Qualification Accredited

OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

A LEVEL

Moderators' report

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

H470

For first teaching in 2015

H470/03 Summer 2022 series

Version 1

ocr.org.uk/english

Contents

Introduction

Our moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Advance Information for Summer 2022 assessments

To support student revision, advance information was published about the focus of exams for Summer 2022 assessments. Advance information was available for most GCSE, AS and A Level subjects, Core Maths, FSMQ, and Cambridge Nationals Information Technologies. You can find more information on our website.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

General overview

The non-exam assessment (NEA) is a compulsory component of the A Level English Language qualification. It is worth 40 marks and counts as 20% of the total A Level. The non-examined component comprises two pieces of work: an independent language investigation and an academic poster.

For the language investigation, candidates should conduct independent research into an area of language study of their choice and produce an investigation report. The recommended word count for this investigation is 2000-2500 words, excluding raw data and appendices. For the academic poster, candidates should produce an overview of their investigation, repurposing the content of their investigation to meet the poster form and their chosen audience. The recommended word count for the academic poster is 750-1000 words.

Guidance on preparation and marking of the NEA is included in the specification, including the marking criteria. Marking should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising failure or omissions. The awarding of marks must be directly related to the marking criteria. Teachers should use their professional judgement to select the best-fit level descriptor that describes the candidate's work. Teachers should use the full range of marks available to them and award all the marks in any level for which work fully meets that level descriptor. Teachers should bear in mind the weighting of the assessment objectives, place the response within a level and award the appropriate mark. If a candidate does not address one of the assessment objectives targeted in the assessment, they cannot achieve all marks in the given level.

Centres are responsible for internal standardisation of assessments.

The NEA assessment is designed to enable candidates to draw together all of the knowledge and skills that they have gained during the course, and to select an aspect of their English Language studies which they are most interested in pursuing. The investigation and poster provide opportunities for the candidates to exercise autonomy in steering the focus, construction and implementation of the project, utilising methods that they judge to be most appropriate (with the support of their teaching team). Often candidates have explored topical areas, data sources and concepts beyond the scope of their classroom studies, enabling them to explore unique instances of language use (though this is certainly not a prerequisite for a successful outcome). We have seen a range of projects this year moving into less familiar territories, and very many that also successfully worked with more familiar topical areas, but what has been very clear is that the overwhelming majority of learners have risen to the challenges of this assessment, having produced engaged, interesting and often ambitious responses. The whole moderating team have commented again on the rich and committed work, and this year, more than any other, the whole team have been impressed with how fully the cohort have embraced the opportunities of the assessment. We have seen work across a range of abilities, and it is clear that whatever mark point the candidates have been working at, candidates have engaged authentically and thoughtfully with their chosen area of study.

Task One: The Independent Language Investigation

Candidates have produced work on a range of topical areas, and it seems that many have produced projects in response to complex societal issues and their lived or observed experiences during the last couple of years. We have seen a considerable number of projects exploring linguistic representations of mental health, climate change, the pandemic, war and conflicts, issues around female disempowerment, male health and identity-shaping, adoption of gender inclusive language, and around second language users in an increasingly multi-lingual context. The moderation team have all been impressed by the range of topical focuses and depth of ingenuity demonstrated in refining the investigations and the often extensive research that has been undertaken to offer revealing, convincing and thought-provoking outcomes. Many candidates demonstrated great care and selectivity in identifying appropriate conceptual and theoretical frameworks to help them interpret their data sources and the representations of the societal issue that they had identified, often looking beyond those they had covered on the specification, and this commitment is commended.

Perhaps one of the largest shifts in approaches seen in this last series is that the contexts of language use/ language users is tending to lead projects more than ever before. Clearly this cohort has a strong engagement with the world around them, including the social, cultural and political factors that have an impact on their lives, and this has served as the basis for authentic and invested explorations as to how these phenomena are presented to a receiving public via various media sources. In many ways this has necessitated a discourse level focus within investigations, though many candidates have been able to explore more nuanced examples of language use via a range of frameworks to explore the various ways language shapes our experiences and perceptions of significant events, movements and unique historical moments. Considerations around agenda setting, representations, convergences and audience-positioning have been central to these discussions, and for the most part candidates have handled the complexities of the topics and their data sets with high levels of consideration and resourcefulness.

