonstrates by sharing with an audience all the learning that has taken place in the course.

Much of the work seen is exceptional, bold, challenging, full of ideas, brimming over with energy and passion. The Unit 5 performance can and often does give candidates, examiners and audiences an exciting evening at the theatre as well as an examination.

## 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 in the position of director, 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 with one from a choice of three 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 18/19 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 chosen earlier time period, generally to good effect. There is no requirement, however, for candidates to refer to a performance of the same play specifically except, when connecting with the 20<sup>th</sup> Century conditions and, in this case, it has to be 'a production of the play' and not a collection of 20<sup>th</sup> Century production information.

In Section A, 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 within a director's concept/interpretation.

Responses to this question may or may not develop ideas outlined in question one but there needs to be an overall concept/interpretation evident in the question two response, based upon a detailed study of the text as a performance vehicle, most usually in a series of workshops, and upon an understanding of how a director might make it work in performance. There is a choice of question for candidates.

In Section B, 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 (the Primary Source), it is not the historical context of the play (the Secondary Source). The differences/similarities identified by the candidate based upon their experience as a 'critical' member of an audience and in relation to the question asked should be clear in the response.

Although the A2 year is student-centred it was clear again this year, from across the range of responses, those centres where sufficient time had been spent preparing candidates for this unit and where meaningful, well-structured practical lessons/workshops 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.

In these cases, 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.

This was emphasised in previous series of examinations and successful candidates in 2006 have also clearly been prepared for this unit with the questions and the demands of the paper in mind.

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 information which was simply a regurgitation of a prepared concept without due referral to the demands of the question. The Unit is a reflection on performance, not play and the candidate is in the role of director in Section A.

Less secure responses were 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.

Centres are reminded once again that all questions refer to the Edexcel edition of the Section A texts and not to other editions.

There were again far more centres offering 'Trojan Women' than 'The Beggar's Opera', with at least one centre this year offering both texts - presumably different teaching groups - with its students.

2ai was more popular than 2aii.  
2bi was more popular than 2bii.  
3a was more popular than 3b - just.

## 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 at a similar level this year to last year, with preparation in centres again much in evidence.

There is evidence from the marks awarded, of candidates having explored the Section A text in much more detail and in a series of more practical workshops and of them being able to respond much more effectively using a range of (mainly) performances of Shakespeare as Primary Source at the heart of the Section B response. There was clear evidence of much more informed preparation for Section B this year than in previous years, with performance much more in evidence in the responses.

There were extremely 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 the examiner will not penalise candidates, they effectively self-penalised by not allowing the progression the question demanded within the thinking behind the rehearsal of the given extract in relation to the concept to take place. It was often difficult for examiners to divide the response into its required parts in order for them to be able to award marks appropriately.

Similarly, there were candidates again this year 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. In these cases, there were little or no references to rehearsal and how to work with a company in creating the rehearsal experience in relation to the extract and the question. There were, however, 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 question one and wrote a disproportionate amount for question i) for up to 4 marks, in some cases writing much more than they wrote for question iii) where 10 marks were available. There was less evidence of this in 2006 than in previous years, but where it was evident there were examples of candidates writing at least two sides for question i) and less than half a side for question iii). However, detailed the response to i) may have been, there were still only 4 marks available.

There was unfortunately less evidence of use of drawings and diagrams this year but, where these were referred to and supportive of the body of the text they enhanced marks for candidates, enabling the examiner to be drawn more into the process by the visual impressions of set, costume and staging elements.

The notion of director appeared to be clear to the majority of the candidates. What was not so clear at times was the work of the director in the rehearsal process, with supporting examples of rehearsal techniques where appropriate and the decisions the director had to make in working with others to create performances. This was evidenced in question one.

There was a sense, at times, 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, in connection, 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 around, for example creating the relationship between Hecuba and Andromache within the rehearsal. There was, however, often a sense of prepared notes to these responses, rather than an attempt at answering the question.

