

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2010

GCE

GCE Drama and Theatre Studies (6DR03 01)

Exploration of Dramatic Performance

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 GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Summer 2010

Publications Code UA023762

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

6DR03 Exploration of Dramatic Performance

Requirements of the Unit

This unit requires the creation of a unique and original piece of theatre. The knowledge and understanding gained in the AS units can now be applied to a created production. Candidates are assessed on both the process of creation and the finished product in the form of a performance presented to an invited audience.

The unit focuses on a group production in response to either stimulus material, themes, ideas and issues OR in response to a published play.

This unit is internally assessed and externally moderated. Assessment evidence consists of student profiles written by the teacher assessor, a final performance recorded on camera and transferred to a suitable audio/visual format and Supporting Written Evidence Documents.

Candidates are assessed as individuals in relation to the process and the final production. Candidates may offer Performance, Design or Directing.

The minimum group size is 3 performers and the maximum is 6 performers. Each group may be supported by up to 3 design candidates as long as each candidate offers a different skill. The performance should last between 15 minutes and 30 minutes maximum according to the group size.

The Supporting Written Evidence Document (SWED) should address the 6 questions printed on page 42 of the specification and must not exceed the recommended maximum word limit of 3,500 words.

There is no time limit given for this unit as long as it is completed and marked by the deadline to submit the work to the moderator which is mid-May in the year of examination.

The majority of our centres taught the legacy specification and will have recognised that this unit is an amalgamation of old specification Units 4 and 5 and allows centres to choose the route that best suits their candidates' abilities.

How Candidates Performed on this Unit in the 2010 Series

The starting point for this unit is the introduction of the stimulus material/s. There was much evidence that centres had gone to great lengths to carefully choose and prepare stimulus materials. Many centres started this work at the end of the Summer term preceding the A2 year by looking at practitioners, seeing more unusual theatrical events and encouraging their students to think beyond mainstream theatre and traditional texts. Some centres even did a mock Unit 3 piece by performing to a local Primary school while another group did a collaborative project within their own school.

The main advantage of actually starting the Unit once AS results are published is that the exact number of students in the group/s is known. A number of centres asked if they could have a group of 7 performers particularly if they happened to have a group of just 7 students. This was not allowed under any circumstances. A group of 7 would have to work as a 4 and a 3 and the vast majority of centres adhered to this and saw that it was both fair and logical. There were a number of centres who started the unit with 3 candidates but one dropped out; they were allowed to continue the course with 2 genuine candidates and then use ONE more bona fide student to make the group up to 3 thus ensuring parity between all centres.

Although not true to all centres, some moderators observed that larger centres seemed more confident to award a range of marks. Perhaps the larger number supported the detached and accurate application of grading criteria? Centres with smaller numbers must be wary of becoming too subjective and not applying the assessment criteria accurately. Words/phrases such as "a

lovely girl", "super in all aspects", "highly talented" and "as the only boy in the group" do not address the assessment criteria and should not be used as a means of awarding marks.

In the main, candidates in most centres chose to devise a piece of theatre from an open-ended stimulus and this meant that the majority of work resembled that of the legacy specification Unit 4 - Devising. The means of introducing the chosen stimulus materials appeared to vary greatly across centres. Without actually being there, it is impossible to say if there was a correlation between the introductory lessons and the final performance. It was felt, however, that those candidates who had been taught and lead through a series of workshops at the start of the unit appeared to have been given many more opportunities than those who were left to their own devices.

Evidence in SWEDs indicated that some centres presented a group of objects on a table to their candidates on day one of the new term and thereafter they were left to develop the piece themselves. At the other extreme, teachers seemed to make the entire journey with the candidates including directing the piece, which is not in the spirit - nor the rubric - of the exam. Moderators reported that in most centres work started on the unit with a series of teacher-led lessons, which became workshops that eventually handed control and decision making over to the candidates themselves and this approach appeared to have been much more successful.

While there did not seem to be anything obviously new in terms of the stimulus materials they were much better developed and demanding. Poems, artifacts and music featured heavily alongside stories, newspaper articles, films and TV documentaries.

Moderators reported that, amongst others, successful pieces were created from novels (e.g. *The Book Thief*), poems (e.g. *London* by William Blake) song lyrics (e.g. *Save Him* by Justin Nozuka) and biographical facts (e.g. Ruth Ellis).

It appears that many centres compiled a resource bank that gave students access to a range of materials in and around a theme. War, food and loss were recurring themes but they were often developed with great maturity and sensitivity. A large number of centres indicated that teacher involvement with the stimulus materials had taken about a month before groups embarked on their own development. Some centres chose the groupings, others let the students choose but it is essential that the teacher/s ensure that the groups adhere to the size and time limits outlined in the specification and the ICE document.

A smaller number of centres chose to use a play script as the stimulus for Unit 3. This option relates to the legacy specification Unit 5, which was very popular with students and teachers alike. Interestingly, texts used were anything but traditional, and seemed to suggest a more unusual avant-garde response. Moderators reported that playwrights including Alfred Jarry, Beckett, Ionesco and Weiss were all used very successfully, as were pieces based on contemporary texts such as *The Pillowman*, *Crave*, *4:48 Psychosis*, and *Overspill*. There were also interesting combinations of materials that included for example research material and the film of *The Magdalene Sisters*.