There have been a number of projects on Louis Theroux's work with convicted criminals who have psychotic or sociopathic disorders, utilising interview segments to explore the interviewees' linguistic manipulations when discussing their crimes, in the hope of positioning audiences to feel sympathetic towards them. These projects have tended to be supported by extensive engagement with academic research on such disorders, and for this reason are able to offer incisive and nuanced interpretations of the data. Other candidates have explored the ways in which newspapers represent crimes committed by such criminals, and the ways in which audiences are positioned to fear people with these disorders. Projects on mental health representations within male and female publications have also arisen, exploring the damaging taboos around male mental health vulnerabilities and the differing messages given to women and men in response to mental health challenges (men are encouraged to endure through mental strength, while women are encouraged to share, discuss and have licence to be vulnerable). There have been projects on representations of pandemics – including comparisons to how the 1665-1666 Great Plague was recorded and how the modern day COVID pandemic has been addressed in the media. Boris Johnson and leading health experts have often been the key focus and data sources of a number of projects – with some considering the mismatch between scientific, health-focused discourse and messaging, and the political rhetoric used to achieve other agendas. The overwhelming number of projects that have explored current events are as successful as they are lively, but it should be noted that there are instances where candidates have been drawn into lengthy personalised contexts, offered personal opinions on the topical focus rather than offering a language-focused analysis, and/or have been distracted by moralising on topics which have powerful emotive resonances. Of course, these less successful approaches are not unique to these types of projects but are perhaps more likely given how strongly issues around these topics can impact individuals on a personal level. However, with careful discussion with teaching teams and time taken to refine these projects, such unhelpful insertions can be resolved during the editing process.

This series more instances of candidates generating their own transcripts have been noted, where candidates have used their own real-life experiences to generate data and to shape their investigations. There were examples from classroom settings where candidates explored power dynamics during interactions between male and female learners in mixed and single gender groups. There were several excellent examples on code-switching of bilingual language users, exploring ideas around prestige language and the relationship between cultural and linguistic appropriations. Candidates also enlisted younger siblings and parents to produce transcripts to support language acquisition projects (and most were able to avoid the trap of failing to use appropriate academic distance in their writing). These types of projects have often been among the most successful in previous series, and this year is no different. Indeed, the moderation team have commented that a candidate who is able to conceptualise the complexities of generating appropriate, legitimate and useful data, and then to craft a meaningful investigation, is one who is likely operating at a high level.

As has been the case in other series, projects on power and gender (singularly or combined) have tended to pre-dominate, and though these areas have been enlivened by some new topical focuses (as outlined above), we have also seen very many more traditional approaches. Typical projects have tended to explore the rhetoric, power interplays and gender dynamics or representations of politicians at key historical moments (Trump, Theresa May, Thatcher, Hitler, Chamberlain, Obama, Corbyn still turning up regularly) and TV personalities interacting with guests or during panel discussions (examples include James Corden, Graham Norton and a range of male and female sports pundits/personalities). Media focuses on leading topics/stories have also been widely explored (sources including newspapers, news programmes, magazines, talk shows, social media), including projects on relationships, mental and physical health, beauty and fashion, and more focused topics on the ways in which certain celebrities are presented (including Meghan Markle and female celebrities over and under 50). No series would be complete without projects on 'Love Island' and other similar programmes, and as always, we have found projects across the range of levels on these topics – with AO2 engagement and competency of AO1 generally determining how successful the responses are. Centres and candidates are familiar with how to work with such topics and data sources, and such approaches continue to be an excellent access point for lower-level candidates who are more comfortable working in tried and tested areas. Of course, we do see excellent work on such projects too.

This series has also seen an increase in candidates utilising fiction-based texts (such as mainstream cinema and television), and we have found that some of these types of projects can be deeply problematic for a number of reasons. One of the key issues with using fiction sources is that candidates often do lose sight of the fact that the characters are not real-life language users and that they are constructed by writers/producers to achieve a range of agendas (often external to whatever experiences and scenarios the characters are depicted in). Where this key point is missed, or not sufficiently engaged with, candidates' treatment of the characters as real-life language users ultimately means any sort of language analysis or AO2 discussion is flawed and unconvincing. Similarly, context around plot-points and backstories is not likely to yield useful interpretations. The secondary issue with such projects is that there have been a number of occasions where the flaws in the candidates' approach to the fictional source, have not been addressed in the mark that the work has been given.