Some candidates had ideas that, although imaginative, would not necessarily be practical as rehearsal techniques in relation to the given extract and had clearly not been attempted during preparing for this examination. It is important to stress that question one is about preparing for a rehearsal of the extract and candidates need to inform the examiner in the response that they are looking at ideas for rehearsal not performance. This does have a major impact on the mark the

examiner is able to award, with rehearsal being explicit in the response a key factor for earning marks.

In Section A there was a tendency to want to update the plays, particularly 'The Trojan Women', 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, for example, setting fire to the city at the end of the play and it 'would have to be real flames in order to portray the real effect for the audience' or having Astyanax thrown off the city walls rather than it happening off stage with no indication of how this might happen. Responses to 'The Beggar's Opera' were generally much more aware of what is and is not possible within a staged performance. A particular example of a response that was conveyed effectively staged the production in a warehouse with rooms and areas defined for the audience who were led from place to place by the Beggar.

Whilst the examination encourages creativity, and there was evidence in Section A question two of candidates being highly imaginative in their approach to the chosen text, ideas must be realistic and practical and in keeping with the spirit of the original. For example, candidates struggled more with the circus tent concept for 'Trojan Women' than they did with the same concept for 'The Beggar's Opera', and there was a real searching for connections for the examiner with 'The Trojan Women' presented as a 'pantomime' or 'The Beggar's Opera' set in Sherwood Forest 'around the time of Robin Hood'.

In the majority of cases this year, however, 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 again 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. In these cases there was often a sense of presented notes which did not always engage with the question.

Candidates who earned the higher marks for question one 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 examination paper and this experience for candidates comes from a meaningful preparation period in which workshop activities are used to explore the text and, where possible, they are given the opportunity to be director within workshops.

For question two, 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. Fewer candidates presented interpretations that were not in keeping with the performance values or historical heritage of the chosen text this year, but there were some.

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. In response to the question on themes, candidates who started with the audience in mind in relation to the way their chosen theme might be

presented to them tended to earn more marks than those who simply presented their concept and then stated that it would be relevant because it was in 'modern dress' or because the audience would understand those themes because they are relevant.

For 'The Trojan Women' Iraq again 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. There were some interesting ideas from Eastern European and Far Eastern history that showed imagination. Some potentially harrowing pieces in performances based around the Holocaust were particularly noted by examiners this year.

A number of candidates returned to Ancient Greece in their concepts and were able to do so with 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 appeared to be much more open, with the present day featuring heavily but many candidates choosing to leave it in its time period. The majority of candidates were able to retain the spirit of the original in the concept. There appeared to be far fewer television influences on concepts this year, but there were some, including an 'X Factor' theme that did not entirely convince, with a number of centres looking at physical theatre or Moulin Rouge in their approach. There were some interesting examples of site specific work with warehouses and the circus featuring in the responses, with a sense of the 'faded spectacle' of the Big Top providing the key to the proposed production's success.

A disappointing aspect of responses to this play again this year 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 were candidates, for example, citing the use of songs by popular singers/musicians but then not giving examples of how these would work or, specifically, setting the production in Jazz era America but then not exploring, in some cases, how the music would connect into the play. The music aspects of the play are still leaving a lot to be desired in candidates' responses, with little evidence at times of them having formed part of the preparation process for this text. Very few candidates actually refer to the music or the songs where this is not specifically demanded by the question but, when they do, their response tends to come to life much more for the examiner.

There was evidence of the 'Centre Concept' for both plays and this tended to lead to a less creative response to the questions in some instances. 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 there was clear evidence of candidates understanding the chosen play but often this understanding was still not always 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 as a director based upon knowledge gained throughout the course, connected to the workshop activities, were often 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 the thinking is applied to the questions that gains the marks. It was clear that the preparation for this examination 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 very 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 to be performed. This led to a literary rather than theatrical response. This was sometimes true of Section B as well, but there was less evidence of this than in previous years.

Examiners were interested to note again the number of candidates who were misspelling the drama vocabulary at this level (e.g rehearsal 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. Influences from Brecht, Stanislavski, Berkoff, Artaud and Bollywood were in evidence again this year, generally to good effect but not always. The overall evidence, however was that there was much less unfocused work from candidates this year than last with some clear and defined concepts that candidates were able to take ownership of and explore within the written paper. There was confidence evident in the work of a large number of candidates and there were some really refreshing and interesting responses that engaged examiners so much they were reluctant to move on and wanted to know more.

