

5DR02 Exploring Play Texts

This unit requires students to practically explore a full and substantial published play-text (A01/Paper 01) and then to evaluate this process of exploration in a 1,000 word Documentary Response (A03/Paper 02). Students must also complete a 2,000 word Response to Live Performance.

Detailed information about the delivery and administration of this unit can be found in the **2DR01 GCSE Drama Specification 2012 document** and the **Administrative Support Guide (ASG)**. There is also useful information on the Controlled Assessment aspects of the unit in the **Controlled Assessment Teacher Support Book for GCSE Drama (TSB)** and on the features of student performance within this unit in the 2014 series in the Report of the Principal Moderator.

All documents are available to download free at <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/drama-2009.html>

The Record of Work:

While this document is not moderated, it remains a vital piece of evidence to support the moderation process. There is specific guidance on the ROW updated for 2015 in the ASG.

In this case, the centre has chosen to explore the play "Too Much Punch For Judy" by Mark Wheeller. The ROW is in a continuous prose format, one page per session and requirements – strategies, mediums, elements - have been highlighted in bold for the moderator. There are general timings (per session) included on the ROW. Detailed timings and annotation of the activities which actually took place (ticks, notes) would have helped to confirm to the moderator which tasks/activities had been completed and that the students had accessed 6 hours of exploration, as per unit requirements.

ROW does not fully meet requirements for the unit:

- *Evidence of the use of two specific strategies – still images, sound-scape. Free choice of other strategies/mediums in Session 2 but would have been helpful if those chosen had been specified – a record of work not a scheme of possible planned lessons.*
- *A range of Drama mediums used including movement and voice. Use of some mediums such as lights/sound gives a performance focus.*
- *Monologue task (session 3) also has a performance focus.*
- *Key elements: characterisation, contrast and rhythm/pace/tempo.*
- *Focus of the work is narrow with some off-text tasks such as response to drink-driving adverts.*
- *Discrepancies between the ROW and the D2b have been noted.*

Paper 01 Sample Session

Moderation of the 6 hour exploration is based on a sample session, submitted on DVD. There is detailed guidance on the Sample Session and the DVD in the ASG document. Good practice seen in the 2014 series as regards student identification and filming can be found in the Principal Moderator's Report for the unit.

DVD Overview

A clear introductory line-up has been produced by the centre although muted to meet the requirements of data protection.

There is some helpful practice in terms of identification here:

- *Students each wear different coloured t-shirts/uniform top.*
- *Clear camera quality.*
- *Use of zoom and pan allows most groups a slot in front of the camera while exploring.*
- *Exploration work of all students is shared allowing moderators to both see and hear the work of individual students.*
- *The size of the group also makes identification easier.*

The Sample Session corresponds to activities from Sessions 1 and 2 from the ROW although the standardisation recording begins from mid-way through the first activity. Students work in small groups on a series of still images re-creating the crash and developing their understanding of this moment from the play, combining these images with a teacher-selected music track. They then share their work with the class. This is followed by group exploration using the medium of sound-scape and ultimately combining ideas from earlier still images with their sound-scape.

Throughout the session, exploration is well-paced, with students sharing their outcomes as 'work in progress' at each stage; each task makes use of a specific drama strategy. Work is shared with music and lights which does add a performance focus to the exploration. The use of music and the consideration of the reason for selecting this track does move the work away from the text to some degree.

Evaluation which takes place as part of the sharing process also does seem to have a performance focus in terms of the vocabulary used by the teacher. However, it is worth remembering that **all marks for this part of the unit are awarded for practical drama exploration**. Students' verbal responses therefore carry no marks within the session and centres might wish to consider therefore, how much time to allot to discussion within the recorded session. Clearly the work is explorative here although students' perception of exploration vs performance may be affected by the teacher's choice of vocabulary and this could have an impact on their Documentary Responses for Paper 02.

Candidate A

**Short-sleeved grey t-shirt with orange and blue trim.
Dark curly hair. 8th in line-up. Works with candidate B in both tasks.**

Centre Mark	27
Moderated Mark	23

A confident and enthusiastic candidate with a strong sense of leadership in both groups. He is responsive to the teacher's questioning, supporting the perception of him as an able student with an excellent level of understanding.

Still Image task – In his group of three it is clear that he shapes much of the work resulting in effective but fairly simple images. He leads a discussion in his group about the possible reactions to the crash and demonstrates a collaborative, sustained involvement throughout the session.

His use of strategies, elements and the medium of drama lack real creativity when the work is shared although there is control and fluency in evidence.

