

GCSE

English Language

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J355**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

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

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

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2015

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

English Language (J355)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A640 Speaking and Listening	4
A650 Spoken Language	4
A651 Extended Literary Text and Imaginative Writing	9
A680 Information and Ideas (Foundation Tier)	11
A680 Information and Ideas (Higher Tier)	15

A640 Speaking and Listening

General Comments

Speaking and Listening is now a separately endorsed unit, no longer forming 20% of the final GCSE grade in English or English Language. A few centres did not submit any documentation for unit A640, assuming that as a separately endorsed unit there was no moderation procedure required, however, the vast majority of centres were aware that in terms of the teaching, assessment and administration of the unit very little has changed as explained below:

- Units A652a and A643 are now a single unit A640
- Band 5 is now the top band, but the descriptors and mark ranges remain the same.
- The unit is now common across GCSE English Language and GCSE English, involving common mark sheets and a single moderation process.
- Advisory visits will continue to take place every three years, or more often if a centre needs extra support.
- The administration of the moderation process remains the same with centres selecting their own samples (7 per teaching group) and sending them to the moderator with other required documentation.

For this series one moderator was responsible for both unit A640, Speaking and Listening, and unit A650, Spoken Language, to reduce the number of separate moderators, with whom centres had to deal.

The Training and Guidance filmed footage, to support centres this academic year, was issued online to enable all teachers preparing candidates, to access the material for assessment purposes, task setting and administration. As with the previous filmed footage, there was a complete range of activities across all three contexts, but which gave specific support to the “real-life” context and task setting. Two areas were identified as being problematic for some centres.

A large number of advisory visits have been carried out this year and the majority of centres were very welcoming and pleased to receive advice and support.

Task setting

Centres are experienced in task setting to cover the requirements of the three different contexts. It was clear that some departments and individual teachers had put a great deal of thought into designing tasks, which would allow achievement across the ability range, and into providing opportunities for candidates to succeed.

Task setting is crucial in determining successful outcomes for this component, and centres are always advised to set tasks which allow the assessment criteria to be met, and are engaging and relevant for the candidates. However, centres must be made aware of the fact that some tasks can be limiting. Giving candidates the freedom to choose, for example, the subject matter of a presentation for the Individual Extended Contribution, may lead to under-performance. So using examples from this series, a presentation on “Can footballers’ wages ever be justified?” allows achievement in the higher bands; a talk on “My Work Experience”, with no appropriate focus, is unlikely to lead to Band 5 marks.

However more worryingly, the requirement of the “real-life context in and beyond the classroom” is still proving problematic for some centres, despite this being an established specification. It is difficult to say whether centres are not taking this requirement seriously and if so, are opting out of their responsibilities to ensure that it is covered, or whether it simply is a matter of not understanding what is required. With the support available the latter seems increasingly unlikely.

Often individual teachers do not fulfil this requirement in a centre where the rest of the department is secure with its demands. It is essential that all teachers preparing candidates for this unit are required to watch the filmed footage, where the RLC is explained very fully. The requirement that one of the basic three contexts must address this aspect is not onerous or difficult to comprehend. The repeated advice to centres is that it is not just a matter of subject matter, but rather it is a question of purpose and audience, which extends the performance “beyond the classroom”. So a prepared talk delivered by the candidate, regardless of the subject-matter does not meet this requirement. It does not alter the validity by calling it “a formal talk”, if the presentation is still to the rest of the class and if they are not in any role other than themselves. If the candidate is given a clear role and purpose, for example as a charity representative, the talk would move ‘beyond the classroom’.

So a talk on work experience is no different to one on hockey; both are straightforward talks to the rest of the class. Similarly a police investigation into Lennie’s death set in a mock police station, with candidates in role as characters from the play can never be classed as “real-life”. Similarly, a group discussion on a ‘real-life’ issue does not satisfy the requirements of the RLC, unless the group are in role.

However many centres have embraced the “real-life” context with enthusiasm and likewise their candidates, seeing it as an opportunity to extend and demonstrate their skills. In these centres task setting is far more imaginative as a result.

There are noticeable improvements in the setting of the drama-focussed activities, with the majority of centres now using role plays and imagined scenarios rather than literature texts and set plays. Role plays are often a good way of fulfilling the demands of the ‘real-life’ context and allow the candidates a much more accessible route to marks in the higher bands. The extra scene or speech is often a popular valid activity, but care must be taken not to stretch the bounds of credibility or set inappropriate tasks, which do not allow candidates to achieve their potential. Hot seating Lennie from “Of Mice and Men” would be one such task, with limited verbal responses possible.

The number of centres which link Speaking and Listening activities with the work for the unit A650 Spoken Language study, remains surprisingly small. In one centre the students recorded their own group discussions, then studied them as their Spoken Language study on Language and Gender.

