



General Certificate of Education

**English Language and Literature
2726**

Specification B

ELLB4 Text Transformation

Report on the Examination

2010 examination - January series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX
Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

This was the first submission of candidates' work for the Text Transformation unit in the new English Language and Literature B specification. As it has been developed from the legacy Text Transformation unit (NTB4), there are no essential philosophical differences in what constitutes an acceptable transformation: a literary source text is chosen and forms the basis of a new piece of writing that must be of a significantly different genre (not necessarily literary) from the original, but which must still have identifiable links with it and should provide a new slant upon, insight into or interplay with the original. These close links between the legacy unit and the new means that centres seemed to have little difficulty in ensuring that their candidates produced work that fulfilled the criteria for ELLB4. This report, therefore, will concentrate on the way that centres coped with the new requirements for the unit.

Set authors

The introduction of a list of set authors worked very well. No longer were moderators faced with having to tell centres that students had made unsuitable and unhelpful choices of source texts that led to unsuccessful transformations, as was occasionally the case in the past. More importantly, this change to a set author list seemed to result in some good transformations (and associated commentaries) being submitted. Even with a relatively small entry (as was expected for the first January submission) there was a welcome range of authors chosen by candidates and centres. From the prose list only William Trevor seemed not to feature in choices; Grace Nicholls from the poetry list suffered a similar fate together with Ben Jonson and Aphra Behn of the dramatists. It is to be hoped that with the expected much larger summer entry all writers will be represented in candidate and centre choices. It may have been a consequence of the January entry that obviously truncated the amount of teaching time available for the unit, but it was noticeable that a larger number of centres than for NTB4 chose to submit transformations based on the same texts for all of their candidates, which is a perfectly acceptable practice.

Joint transformations

The second major change from the legacy unit is that candidates have to submit work based on two texts (chosen from two different lists of writers). They can choose whether to submit two separate transformations and commentaries or to produce a single transformation and commentary based on two texts. There is no advantage to candidates in following one route or the other in terms of marks achieved. Most candidates chose the former route and produced two transformations, but there was a significant number of submissions (often from within the same centre) of candidates who produced a joint transformation. These tended to be from the more able candidates, though this was not always the case. It is worth reminding centres that it is not a joint transformation if a candidate transforms one text by an author on the list in the style of another author from a different list. This results in only one transformation and therefore a second must be submitted. However, if a candidate chooses to transform the works of two authors from separate lists in the style of a third author (whether or not this third author is a prescribed one) this is acceptable as a joint transformation. Nor is there any need for centres to ensure that a two-transformation submission is equally balanced in terms of word count. If the two transformations fall within the prescribed word limits, then the division between the two is a matter of judgement for the candidate and centre.

Annotation of folders

The new regulations mean that candidates need only submit the final version of the transformation(s) and commentary(ies). The days of submitting all drafts to the moderator are gone. This did not, however, prevent some centres from posting these bulky offerings to the moderator. The only additional material that need be included by a candidate (if necessary) is a style model of the genre for the transformation or an extract from the source text if the centre considers that it will be unfamiliar to the moderator. In addition, the new regulations stipulate

that the transformation and associated commentary must be annotated by the centre. The great majority of centres complied with this requirement and included helpful formative and summative comments on the candidates' work and these greatly facilitated the work of the moderators. In addition, many centres included a well-designed and detailed sheet for each candidate that indicated the rigorous and professional process of internal standardisation that had taken place. Whilst this is not an AQA requirement (the Candidate Record Form (CRF) is), it was always reassuring and helpful to moderators to see such attention to detail in the assessment of candidates.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.