Soundscape task - In Task 2, Candidate A's group spend a lot of time discussing rather than exploring the use of soundscape. The teacher encourages them to explore the soundscape rather than discussing their ideas. Candidate A does take the lead here 'Let's try it!' However exploration seems to be largely theoretical within the group. When sharing their soundscape work there is the beginning of some imaginative exploration. Candidate A can be seen using voice and mediums with real assurance when the work is shared however the teachers comment, 'you didn't take it to a climax ... but you have a good base' sums up the lack of development and imagination demonstrated in this candidate's work, in this session.

The evidence on the DVD confirms that in this session, his work merits a mark of 23 towards the top of Level 2 "Excellent" rather than a mark in Level 1 "Outstanding":

- *Evidence of excellent knowledge of the text in place.*
- *Use of strategies shows understanding.*
- *Committed collaborator.*
- *Meets criteria for Level 2 securely indicating top of the level.*
- *Edging towards the next level but lack of imagination/development required for a mark in Level 1 Outstanding.*

Candidate B

**1st in identification line up. Works with Candidate A in both tasks.
Brown/ginger hair with swept across fringe.
Short-sleeved grey t-shirt with FITCH written in blue on the front.**

Centre Mark	26
Moderated Mark	22

A very supportive and committed student throughout the session; he appears responsive to the ideas of others in his group and makes a number of suggestions. He offers comments on others' work and throughout the session can be seen engaging fully.

Still Image task – In his group of three, he collaborates well, listening and offering ideas to support the sequencing and development of the still images. Some moments where he can be seen leading, however, generally he allows candidate A to take the lead and builds on these ideas.

Demonstrates practical ideas for images, considers their use of space and positioning and tries out ideas. In discussion he can be seen contributing – he makes a comment about the relationship between the sisters which supports practical understanding. He is part of the first group to share and shows effective use of still image and of the drama medium - facial expression in particular.

Soundscape task - In the soundscape task he continues to collaborate with focus and is supportive of others' ideas, although his group do spend a lot of time discussing rather than exploring the use of soundscape. When sharing, he demonstrates an interesting use of strategies/medium, for example his choice of positioning in the crash image and his use of voice to create atmosphere. However there is a lack of development and imagination evident.

The evidence on the DVD confirms that in this session, his work merits a mark of 22 - a secure Level 2 "Excellent" - rather than a mark in Level 1 "Outstanding":

- *Evidence of excellent knowledge of the text in place.*
- *Use of strategies shows understanding.*
- *Committed collaborator.*
- *Meets criteria for Level 2 securely.*
- *Lack of imagination/development required for a mark higher in Level 2/in Level 1.*

Candidate C

**9th in line-up. Small boy, ginger/brown hair swept to the side.
Only student wearing school uniform.
Works with Candidates D and E in task 2.**

Centre Mark	25
Moderated Mark	20

Still Image task - Initial response to music. He does put his hand up to answer a question. After a number of students have responded, his hand goes down. As soon as they go back to exploring the still images, he is seen immediately suggesting ideas to partner; in discussion makes informed comments about the 1st pair's work, supporting the judgement that he is a student of excellent ability.

When sharing work there is a confident use of strategy and medium, particularly facial expression and he shows some fluency in his use of the different still images. However these images do lack real creativity.

Soundscape task – His group is still seen working on the left hand side. Of the screen. Candidate C often holds the text and refers to it. Quiet but clearly engaged, he offers suggestions and points to areas in text to show others areas of dialogue that could be used. He shows engagement and understanding in his selection of dialogue.

His contribution when the work is shared is sustained with a confident use of voice within the soundscape. This is an example of a candidate who improves in achievement throughout the session although the work does lack development.

The evidence on the DVD confirms that in this session, his work merits a mark of 20 - a low Level 2 "Excellent" - rather than a mark in Level 1 "Outstanding":

- *Some evidence of excellent knowledge of the text in place.*
- *Use of strategies shows understanding.*
- *Committed collaborator with occasional inconsistencies.*
- *Meets criteria for Level 2.*
- *Lack of imagination/development required for a mark higher in Level 2/in Level 1.*

Candidate D

**Blue McKenzie T-shirt. 4th Student in line up. Small boy.
Works with Candidates C and E in task 2.**

Centre Mark	24
Moderated Mark	19

Often seen supporting and working with secure focus within the session. His comments made during discussion do support a secure understanding as well as link directly to text.

Still Image task - There is clear exploration within the creation of still image but the depth of work is restricting. Practical pair work enables “D” to show some leadership, but he is more supportive rather than leading to his partner. During sharing work, makes comments “situation going from bad to worse” which again illustrates understanding. However, later comments relating to how the music was used are more focused on the outcome in performance terms, rather than the personal experience he felt during the exploration.