Reference has been made to the support available as regards task setting for all aspects of Speaking and Listening. The tasks illustrated on DVDs issued and online filmed footage should be used together with the commentaries and a guidance document available on the OCR website, specifically for the “real-life” context. The Controlled Assessment Consultancy is always available to centres seeking further advice on individual tasks and through this a centre’s tasks may be validated. Centres with previous entries will have had direct feedback regarding task setting and task setting is always a major aspect of Advisory visits by external moderators.

Record keeping

A key part of the process is record keeping. Centres are advised to maintain on-going records for all candidates, perhaps making use of a centrally held database of marks for candidates, with written comments. Such procedures, good practice in centres, help to prevent problems arising from staff absences or changes of staff. It also helps in the selection of the final three activities to be used to form the basis for assessment. Good practice continues to be multiple opportunities, with the final selection being on an individual basis.

Many centres have their own working records, which contain feedback to candidates and candidate involvement in the process. Final submission for assessment is then on the OCR

Controlled Assessment form for Speaking and Listening, which covers all the necessary elements, required by the external moderator. This year a number of centres sent bulky packages with their own working records expecting moderators to look at those rather than the CAFs provided by OCR. They often contained feedback to candidates rather than comments directed to the moderator. Centres must remember that candidates' record sheets form a vital piece of evidence in the moderation process. If there is a lack of detail in the description of activities or when comments on performance have been "lifted" directly from the band descriptors with little or no linkage to individual candidate achievement, then it is extremely difficult to carry out the moderation of a centre. Typical lack of detail in description would be "a talk to the class" or "a group discussion on poetry" or "a scene from Macbeth". The level of challenge or complexity involved cannot be judged without the specific subject matter, or in the case of the drama-focussed context, the role adopted and developed. Similarly bland, generalised comments regarding performance, where it is impossible to distinguish one candidate's performance from another, or which band descriptors are being employed, are unsatisfactory.

It is important that all the teachers preparing and assessing candidates adopt a common approach to filling in the record sheets and that good practice is enforced throughout a centre. There was often great variation within a centre, with some teachers providing detailed, helpful and pertinent comments on candidates, and others whose forms were at best perfunctory. It is a centre's responsibility to ensure that external moderators are supplied with a comprehensive set of records, with all sections completed and marks/arithmetic checked to eliminate mathematical and transcriptional errors.

Thankfully the majority of centres provided all the necessary information, with well presented records, increasingly word processed in part and wholly. However the one "rogue" teacher can undo the efficient hard work of a department.

The Application of the Criteria

The starting point for this must be achievement as set against the performance criteria, fixing first on a band and then secondly on the mark within the band range. Comments on achievement on candidates' records should make reference to the band descriptors and give a mark out of 40 for each separate context.

Worryingly it was noted that not all centres or individual teachers within centres matched band descriptors used to the marks awarded. There were discrepancies with teachers not seeming to describe performance accurately. It must be noted also that the sole intended audience for comments is the external moderator, so comments of encouragement are inappropriate: for example, "Superb!" or "Excellent, an effective role".

Good practice in awarding marks balances strengths and weaknesses, not just rewarding strengths. An explanation is given, for example as to why a candidate failed to achieve the next band when on a borderline. This aspect of the application of the criteria is particularly important, where there is bunching of marks, to distinguish separate performances.

The final mark is based on a simple mathematical calculation; the three separate marks are totalled and divided by three. Centres are advised to check the final calculations carefully as odd mistakes were discovered by moderators.

Importantly no assumption should be made as to a link between bands and the level awarded.

Internal Standardisation Procedures

The majority of centres continue to have secure, often very rigorous procedures in place to ensure internal standardisation of the marks. Good practice is to use cross moderation/markings exercises across groups, reorganisation of groups for assessment and department marking often using centre filmed material, together with using the filmed assessment evidence provided annually by OCR.

Centres are reminded that it is essential that all staff preparing and assessing candidates watch and discuss the filmed assessments. Signing the GCW351 form testifies to this having taken place, but it was apparent that this had not taken place in all centres. The internally set standard must be confirmed against OCR's Agreed Standard. This is done by assessing and comparing the marks awarded by OCR for the filmed assessments with the centre's marks, irrespective of centre size. The centre must then adjust its standard, where necessary. Centre visits by an external moderator further confirm a centre's marking.

Worryingly, some centres professing to having watched the DVDs/filmed footage went on to get the "real-life" context wrong. Also centres are warned against using out of date, old material from previous specifications. No filmed assessments have been issued on video for this specification, yet some centres claimed to have watched one.

Standardisation procedures should cover assessment, task setting (not necessarily the same tasks across all groups, but all candidates meeting all the requirements) and record keeping.