However, it should be noted that fiction texts can act as revealing and interesting sources through which an appreciation of how language is used to construct meaning can be explored. What fiction texts can help us to understand is how, and possibly why, authors and producers reflect the world around them within their fictionalised world in the ways that they do – why are male and female characters described in the ways that they are; why are characters of colour shown to interact with other characters in the way that they do; why are any characters described to have certain hang-ups, inadequacies, strengths, aberrant behaviours, internal conflicts and preoccupations etc, etc? Grappling with these ideas can help us to understand how the language used to construct characters in fictional texts mirrors, reflects and sometimes shapes societal ideas and preoccupations around gender, race, morality, power structures,

mental health, physical ability/disability, etc. As long as a candidate is able to frame the focus of their investigation around the constructed language use, there is every reason that the investigation can be successful.

The moderation team have commented also on the increase of projects which explore song lyrics, as being representative of fixed moments that reflect societal attitudes on certain issues. While theoretically such projects can reveal cultural shifts in the language used to describe different groups in society or attitudinal shifts, to be able to do this successfully one or two songs are unlikely to be a sufficient source of data to draw convincing conclusions. It has been observed by the moderation team, that while these topics could be viable, most often they appear to be driven by the candidates' personal interests, and are typified by a lack of clarity around the aims and approach, and an inability to offer convincing interpretations of the (often too limited) data sets. For this reason, many of these projects are unable to offer a coherent language investigation. A successful project needs to examine an appropriate range of data and consider contexts thoughtfully. For example, if exploring the representation of homosexuality in rap music between 2000 and 2022, a dataset could comprise a catalogue of top ten hits in the year 2000 in comparison to a similar sample from 2022. A range of artists ought to be included so that the songs selected could be seen as representative of attitudes among those who dominate the rap industry in each focus period. Contexts could include exploring what societal attitudinal shifts have or have not taken place, law changes, the increase in LGBTQ+ awareness, the number of artists who openly do not identify as being straight, where artists come from, what audiences are being served etc. to explore what changes might have occurred and why.

Applying the Assessment Objectives

AO1 assesses against the level of discernment in the methods and approaches that have been adopted to design the study and the depth/breadth and sophistication of the language analysis. However, it is the quality of the language analysis and the skills and methods utilised to interpret the data that ought to be prioritised in determining a level and mark. Candidates who attract marks in the highest levels demonstrate judicious selectivity in what aspects of language they chose to focus on and demonstrate an incisive interpretation of the data (often by integrating excellent AO2/AO3 insights). Generally, candidates working at the highest level will demonstrate a sophisticated command of terminology, though a marker should be less concerned with evidence of correctly identified linguistic features, than a commitment to applying terminology that enables a secure depth of interpretation.

Historically, one of the key markers to differentiate between responses within the higher two levels has been the quality of the written expression and the consistent security of the academic register, and certainly there are many candidates who have demonstrated these skills. However, it has been noted this series, that a number of candidates have been placed in the higher levels despite a fairly large range of typos, formatting issues, lapses in expression and the adoption of a generally unacademic register. This has resulted in some disparity in the marks given by centres and the moderation team. Though generally it is recognised that editing opportunities might have been more restricted because of the constraints of the pandemic, and candidates may also have missed opportunities to refine their academic writing due to the amount of missed learning, this is an aspect that seems to require greater focus in a large number of centres. Refining this aspect is especially key when there is a gap between the often-significant depth of knowledge and skills shown and the less secure quality of the writing, as this can result in some difficulties in determining a fair mark for such candidates.

A great strength of many of the investigations, across nearly all levels, is the logical approach to organising the various sections. Centres have clearly been giving excellent advice as to how to structure the investigation, and candidates have demonstrated skill in utilising report conventions. Most candidates are producing reports that use headings and sub-headings effectively, and we are now observing less examples of very dense, unstructured analysis sections. Sub-headings in the analysis section certainly seems to be supportive to less successful work where candidates might otherwise to organise their ideas. Tables, charts and graphs still seem to offer excellent opportunities for learners to visually represent key data trends, helping them avoid the need for lengthy (and unfruitful) descriptions of the data, so that they can focus on analysing why these trends might be present. Of course, sometimes candidates do still do both, making for fairly convoluted analysis sections, but on the whole, there is a sense that candidates are being more purposeful in their use of visual data tools.