Soundscape task – He becomes a little less involved in the second half of the soundscape work; the ideas he develops from this point on, such as the “ambulance work”, become slightly superficial; he does not contribute to the final feedback session and is the only one not to raise his hand which, while not a contributory factor to his mark, is perhaps evidence that he is becoming more passive. Further his group took a little time to discuss their ideas, rather than getting straight in with practically exploring them.

This student gains most of his marks at the beginning of the workshop in pair work and tends to get a little lost in the larger group work.

The evidence on the DVD confirms that in this session, his work merits a mark of 19 just into Level 2 “Excellent” rather than at the top of the level:

- *Excellent knowledge of the text in place – just.*
- *Committed collaborator at times, though lacking consistency.*
- *Use of strategies shows understanding.*
- *Meets criteria for Level 2 but lack of imagination/development required for a mark higher in Level 2.*

Candidate E

**Fair haired boy. Black polo-shirt. 6th in line-up.
Works with Candidates C and D in task 2.**

Centre Mark	18
Moderated Mark	17

A solid and committed student throughout. He is fully supportive of others' ideas and shows a secure use of the medium.

Still Image task - Initially he works at the back with the boy in the light blue top. Both are engaged quickly in the task and "E" can be seen looking for examples in the text early on before it books down; E becomes quite animated in his exploration and appears to be taking the lead in his pair.

Sharing the work he shows confidence with the drama medium, particularly in terms of facial expression. He is able to justify his choices with the freeze frame and how Judy would have 'felt guilty afterwards" and how they wanted to emphasise Judy's mind at this point. While marks are only awarded for practical exploration, his comments did support a solid understanding of the text.

Sound-scape task - In the soundscape task he is quick to suggest ideas and can be seen working well within the group but he is largely lead in this exercise by the others. That said he is very focused and contributed well to the piece that is shared. His focus and use of stillness in particular shows a grasp of their intentions. His comment about the other group and the "cannon ball effect" of sound shows his understanding of how the drama medium and strategies work in exploring the text.

The evidence on the DVD confirms that in this session, his work merits a mark of 19 - just into Level 2 "Excellent" rather at the top of the level:

- *Good knowledge of the text in place.*
- *Engaged and focussed.*
- *Use of strategies shows understanding.*
- *Meets all the criteria for Level 3 but lack of imagination for the next level.*

Paper 02 Documentary Response

Moderation of the documentary response is based on a sample from the work of the whole cohort at the centre, with each selected student's response submitted on paper. There is detailed guidance on the sampling process and on the submission of the documentary response in the **ASG** document. Good practice seen in the 2014 series can be found in the Principal Moderator's Report for the unit and there is helpful information as regards the administration and delivery of the Controlled Assessment aspect of the unit in the **GCSE Drama TSB**.

Key aspects of assessment for this paper:

Documentary Response (DR)

The criteria for this task asks for an evaluation of the student's understanding of the text but this understanding must be connected to the drama exploration. Factual content related to the text but unconnected to the drama exploration carries no marks.

Evaluation must focus on the student's own use of the drama mediums and elements of drama and on the work of others. Speculative evaluation, focussing on work not actually completed in the 6 hour exploration, carries no marks. General evaluation is less supportive than very specific examples. Responses marked in Level 1 and at the top of Level 2 will typically demonstrate a balance between examples of their own work and the work of others.

There is no requirement in this task for students to evaluate their use of drama strategies. While these do form a key part of the unit, and students may write about strategies, they may not be penalised if they do not include specific evaluation of the use of the strategies.

There is no requirement for students to write about all the sessions/activities completed in their response. Where students focus in too much depth on one or two sessions, their response is likely to lack depth. Equally where all sessions/activities are covered, evaluation will probably lack depth. Responses marked in Level 1 and at the top of Level 2 will typically demonstrate both depth and breadth of understanding.

The Response to Live Performance (RLP)

The criteria for this task requires students to apply skills of Written Communication to their Response in terms of both form and style, and spelling, punctuation and grammar in addition to their evaluation of a performance as a member of the audience.

Candidate F

	DR	RLP	Total
Centre Mark	8	14	22
Moderated Mark	5	12	17

DR: This is a well-written response although there are no marks for QWC in this task. In terms of content, this is an uneven response that tends to be rather narrative in nature. Much of the writing describes what the candidate did, with moments of detail and exploration for example the “sense of dramatic irony” on p. 26; and the “closed eyes and gritted teeth” towards the bottom of that page. The evaluation however has not been developed beyond a “Good” level. Although there are references to practitioners, Artaud and Stanislavski, there is little sense of how the work with the practitioners added to this candidate’s understanding of the text. The final paragraph, “After completing this script and write up, I would not drink drive”, focuses on generalised reaction to drink-driving rather than an understanding of the play.