Administration

Despite building a session on administration into the Advisory Visit, and including administration instructions on the filmed footage, there is still some confusion about how this unit is moderated. Moderators have reported a small number of centres being weeks late in sending all the relevant material, with no explanation or apology forthcoming. In some instances, thankfully a small number, moderators have received negative reactions, when legitimately asking for moderation material. It is in the interests of all parties that deadlines are kept assiduously, and that candidates' results are not put in jeopardy.

There was less confusion about the different sampling arrangements for Spoken Language and those for Speaking and Listening this year.

To summarise, Instructions to Centres on Moderation are available on the OCR website, as are all relevant forms, hard copies are sent into centres, administration procedures also form a section on the online filmed footage and in the accompanying commentary.

As centres increasingly move to systems where non-specialist examinations officers are the point of reference and dispatchers of moderation material, it is vital for the smooth running of the process that instructions regarding procedures are read, understood and carried out by all relevant parties. Examinations officers need the support of Heads of English or their deputies in all this.

Grateful thanks to all those who got it right and enabled moderators to meet their deadlines.

Conclusion

In conclusion it cannot be stressed enough that centres make use of all the support material readily available for this unit, mention of which has been made previously, but to summarise:

- Online filmed material with accompanying commentary
- Specific “real-life” context guidance document
- The Consultancy Service for Speaking and Listening
- Advisory visits with centre specific feedback
- Reports to centres on the examination series, both centre specific and the Principal Moderators’ Report to Centres

The Administration procedures have been summarised previously.

Finally the Speaking and Listening Unit has always been a real strength for candidates, as witnessed by moderators making Advisory visits to centres. There is a great deal of good work being done and this is testimony to the hard work and dedication of the teachers involved in preparing and assessing candidates. Many thanks as always for your continuing commitment.

A650 Spoken Language

General comments

Once again, moderators commented on the high standard of work produced for this component, and particularly on the evident engagement of candidates with the text and tasks. Centres are often ambitious in the challenge they present to their candidates and the candidates often respond by producing work that is well beyond the demands of the GCSE.

Administration

In the vast majority of cases, centres managed the administration of this component very efficiently – sending the work samples promptly and presenting them clearly. Moderators were appreciative of centres which included transcripts of the texts that had been studied and the notes which candidates used during the final assessment. It is of great help to the moderator when the CAFs are completed fully, with the candidate number and when, after internal standardisation, the final mark awarded is clear.

Task setting and contextualisation

For all topics, it was very clear that candidates responded more successfully when the task was clearly defined, rather than specified simply as “A Study of ...” Particularly successful were tasks which encouraged candidates to look at how language is used for a particular purpose. For example, candidates asked to consider how Boris Johnson used language to entertain and celebrate Britain’s achievements in his Olympic speech were able to closely consider how he interacted with the audience through humour, but also acknowledged the athletes sitting behind him in his praise and recognition of their success in the Games. The task required them to look closely at his lexical choices but also at his mode of delivery and his rapport with his audience achieved through pace, body language and facial expression.

Considering the styles of various children’s television presenters often resulted in candidates comparing, for example, the range of vocabulary, tone of voice and style of communication in programmes designed for children of varying ages. Some responses were rather descriptive and lacked close reference to a particular transcript or episode, instead looking generally at a particular presenter. At times there was too much focus on how a presenter looked or dressed; unless linked closely to their language presentation, such observations are unlikely to be relevant.

Some centres struggled with the Language and Gender task through a failure to look at specific texts to offer candidates sufficient scope to analyse specific language choices and communication styles in their responses. Instead candidates produced a more theoretical study of language and gender but the responses lacked references and analysis. One centre used its own recordings of a group discussion used as a Speaking and Listening assessment for this study, looking at how boys and girls varied in their language choices and contributions according to whether groups were mixed or made up of one gender only.

Some centres chose to compare texts and while this is not a requirement of this component, it can be helpful to candidates in illuminating the choices made. In some cases this was very successful, often where able candidates had a secure and at times subtle understanding of the varying contexts; for example, comparing a children’s presenter from the 1970s to a modern presenter today. Where it was less successful, candidates were comparing texts which were either too different for them to make useful comparisons, or where the contexts were too similar; at times, candidates were struggling to cover a great deal of material and did so at the expense

of the depth of their analysis. It would be perfectly valid for a centre to use comparison as an approach to teaching; for example, looking at a range of different types of interview, and then to use a single text for the final assessment.

Centres are reminded that tasks can be validated by a senior moderator through the Controlled Assessment consultancy on the OCR website.

A small number of centres entered tasks set for 2014, or in some cases 2016. Centres are reminded that they are responsible for setting the tasks appropriate for the year of entry.