In Section B examiners again reported a mixed profile of responses from candidates who had seen performances close to the original performance conditions, for example 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 again evidence from a very small minority of candidates of a play, or in one case plays, from outside the stipulated time period for Section B being studied. The dates 1575 to 1720 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 and those that did were heavily video orientated, with the McKellen/Dench 'Macbeth' featuring heavily. The Peter Brook 'Midsummer Night's Dream' was also much in evidence this year, mainly in relation to the Doran Production, and there were generally some valid connections made by candidates. There were some engaging responses to productions of plays by other than Shakespeare with, for example, 'The Changeling' featuring from a number of candidates.

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 always able to meet the demands of the question in the same way and tended to wander more often away from the point of the question than those who started with their primary source.

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. Notable responses came from 'Macbeth', 'A Midsummer Night's Dream' and 'The Changeling'. It is surprising, however, that some candidates are not able to name key figures connected to the performance they have seen. There is still a lot of 'the actor who played....' or 'the director of this production...' without naming names, or worse, presenting 'the character who played....' rather than the actor.

Where candidates were able to complete the administration of the examination on the front sheet accurately this was extremely helpful to the examiner and clearly indicated which question was being answered.

A significant number of candidates this year either did not complete the front grid or did so inaccurately which meant some guess work from the examiner in awarding marks to questions when it was not clear which question was being attempted. In some cases, additional sheets were not numbered or named and this caused some anxiety for examiners concerned that they could easily be misplaced at some point during the examination process.

## SECTION A

### Question One

Candidates who indicated clearly that they were rehearsing the extract tended to be those that earned the higher marks. Where the answer was specifically rooted in the extract, giving clear supported examples from appropriate sections of it in relation to the actors, candidates were able to be confident in their responses. There were candidates who clearly understood the relationships in the extracts but offered character studies that did not always address the demands of the questions. Diagrams were sometimes used to good effect in this question and there was an overall sense of candidates working with 'company' in a lot of the responses.

### Question Two

There was some good use of diagrams to support responses to this question at times. Some candidates were confused about 'theme' and struggled to engage with the question based on a theme, often grouping a number of themes together and not being specific enough in the response. A number of candidates wrote about a number of themes rather than the one demanded by the question, often with little specific support from their proposed concept.

The 'sound' question had a range of responses with candidates able to earn the higher marks where they were clear about their audience and about their use of sound in relation to the question and the proposed use of sound, giving clear and supported examples from within a clear concept. There were strong answers across this question and evidence of some real imaginative thinking from candidates and a real sense of ownership.

## SECTION B

### Question Three

There were some interesting responses again this year in relation to 18/19 Century conditions and candidates were often able to explore his time period to some depth in relation to the question. Where candidates had a choice in question a) they tended to be more successful on an earlier time period than on the 20<sup>th</sup> century, although as always, there were exceptions to this, with 'Macbeth' and 'Midsummer Night's Dream' for example. The statement proved to be a real springboard for responses, on both sides of the discussion, and candidates really got to grips with it and were able to offer some really strong and clear responses.

This section appears to have engaged more candidates in the performance of the play this year rather than its literary merits and has enabled some interesting ideas to come out about performance conditions. There were some strong and clear responses to the 'design' question where candidates were really able to focus on design in relation to the original performance conditions, not always in support of the over-use of design elements in modern theatre.

## Statistics

### Unit 4

#### 6344 Devising

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40	30	0
UMS boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

### Unit 5

#### 6345 Text in Performance II

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw boundary mark	60	56	50	44	38	32	0
UMS boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

### Unit 6

#### 6346 Text in Context II

	Max mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw boundary mark	60	49	42	35	28	21	0
UMS boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

### Advanced UMS grade boundaries

Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E
<b>600</b>	480	420	360	300	240



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

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA017849 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)  
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at [www.edexcel.org.uk/ask](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/ask) or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

**edexcel**   
advancing learning, changing lives

**A PEARSON COMPANY**