Some centres used a combination of complimentary play texts supported by stimulus materials and this combination seemed to be very successful. e.g. *The Crucible* with current articles on victimisation and cults, *Blood Wedding* with materials on arranged marriages and *School for Scandal* with media manipulation today.

The final aspect that centres addressed when introducing stimulus materials was greater focus on genres and presentation styles. When candidates reported that their piece was in numerous styles, influenced by, for example Stanislavski, Brecht and Berkoff, it was inevitably less successful than the work of the majority of centres where candidates seemed to understand that depth was preferable to breadth and had chosen to focus on perhaps just a couple of practitioners.

Overall, the evidence indicates that centres that took time to prepare and introduce a range of stimulus materials that met the needs of their students gave them an excellent start to this unit.

Supporting Written Evidence Documents (SWEDs)

The SWED is worth 50% of the unit overall and needs to address two distinct areas (1)Research and Exploration and (2)Evaluation. The former objective was far better covered than the latter, and moderators reported that many centres had over rewarded candidates for their Evaluation, which was often very scant. There should be an even balance between these two elements as they are each worth 25% of the unit overall. The SWED 'should not exceed 3500 words' as printed in the 'Getting Started' booklet first released to centres in 2007. Unfortunately, this information was omitted from the specification but was made very clear in the Unit 3 specific paperwork in the ICE booklet, which includes all the forms for this unit, in the FAQ section of the Edexcel website and in any query addressed to the Ask the Expert service from Edexcel.

Many candidates stated that their SWED began as a rough working notebook and this seems a good approach as it implies that note taking has been ongoing throughout the unit. There is no one specified approach to the SWED other than the word limit and the fact that it needs to address the 6 set questions. The majority of candidates addressed each of the 6 questions in turn, usually in continuous prose and often including sketches and diagrams. Moderators reported that very few candidates wrote less than 2,000 words and through lack of detailed development, they tended to be awarded marks in the lower bands for this element. Most candidates used the word count to the full and very disappointingly, a significant minority had been allowed to exceed the 3500 word count. The word limit provides rigour and challenge to the most able in the same way as a time limit does for a written examination. Happily, most centres welcomed the word limit particularly as the work is marked by the teacher assessor in the first instance and the whole unit felt manageable and appropriate in terms of the written content.

A number of centres had not secured all the candidate signatures and this meant forms had to be returned for signatures as this is a requirement for all coursework components across all subjects and awarding bodies. Similarly, some centres had not entered the exact word count when this is also part of the same requirement.

In order to fully support the candidates and the moderation process, teacher assessors need to mark and annotate the written work, as they would do normally. It seemed very strange that a few centres submitted course work for moderation purposes that had no marks or annotation on it at all. Moderators reported that candidates were best supported when their SWEDs showed clear comments and annotations from the teacher/s that allowed the moderator to see where marks had been awarded and why. In the main, the candidate record card was stapled to the front of each SWED as requested in the ICE but when the moderator removed these, it was alarming to see that some candidates' written work was not named. It is essential that when work is submitted for an examination it is possible to identify exactly who has written each page. Given that nearly all the SWEDs are word processed, candidates who used a header and footer facility had the relevant information on each page.

Moderators reported that there was almost no evidence of plagiarism on this new unit. This is partly due to the revised questions that seem accessible to everyone and encourage responses that are more personal.

In terms of presentation, most SWEDs were presented on paper as requested in the ICE, although some centres clearly had not read that plastic wallets are not permitted, nor are notebooks of any kind. Some centres organised the SWEDs into performance groups, which was very helpful to the moderation process.

Question 1

How is the initial material being researched and developed at significant stages during the process of creating drama?

Most candidates began this question by outlining the stimulus materials they were given and their initial response to it. Lower band responses were sidetracked by listing all the things they did not do, or by writing a substantial amount before stating that they then abandoned this idea. Dated diary entries were an effective way of showing how materials had progressed and also allowed for reflective and evaluative comments. Almost all candidates acknowledged use of the internet but it was pleasing to see that libraries, museums, verbatim accounts, archives, and many other resources had been well used. Higher scoring responses continued to develop this question almost through to the performance date illustrating that the process was a lengthy and ongoing one.

Question 2

How effectively are you personally exploring and developing your role(s)?

This question produced a wide range of responses. Some did not really get beyond GCSE level when they not only talked about hot-seating they then went on to define what hot-seating is. This really is a waste of words given that they are writing for an informed reader. It is possible to interpret this question to mean just your role i.e. that of candidate writing the SWED, or the roles of the group. While either is acceptable, higher band work does require candidates to be aware of self and others and when others in the group were included in this question, it did give a sense of group ownership and responsibility.

Question 3

How did you and your group explore the possibilities of form, structure and performance style?