Candidates at the higher levels tend to use each of the headings well and are prioritising focusing on the analysis section. However, there is still a tendency to over-commit to the introductions and methodologies with some lasting for several pages and causing a distinct lack of breadth and depth in the analysis section. Or, as seems to be most often the case, a complete disregard for the word count. Centres should be reminded that candidates should aim to work within the advised word counts as far as possible not least because it is very hard to make a case for judicious selection of material if the candidate has been unable to meet word count brief for the task. However, there are more wide-reaching consequences of over-long responses and the key one to consider is that within centres, where some candidates are producing over-long responses (albeit detailed and wide-ranging), it can distort perceptions on the achievement of other candidates in the cohort who have produced work within the word count and who therefore cannot cover as much material. We have seen instances (for several years now) of candidates producing work thousands of words over the word limit, and it is important that centres do all in their control to stall this upward trend. Careful selectivity and refinement of the scope of the project is required early on to ensure only the most revealing material is used. Then candidates should be asked to edit their work until the word count is more reasonable. Finally, if work is submitted

considerably over the word count, it is the recommendation that an AO1 mark reduction is implemented on the basis that the candidate has not been selective in their material. This is typically an issue at the higher end of achievement, and at this level it is expected that candidates can recognise the most illuminating material to include.

AO2 assesses against the candidate's ability to engage with conceptual and theoretical factors that could act as a point of interpretation of the data. The most successful responses will engage with the AO2 frameworks from the point of conceptualising the investigation, to aid in understanding what data sets are likely to offer illumination on the topics or issues that the candidate is interested in exploring. Where candidates engage with specific theories early in their introductions, they generally are able to make a strong case as to why the focus of the analysis should be on certain language frameworks and this promotes a purposeful approach to the data analysis from an AO2 perspective. Due to gender and power being the areas where most candidates choose to focus, the usual theories on accommodations and gendered differences, tend to be used by the majority of candidates, but we have found an increasing trend towards using theorists beyond the scope of the specification. However, even where the more traditional theorists (Tannen, Lakoff, Cameron Zimmerman and West, and Grice, Goffman and Fairclough) are drawn on, candidates at the higher levels seem to be better prepared to explore the limits of these theories, or are able to balance established and emerging theories in a more subtle and thoughtful way. Increasingly, the moderation team have noted that where concepts/theories prove inadequate to interpreting the data, a range of contexts are drawn on to offer insights. The rigour of the critical engagement with theories is certainly a marker of success, and it has been pleasing to see that strong candidates continue to be fully engaged with conceptual frameworks and are willing to undertake often extensive wider reading to identify those most beneficial to their projects. At the lower levels, there is still a tendency to draw broad and generalised conclusions from theories, and though usually these are accurately applied, they do tend to offer rather limited insights. We have found some examples of candidates working with single theories/theorists, and while some candidates have achieved in the top levels by offering a nuanced and fully critical interpretations of the data in relation to the selected theory, this is more frequently a self-limiting approach that can lead to less successful responses. As a rule, working with a couple of theorists/theories is the advised approach, whether they be part of a continuum of theoretical understanding, or those that offer differing insights, or those that focus on a range of specific elements of the task and topic.

AO3 assesses against the candidate's ability to explore contexts that might have influenced the production of the data sources, and the extent to which they might support an interpretation of the data. Contexts of production can focus on an individual language user's personal agenda, background, position in society, ideology/attitudes, etc., but there should also be consideration of wider societal contexts. Localised and universal events, dominant cultures and ideologies, attitudinal shifts, generational or sector-related norms, etc. can all offer scope for interpretations of data. Candidates should seek to investigate and integrate contexts that are likely to offer the most revealing interpretations of the data, in addition to helping to establish the ways in which they could have shaped meaning. Successful candidates will introduce relevant contexts early in the investigation, they will inform the topic selection, help to identify appropriate data sources, will be used to support the focus of the analysis and will offer a framework around which to interpret the data sources and offer conclusions. Candidates working at a high level will offer a critical assessment as to the extent contexts might influence language use and be prepared to explore hitherto unconsidered interpretations if the data leads them in another direction from the one they expected. Less successful candidates tend to treat their personal interest in the topic as context, or will lean towards generalised, assertive and uncritical engagement with accepted/expected views, perspectives or behaviours. It should be noted that one of the easiest ways to amend imbalances in the focus of the investigation, is to use a rigorous editing process that removes

superfluous personal contexts, in favour of refining contexts that support interpretation and greater focus on the analysis of the data.