Characteristics of weaker and stronger responses

The most successful responses were those where candidates had a good understanding of the contexts and purposes of the texts and were, therefore, able to consider how language had been chosen to meet these purposes. They were able to comment precisely on the effects of particular language choices and how they achieved the purpose. For example, some commented on Johnson's self-mockery in his speeches, making him endearing to the audience, alongside sections in interviews where his defensive stance and well-structured language showed him as a serious politician as well as an eccentric personality who could engage with the electorate.

Successful candidates also showed an understanding of the structure of texts, particularly when dealing with longer speeches, how they progressed towards a conclusion and how language choices varied accordingly.

When tasks lacked clear focus, candidates were more likely to adopt a 'feature spotting' approach where examples of devices, typically lists of three, anaphora, figurative language, or closed and open questions etc. were listed. Because candidates were then dealing with a group of examples, often from different parts of a text, their opportunity to comment analytically and sensitively on the choice of language was restricted and their points were consequently often superficial and repetitive. These responses tended to lack an 'overview' of the text, therefore, demonstrating limited understanding.

Application of the marking criteria

The majority of centres applied the marking criteria accurately. Many supported their marks with detailed, analytical comments which appropriately addressed the criteria and coupled it with comments on how the candidate had met those criteria. There were many centres whose marginal annotations of work were sparing but purposeful and not simply couched in the terms of the Band Descriptors; these annotations reflected a genuine understanding of what the individual candidate was trying to achieve and usually were to be found on the work of candidates who were pursuing a genuine line of thought or argument.

When moderators disagreed with centre marks, the most common disparity was in what constituted 'analytical understanding', perception or cogency'. In these instances, simple or descriptive comments with a straightforward example were often praised as 'shows analytical understanding'.

Many centres' samples showed evidence of internal standardisation and in the most effective of these moderators saw annotations and comments by more than one teacher. While presenting evidence of this sort is not required, it is vital that all teachers in a centre are applying the marking criteria consistently in order to establish a single, valid rank order.

Many thanks for all the effort and hard work that centres have invested in this unit.

A651 Extended Literary Text and Imaginative Writing

General Comments

Tasks, Texts and Responses

The central band four-six descriptor is “understands and demonstrates how meaning is conveyed”. In band three and above this is developed to include “evaluating (commenting on/ making judgements about) language and structure as appropriate” (in ways that are relevant to task and text). Such an approach would certainly be beneficial to all candidates, irrespective of their aspirations or their choice of task and text, in so far that they can write about language and structure throughout the piece: rather than focusing exclusively on the former.

Long narrative recapitulations should be avoided: they will not gain a great deal of credit. Neither will responses that insist on including passages on the alleged social, historical and cultural context of the work, which is not asked for and not tested in this Unit (see below).

SECTION A – Extended Literary Text

THEMED TASKS

There were few takers for these tasks. However, those candidates who did choose this task wrote about the importance of the opening lines of each chapter in 'Of Mice and Men' and the importance of Steinbeck setting the scene. This proved to be an excellent choice, as even the weaker candidates were able to frame a good response.

PROSE OR LITERARY NON-FICTION

John Steinbeck “Of Mice and Men”

This was the most popular question by far and there were some very good responses. Even the less impressive were still very solid and workmanlike. The best responses were able to see and demonstrate the variety of types of violence from physical and verbal to psychological. Hence, a high proportion of the candidates started with Curley's need to prove his strength to everyone around him, with fighting the first thing on his mind. The recognition that the ranch was a very masculine environment and that the men were often impressed by other men's strength, even if they disliked the person, characterised the very good responses. Violence was seen to underpin the world in which the men on the ranch lived: Curley's confrontational behaviour, Lennie's inability to understand his own strength when he finally reacts to Curley's ruthless beating of him, when he kills Curley's wife, the torture George faced in having to shoot Lennie, etc.

Less successful responses tended to catalogue the violent scenes and then comment on them. Generally, there was good commentary on the language but why the violence was important eluded most of the candidates at this level.

Less successful responses, as so often in this Unit, were shaped rather more by perceptions of the social context than of the developed detail of the text.

To repeat yet again what has been said in successive Reports to Centres: references to Social/Cultural/Historical context are not sought here and are not required. They do not necessarily

detract from the merits of a response but they rarely do little to enhance it. This is especially true of received, often generic comments, which tend to become clichés.

Athol Fugard “Tsotsi”

This text is not widely presented but is done so with great passion and commitment by those who choose it.

This task proved to be a successful one by the few who chose it. Candidates responded well to making and developing links between Tsotsi’s childhood and how his character developed later in the novel. Successful responses showed in-depth understanding of why Tsotsi/David was a victim/product of circumstances beyond his control.

Jane Austen “Pride and Prejudice”.

The work on this text submitted by the few centres which had studied it was excellent: little comment is needed beyond a confirmation that this text **is** within the compass of GCSE candidates given that the right approaches are taken.