A considerable number of candidates gave a very broad based response to this question with weaker candidates giving an account of what the group had done, which does not address the question properly. While it is preferable for candidates to focus on what they did do, rather than what they did not do, exploration can allow for some pertinent evaluative comments and observations. A good number of responses broke the question down into the three sections of form, structure and style and this really allowed them to address and answer the question. Quite a number of centres had chosen to link this question to Question 4 and it was an effective way of connecting style with practitioners and live theatre seen.

Question 4

How did the work of established and recognised theatre practitioners, and/or the work of live theatre, influence the way in which your devised response developed?

While all the practitioners we might expect featured in this section, in order of frequency it was probably Brecht, Stanislavski, Berkoff, Artaud, Kneehigh, Complicite, Frantic Assembly, DV8, Meyerhold and Brook that were most cited. While lower band candidates seemed to present a list of practitioners including a bit about them, there were many cases where candidates had genuinely understood and engaged with a genre or style and managed to embrace it very successfully. Candidates spoke passionately about productions they had seen and it was wonderful to see how they had used ideas and styles. Kneehigh were much emulated and seemed to be loved by all those who were able to see their work. While all the mainstream theatres and companies were often referred to, candidates were also getting to see student productions, alternative and fringe theatre events, which often connect closely to them in terms of age and style.

Question 5

How successfully did your final performance communicate your aims and intentions for the piece to your audience?

Some centres thought that these last two questions were the only place to evaluate the work they produced, however high scoring candidates talked about aims and intentions from the very start of the project and used them to hold a focus throughout the SWED. It is essential that the final performance does have an audience and yet it appears that some did not. Preparing the performance for an audience is a requirement of this unit.

Audience questionnaires and talkback sessions sometimes helped with this question. It was often possible to gauge audience response from the DVD sent but this question is more concerned with the candidate's perception of what they were trying to communicate, who it was aimed at and why.

Question 6

How effectively did the social, cultural, historical/political content of the piece communicate to your audience?

This question was often the deciding factor between an excellent candidate and an outstanding one. It is a common strand that permeates the specification as a whole and some students did recognise this from their Unit 1 and 2 work. As the sixth question and in some ways the least obvious, weaker candidates often wrote very little or gave a list of dates that had no connection with the piece of theatre they had created. Stronger candidates understood that whatever stimulus they had started with, it had something to say to their audience because it referenced some social, cultural, historical or political point of view that they had understood and tried to capture or recreate.

Development and Structure

This is worth 25% of the unit and is what drama teachers recognise as the process mark. It is very important that the teacher assessor writes comments on this section of the candidate record card that provides concrete evidence of what the candidate did to support the mark awarded. Consequently, it was not sufficient when a small number of teacher assessors wrote a short sentence such as 'super lad, fully involved throughout the process', or gave top band marks that did not relate to the assessment criteria. Moderators were able to cross-reference well-written teacher comments with the SWED and what the candidates themselves said about the creative process.

Performance

The performance alone is worth 25% of the unit. Moderators all reported seeing some delightful work that was innovative, engaging and entertaining. Unfortunately, this element was over-marked in many centres with a huge number of candidates being placed in the outstanding band when really their work was excellent or less. Most groups adhered to the logical time limit, which is about 5 minutes per candidate i.e. 15 minutes for a group of 3 and up to a maximum of 30 minutes for a group of 6. Moderators only watched a maximum of 30 minutes. The recorded evidence is essential and overall was much improved this year with centres understanding that without it, the moderator had no marks to agree and the centre would be advised to submit a missing coursework form.

There were still issues with compatibility, sound quality and light levels but centres were all very keen to submit back up copies when requested. Candidates' identification to camera were also much improved with centres understanding that an unnamed candidate on a Video/DVD is the same as not putting your name on an exam script. Although not ideal, where centres had omitted to do the line-up or identity parade, they often did it retrospectively or included photographs, and moderators were grateful for this attempt to rectify the situation. A number of centres

provided group photographs, in costume, as a matter of course and these were helpful to the moderation process.

Cameras still need to be placed centre stage and in front of the audience but certainly recordings are getting better. This year saw a wave of promenade performances that are never easy to film but did produce some stunning work. There were several notable site-specific pieces including one in Wales about Welsh identity that delighted passers-by as well as the chosen audience.

Overall, moderators reported seeing some wonderful pieces of devised work incorporating a variety of techniques; of these, the most successful incorporated choral work and physical theatre taking influences from companies such as Frantic Assembly, DV8 and Complicite. The best work was a result of candidates who had researched and explored the stimulus material thoroughly. There were still a number of centres producing work that did not significantly go beyond GCSE level.

Evidence of stronger work from centres was highly creative and clearly showed a genuine understanding of the course and how drama can be developed into something highly creative and original.

Grade Boundaries

6DR03 Exploration of Dramatic Performance

	Max Mark	a*	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw Boundary Mark	60	54	49	42	36	30	24	18	0
UMS Boundary Mark	80	72	64	56	48	40	32	24	0

a* is only used in conversion from raw to uniform marks. It is not a published unit grade.

Maximum Mark (Raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme.

Boundary Mark: the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

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

Order Code UA 023762 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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