RLP: Another piece of effective writing with some effective and accurate use of QWC, but overall, the candidate tends to focus on plot and character and play/writer rather than the production/performance and directorial intention. There is more evidence than with the other responses that the candidate is writing about the parts rather than the actors. At time there is a lack of identification of theatrical elements, for example on p.28 paragraph 4, “In the soundscapes they used explosions these were used when there was either a change of scenery or they had all left the trench like when the Germans attacked the English trench”. There are, however, some examples of clear personal response and evaluation such as the reference on p.29 to the outside world and the consistent stage doorway which “helped us to imagine what lay beyond the doorway”.

The response demonstrates an overall mark of 17 - a secure “Good” rather than a high Level 2 “Excellent”:

- *Understanding of text and of use of drama strategies/medium.*
- *Evaluation supported by brief, undeveloped examples of own work/work of others.*
- *Understanding of play rather than performance at moments in RLP.*
- *Some factual content unconnected to performance.*
- *Practitioner references in both tasks did not fully support understanding.*

Candidate G

	DR	RLP	Total
Centre Mark	8	16	24
Moderated Mark	6	14	20

DR: Top of good level – gives clear justification for comments revealing understanding, but they are not sufficiently rooted in the text for the excellent band. There is analysis and some effective evaluation of the work of others for example, comments about Duncan towards the end of the response: “Two contrasting emotions were anger and fear, these emotions helped us symbolise two crucial emotions Duncan experience.” The focus is often on the effectiveness for an audience rather than on how the drama helped exploration of the ideas in the play – in note the phrases ‘to show’ and ‘to demonstrate’ which are used repeatedly. There is insufficient reflection on own learning about the text for higher marks, despite the level of understanding of place at times.

RLP: The response is too inconsistent to merit a mark at the top of excellent as there is much focus on description as opposed to detailed evaluation, for example, page 35 on the set. Evaluation of intentions seem to relate more to the author's than the director's e.g. the comments on Mason and Trotter on p. 34 and some of the comments as regards understanding link to the issues without clear connection to the production for example, on p.34, “There’s obviously the on-going fight against terrorism in the Middle East”. References to strategies and theatre styles are not particularly helpful in this task. However, there is evidence of detailed understanding of how a performance is created and of engaged reflection on the ideas and feelings conveyed in the performance for example when evaluating the ending on p.34, “The Last Post at the end with the soldiers in a freeze frame with the names of dead soldiers behind them gave me time to reflect on the performance but also reflect on war in general”.

The response demonstrates an overall mark of 20 - a low “Excellent” rather than being placed higher in Level 2:

- *Understanding of text and of use of drama strategies/medium in DE.*
- *Evaluation supported by clear examples of own work/work of others.*
- *Understanding of play rather than performance at moments in RLP.*
- *Secure, well-explained grasp of moments in performance.*
- *Some factual content unconnected to performance in RLP.*
- *Practitioner references in both tasks did not fully support understanding; ditto discussion of strategies in RLP.*

Candidate H

	DR	RLP	Total
Centre Mark	10	20	30
Moderated Mark	6	19	25

DR: There are several moments of personal response to the exploration of the text within this piece of work, but these tend to be under-developed. It is important not to be seduced by the very good writing style here as there are no marks for QWC in this task. For example in paragraph 5, 'the other group used counting...' they mention how this was used to create suspense but do not follow the argument through. Theorists are mentioned as if completely understood – 'doing soundscape has developed my understanding of Artaud's theories' – but merely highlight a gap in their knowledge and understanding of the play. Despite these points there are some strong "Good" evaluation statements throughout, for example, on p.38 "We placed one actor behind the audience to make engine noises, which ... slowly faded out as the other actors in front faded in up to an almost unbearable volume to create a horrific atmosphere to frighten the audience."

RLP: A very strong and detailed evaluation of 'Journey's End' is evident. Excellent understanding of the importance of effect of the drama as per 'the plot line of Journey's End was easy to follow which helped us focus not on the events, but the points and changes made by the events' – evidence of a high level of information synthesis. This student does discuss characters rather than actors but with an excellent level of deconstruction and detail. There are genuine reactions to the performance throughout this piece of work. Evidence of an outstanding understanding of the dramatic elements, for example, towards the top of page 42: 'I felt that a little pool of water...' QWC is of a high level of achievement. This is an outstanding student's response to a live performance, ambitious, detailed, and making use of excellent vocabulary but not quite full marks.

The response demonstrates an overall mark of 25 - a low "Outstanding" rather than being placed higher in Level 1:

- *Understanding of text and of use of drama strategies/medium in DE.*
- *Evaluation supported by clear examples of own work/work of others.*
- *Very secure and well-supported understanding of performance in RLP.*
- *Supporting examples in RLP show strong grasp of theatrical elements.*
- *High level use of QWC throughout RLP.*