Work on **Bill Bryson or Kate Adie** was not seen in this session.

More pleasingly there was some work on the **Hardy short stories** completed with great skill and enthusiasm.

DRAMA

William Shakespeare:

“Romeo and Juliet”.

“How far do different attitudes towards love and marriage contribute to the play’s tragic events?” It was pleasing to see a significant number of very successful responses to this task and text. The usual format was to comment on the attitudes of several characters and although this worked well, it was surprising that few candidates considered Mercutio. There was also less consideration of the arranged marriage than expected.

Candidates made strong links between the “death marked love” noted by the Chorus at the outset and the inevitable consequences of the secrecy of the affair amidst the clash between the Montague and Capulet families and the arranged marriage to Paris.

“Julius Caesar”

It was pleasing to see that at last a few centres have turned to this much underestimated work. Candidates answering on this task need to see that there are two discrete parts to it. Firstly, how Shakespeare presents Caesar as a victim of his ambition and secondly how Brutus is presented likewise. Candidates who did respond to this task understood the significance of the quote, “Ambition’s debt is paid”: ambition costs, ambition leads Caesar to power and as a result Caesar has a ‘debt’ to pay. The strong responses also showed an understanding of the role of Cassius and how he completes the characters of both men. He was seen as a plot device designed to bring about the tragic elements of the play and present the two central characters as victims of their own ambition by sparking the events that brought about their demise.

POETRY: SELECTED POEMS

Wilfred Owen:

Very few centres chose to write about Wilfred Owen's poetry, but of the few that did, there were some very thoughtful responses. However, some candidates had tried to cover too many poems, so the depth of analysis was lacking.

Benjamin Zephaniah: to date very little has been seen on this writer, unfortunately.

Carol Ann Duffy

Similarly, Duffy remains a very popular choice and the challenge of writing about how she presents childhood experiences in her poetry was tackled with enthusiasm.

Simon Armitage

Candidates really identified with strikingly unusual characters and wrote about them with the confidence we are accustomed to seeing on this writer.

SECTION B – IMAGINATIVE WRITING

Personal and Imaginative Writing/Prose Fiction

Both 'A Clash of Loyalties' and 'Under Pressure' proved to be very accessible tasks, with the majority of candidates choosing the latter. It was pleasing to see that most, if not all, tried very hard to create a sense of tension, as the title implies, and as a result there were some excellent responses. All the satellite tasks were popular. The newspaper article was the most popular choice for both tasks and the most successful, as the diary entry often succumbed to being just another story. Surprisingly, the least successful was the autobiography extract. This genre had not been fully understood by those candidates who attempted it.

It was, however, surprising to see, the brevity of a number of pieces for the satellite task. Both the main task and the satellite task have equal weighting with regards to marks and in a number of instances it was disappointing to see a cursory attempt at the satellite task after a valiant effort at the main task.

Centres and teachers are to be congratulated on steering candidates in directions that often displayed compassion, sympathy and awe in convincing and authentic detail.

Good tests of the merit of a candidate's writing are often:

- The degree of control there has been in shaping and developing the chosen (raw) material of the piece: is this greater or lesser than the sum of its parts? How completely integrated are its different (and quite possibly disparate) elements?
- The range and appropriateness of the vocabulary: is it apt, precise, well separated and lacking repetition?

Finally, centres and candidates are again to be congratulated on the freshness, originality and enthusiasm which characterised much of the work that moderators read.

Administrative Matters

It was pleasing to see that very few centres were late in submitting moderation samples and that many more were pleasingly prompt, allowing moderation to at least, in part, start early at the commencement of a busy assessment schedule.

Most centres were very successful and accurate in the moderation process. Moderators had little to disagree with in band, mark or rank order, suggesting that the task is being carried out with increasing competence and confidence. Those centres which were unable to do this, most often due to marking too generously, rather than misunderstanding the rank order of their candidates, will have been notified in the individual centre report.

There is still occasional disparity between very fully completed paperwork and a paucity of annotation on scripts to show exactly where and how marks have been awarded. Where paperwork was incomplete or in error centres were reasonably prompt and efficient in supplying what the moderators required.

The recording of marks for the writing tasks, ie the separate marks for the different AOs for each piece, was not carried out as well for this session as in previous sessions. Many centres did not break down the marks and just offered a total.

It is important that centres are diligent when it comes to the administration of controlled assessments. There has been a startling increase in the number of clerical errors made by centres this session and OCR asks for your co-operation in eliminating this, in the interest of all candidates.

A680 Information and Ideas (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

The question paper proved to be accessible and of an appropriate level of demand for the tier. Most candidates were able to engage with the two reading texts for Section A: *How to be a wildlife photographer* and *Party Animals*.

The majority of candidates appeared to have been well prepared for the examination. The spaces provided for responses were sufficient for all but a minority of candidates, who generally used the additional pages towards the back of the booklet.

In most cases, candidates appeared to have followed the advice regarding time allocation; few responses showed evidence of running out of time. However, there were instances of candidates rushing through the Reading section and then spending an excessive amount of time on the Writing section, often to their detriment as more writing led to more errors being made.

Individual Questions Section A – Reading

No examiners reported any instances of candidates using the incorrect text for Q1, but a very few candidates used the first text to answer either Q2(a) or Q2(b).

1(a) – 1(c) These easier questions provided a relatively gentle way into the paper, though not all candidates scored all six marks. Some candidates had a limited grasp of the term ‘adjectives’ in Question 1(a).

1(d) Stronger responses demonstrated a clear focus on the task: ‘Outline what you learn about what is needed to take good wildlife photographs.’ Many were able to express points in their own words, *as far as possible*, as the question says. These candidates showed a secure understanding of a range of valid points.

Once again, less successful responses were often marked by the presence of one or more of the following:

- points made that were not relevant to the task
- points laboured or repeated
- the occasional word changed in a minimal attempt at own words
- own views on the topic offered
- analysis of the writer’s use of words.

The weakest answers lifted material indiscriminately and showed an almost complete misunderstanding of the task and/or text.

Question 2

Most candidates took note of the relative weightings of Q2(a) and Q2(b) – six and 14 marks respectively. There were still, however, a minority of candidates who wrote at excessive length for Q2(a).

2(a) Stronger responses commented on the effects of such features as the heading ‘Party Animals’ and sub-headings ‘Midnight at the oasis’ and ‘A noisy affair’. They explored the effects created by the two photographs, one of rhinos at a water-hole, the other of two rhinos ‘nuzzling’. Many candidates referred to the attribution of human qualities to the rhinos in the phrase ‘drink, gossip and play’.

Once again, the least successful responses merely identified features without comment or made generic comments about headings, photographs and captions that could be true of any magazine article, or indeed, of any media text.

2(b) The most successful responses contained clear evidence of the ability to select and analyse relevant detail, commenting on both the information given and specific words and phrases. It should be noted that the quality of analytical comment is a discriminator in this question. Stronger responses explored the words used to describe rhinos as 'party animals': they were there to 'socialise', play 'party games' and 'strut' around. Many commented on the effects of the onomatopoeia in 'squeaked and squealed' and 'roared' also to the comical reference to the 'morning after' such a heavy party night.

However, a minority of responses did not address aspects of language used in the article. The weakest responses simply described the content of the passage.

Section B – Writing Questions 3 and 4

Examiners saw the full range of performance. As ever, some candidates are apt to confuse quantity with quality. It is worth pointing out again that length of answer alone rarely secures high reward. There is no need for candidates to provide more than one-and-a-half to two sides of writing (using average size of handwriting as a guide) for their response to either question in Section B. There should certainly be no need to use the additional pages of the answer booklet. Many candidates would have benefited from more practice at planning, paragraphing and checking their work.

Stronger responses showed a clear control of generally relevant material, and offered an engaging opening, clear development of ideas and an effective ending. Both vocabulary and sentence structures were varied for effect. By contrast, less successful responses did not convey much evidence of writing purposefully for an audience. The weakest responses tended to produce rambling material or material lacking coherence to the degree that it had to be re-read, sometimes several times, before the meaning was sufficiently clear.

Common and recurring problems with punctuation included confusion between upper and lower case letters, and a failure to mark sentence divisions. There were again instances of very poor handwriting, which placed a considerable burden on readers. Legible handwriting is essential for the reader to make sense of the ideas the candidate is trying to communicate.

Question 3

There were many stimulating accounts of candidates' hobbies, including football, boxing, racing on horses and in cars, ballroom dancing and so on. Where there was a passion for the chosen hobby or interest, the writing tended to be livelier and more engaging. The best responses remembered the audience, purpose and format of writing specified in the question, and crafted their responses accordingly.

Question 4

There was a wide range of engaging responses to the topic 'Life isn't fair'. Some were adamantly against the practice of photographing their lives rather than living their lives; they deplored the increasing use of selfies and the need to share with others via Snapchat and Instagram every banal aspect of their lives, not least the meals they were about to eat. Others championed the right to do just that if they wanted to. Yet others spoke eloquently about the need to have digital memories to look back on in later life.

A680 Information and Ideas (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

The paper was well received by candidates and their teachers for what it offered in both reading and writing. Responses were detailed and relevant and candidates had generally used their time well. Even when the going got tough for some in the reading passages, compensation was possible in the writing. Many examiners sensed the enjoyment candidates had manifested in completing the paper. Very few candidates appeared to have little idea of what to do although some still confuse the requirements of Q1 and Q2/3. These latter questions were occasionally treated with the application of a list of possible rhetorical devices and a spot and attach process followed. This, assuredly, is not the way to approach these tasks. The passages should be read on their merits and the wording of the task should guide candidates to their decisions about their responses.

All five questions each elicited full marks from some candidates: a rare experience!

Few candidates had been wrongly entered in this tier and those few that had were enabled to show themselves at their best because of the accessibility of the reading material and the writing tasks. Weaker candidates in the tier are strongly advised to be as concise as possible and leave time to check the accuracy of their writing before time runs out.

Able candidates were, conversely, stretched by the paper's demands and worked hard to get each response into the top bands. Whilst there was nothing extraordinary about the Street-Porter article and the questions set on it, the Nicholas Carr article was, perhaps, not written in the same vein and, especially, tone as previous second passages. Almost all candidates were sensitive to the changing tone here, which moved from frustrated to sardonic to optimistic. The only problem seemed to be that technology moves far faster than the timescale for setting examinations: some candidates were keen to point out that the Twitter images are now obsolete.

The paper was very successful, then, in discriminating across the ability range. What it presented was fair and appropriate throughout. But many examiners reported problems with poor or illegible handwriting.

The writing gave a very clear set of choices for candidates. They could write a persuasive talk, a favourite genre for which all now seem very thoroughly prepared or a straightforward (or, indeed very much more complex) narrative, also familiar territory.

Very few candidates failed to answer all the questions although the evidence is that starting with the writing task and leaving the reading until last works for a very small minority of those who choose this methodology.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No:-

1. The majority of responses to this question were well focused: most candidates had been rigorously prepared for this task: but those who still do not understand what they have to do are in marked contradistinction to that majority. Candidates and teachers are obviously aware of the essentials of the task: separate thesis from example, use own words (that is, reorganise the passage so that the information fits the task) and provide a good range of different points. Above all, be concise and do not waste words on repetition and/or irrelevance. NO comment on the style of the passage is required.

The most common inclusion of excess material that was not relevant to the question was the reference to Lady Gaga and her legions and/or the introduction of tweeting in Parliament. It was insufficient to simply say “sportsmen whinge on twitter”. What was required was an understanding that people (including famous people) will say on social media what they will not say to people’s (the manager’s) face.

Personal remarks about social media in all its many manifestations were self-penalising, as were attempts to put an alternative case: neither approach was required

It was reported widely that fewer candidates ignored concision and wrote far too much.

2. It is important to see how poorer answers could have been improved.

No response will be more than very moderately successful if it fails to show the meaning/purpose/intention of the passage and the reasoning behind it. Candidates should be encouraged as strongly as possible to spend as long as they need to get at these essentials: they will write all the quicker and more effectively if they do. As stated in the introduction, candidates should take the passages and the questions on their merits and plan a thoughtful and relevant answer.

Responses that seek to use a pre-digested list of generic devices and attach chunks of the passage to them will be unsuccessful because the thinking processes have been sidelined. All bold headlines stand out; all coloured pictures are bright and attractive; all short snappy sentences capture your interest, and so on. Engaging with a particular passage and making a specific response to it is the way to gain marks.

Thus, what was needed here to show how Janet Street Porter makes her argument convincing, was to see her “take” on Twitter and pick out particular examples of the way effects are produced.

The main point to be made about the picture was not that it was blue “which is a cold colour”, or that it stands out, or any other generic description that could apply to any picture or headline or sub-heading but that it contained a deliberate ambiguity in the twitter livery. “What are you doing?” might well be an invitation to tweet but it is also a challenge to those of Janet Street Porter’s persuasion to despair at such activities. The point is worth emphasising because this is an excellent example of how to approach “presentation.” It shows exactly how the picture provides a visual cue into the text and its concerns.

Almost all candidates commented on “tsunami of bilge”/“tidal wave of drivel” and the rhetorical question they embody. This was subjected to an analytical approach, which was not always sustained throughout the response. Similarly, most candidates saw and commented on the structure of the article in which the writer posits the opposing case: here that Twitter has its virtues only to reinforce her criticisms: this was a point well made. Fewer understood “bastard child” and took it to mean “insulting remark”/“strong language” rather than the literal sense in which it is intended.

The strongest responses gave relentlessly sustained analytical work, which empathised with the article’s stance and opinions. These warmed to the concepts of attention seeking/lack of self-esteem tweeters which were alleged to embody, seeing this paradox as something they agreed with and deplored their lack of intelligence and/or skills. This part of the passage provided a feast for those of an analytical bent to dine out on. Much the same energetic insights were applied to “whingers... who should keep their mouths shut” – if not the language of the classroom, then certainly of the playground.

In short successful responses were the ones which saw (amongst other things) the use of “grammar, context, considered evaluation, subtle innuendo and adjectives” and were able to comment on them with confidence.

3. Many of the general comments above applied to this question but the essential differences between them have not always been fully understood.

Whereas Q2 will stick with one point of, or, at any rate, shades of one point of view, Q3 will have a “yes, but” alternative view at some point. This passage has the “yes but” alternative right the way through. Candidates should, therefore, be congratulated on picking up these changing nuances and commenting on them, which virtually all did. The second key difference is that this task looks for an awareness of tone and how it is presented and delivered. Most saw that as the views change, so too does the tone: three or more times in the article. Anxiety and concern give way to more confident explanation, then to doubt and scepticism and finally to resolution.

Again, a clear awareness of the fundamentals of the article was the essential starting point for successful responses. Is the Internet and all its manifestations helping or hindering our intellectual development? Well in some ways yes, in some ways no, then not very sure, but at the end the crucial punch line “we will, lose something important in ourselves and in our culture” with the memorable metaphor of “pancake people” to round it off. Again the best answers needed to include a full sense of the conclusion to make the rest of the analysis work in a comparative way.

Again, many weaker candidates sought to demonstrate “thought-provoking” without this overview of the structure and understanding of where the article gets to. The best example is the “scuba diver/jet -ski” comparison. Such candidates saw this and explained the difference “deep v shallow” or something of the sort and then suggested that it was thought provoking which, of itself it is not of course. What was needed was an account of the metaphor being simplified into a simile as a quantitative sense of the differences between reading (good) and surfing (bad) and the reasons given.

Some responses assumed that “Is Google making us stupid?” was a rhetorical question which at this point of the article it isn't: better ones saw that by the end of the article it has become one as the writer draws his conclusions.

Some candidates compromised their responses by expressing personal opinions and prejudices.

In short the article's changing tone and the way it unravels the ambiguities stretched candidates right across the spectrum of marks and as such was a success.

4. All the candidates, it was reported, are now confident and practised in the “talk to the class” and can sustain an apt tone in this genre successfully.

The vast majority of takers here went for something that was related to the reading material. Perhaps taking a cue from Janet Street Porter's vehemence, some of the strongest candidates had a field day of eloquent damnation of their peers who, it was alleged, were obsessed with status, likes and numbers of “friends”. This was often done with rhetorical savagery and/or with a slow burning sarcasm. Others took social media as but one of many tokens of what was wrong with society and (a very popular line) why children today are growing up too quickly. It was touching to read these 16 year olds recalling and lamenting the early onset of adulthood when they had played out with their friends, got muddy, been unselfconscious and so on, just as the generation of 2010 had condemned them for the same thing: and no doubt the generations of 1955, 1960 and so on.

Other topics finding support included global warming and a range of other “green” issues; schools and the school system of assessment by examination; drug and alcohol abuse amongst teenagers; issues of gender equality and many more.

Strong responses were characterised by a conscious use of rhetorical devices: sarcastic rhetorical questions were popular, as were one liners followed by the pregnant pause. And all of these were brought to an effectively climactic conclusion.

Where essays were less successful they degenerated into uncontrolled rants or became inappropriately personal. Or as one very experienced examiner put it “the imperative mode was dominant”. Responses that lurched from one complaint to another (and sometimes another after that) lacked an effective continuity and structure and, therefore, development was limited. Some went on far too long and became tediously repetitive and others were so brief they barely got going. Another feature of less successful work was a drifting away from genre and audience, which, again, made for inconsistency and ineffectiveness.

5. This presented candidates with, in the first instance, a straightforward opportunity for a narrative, probably their earliest and most practised writing style.

It certainly afforded all takers with the opportunity to re-shape and develop a piece of their own experience and some familiar themes were re-worked to good effect. Never has communication in sports and games of all sorts been given so much prominence and much of this kind of writing allowed or even forced candidates to go into authentic and convincing detail. One of the best was a candidate who told the story of having been badly injured when thrown from a horse and was advised never to ride again: but she and her mount persevered and won the gymkhana because they learned to communicate in a different way.

Other successful topics included accounts of various outward-bound activities, overseas expeditions and fraught telephone conversations, one of the most convincing of which was the reception of instructions about managing a successful child birth.

Weaker responses almost always took a derivative topic and worked on shaping it around the task. Quite plainly, few 16 year olds have fought on the front line in Iraq or Afghanistan and are giving themselves a high hurdle to convince examiners that they might have done. High-flying businessmen being assaulted by hit-men in Las Vegas are also likely to be past the GCSE stage.

Candidates should certainly be aware of how easy it is to lose marks when the basic mechanics of writing are ignored, as spelt out in the mark scheme. Rambling, comma spliced sentences drag AO 3/3 marks down, as do failures of person and tense agreement. Repetitious spelling error types (as opposed to the odd slip with ambitious vocabulary) do the same.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk/

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2015