As mentioned previously the tendency for projects to lead with contexts in the selection and crafting of the investigation, has resulted in greater competence and nuance in projects. This is certainly an approach that the moderation team supports. However, it has also been noted that sometimes where context leads, AO2 can be rather under-developed, and it is key that AO2 similarly gets an early insertion as it is mostly via AO2 discussion that the appropriate language frameworks are identified. It has been noted that fairly often in projects leading with context, the specific language frameworks emerge as a bit of a surprise within the analysis section, having not been identified or built into the hypothesis before this point.

Task Two: The Academic Poster

The academic poster is assessed against AO5 and provides opportunity to draw out the key content of the investigation, to provide a detailed overview of the purpose, methods and key findings of the project. The specification recommends a generally academic audience, but the continued advice to centres is that candidates are welcome to identify their own target audience and to craft their response in anticipation of meeting their specific needs. New audiences have tended to include lower sixth form learners, parents and peers at open days, and more niche audiences linked to the type of topic the candidate has worked with (though fewer of these have been seen this year). With the increase of topics on current and relevant social issues, successful audiences might include a climate change conference, political rally participants, or an influencer's social page viewers. Irrespective of the audience type, the most successful posters are those that consider how to best present the information to meet the needs of the new audience. Successful posters will tend to use glossaries of key terms, will summarise complex theories, will use bullet points to condense conceptually dense ideas to be accessible for non-specialists, and will adopt an appropriate register. One of the key determiners of a successful poster is a clear understanding of who the target audience is.

Perhaps the most important determiner of success is understanding what the poster is for. It is not designed to be a replication of the investigation, but instead should serve as a point of reflection on the investigation, highlighting and centring the key findings and outcomes. The poster should concern itself with why, how and what – why the investigation was undertaken (what the candidate wanted to find out), how it was undertaken (focus on the key elements that were addressed in the investigation) and what was learnt (the findings and outcomes – this should be prioritised). Centres are also reminded that as there are 750 -1000 words for this part of the assessment, candidates should prioritise the written content. Markers of a successful poster are those that cover the key sections of the investigation, starting with a concise contextualisation of what the investigation sought to explore and which language frameworks were identified to achieve this, and then prioritising a detailed summary of each of the key findings and outcomes. Less successful posters tend towards lengthy introductions and methodologies, with only very brief engagement with findings. In cases such as these, it seems likely that a candidate has sought to work through the various sections, over-committed to the introductory sections and then run out of words and/or space. It has often been observed that more careful editing of the posters is necessary. It is pleasing to see fewer examples of purely cut and pasted work.

On the whole, it is clear that centres are confident in preparing learners for this task, and candidates are often producing highly effective posters that are usefully focused on synthesising the key information from the investigation. However, there are still examples of posters where very little has been written and where it seems visual elements have been prioritised, or posters which have prioritised the written content but have made little effort to use visual tools or to adapt the content for the new audience. Successful posters are those that cover key material in detail, are adapted to the new audience (shift in register, glossaries, summaries, etc.) and that have aesthetic appeal (in addition to communicating ideas visually). Candidates should be encouraged to be inventive in how they visually represent data and use graphological features to provide interest and aid in the communication of key content.

Final words:

The moderation team recognises that centres and candidates have overcome a great number of challenges over the last couple of years of A Level study, and we commend the significant achievements that are represented in the body of work we have seen this year. Thank you all for producing such interesting and engaged work.

Candidates who did well generally did the following:	Candidates who did less well generally did the following:
• established a clear set of aims, hypothesis and concise methodology supported by AO2 and AO3 considerations • produced a logically structured report that had clear headings and sub-sections (and tables/graphs where appropriate) • prioritised the analysis section and offered detailed and nuanced analysis of the data sets, supported by AO2 and AO3 interpretations • offered authentic conclusions assessing the extent to which initial hypothesis had been observed in the data and considerations as to why it may not have done • offered evaluations of the investigation that recognised the success and limits of its outcomes • produced posters that prioritised providing a detailed, reflective summary of the investigation (utilising the 750-1000 words available effectively) • used visual tools to aid in communicating information and to provide aesthetic appeal • demonstrated a commitment to careful editing.	• had unclear aims and/or were too wide or too narrow in scope • had over-committed to the introduction/methodologies • had focused on personal reasons for studying the topical area, rather than on why the topic is an interesting language investigation • had not identified language frameworks to be considered in the initial sections • had not engaged with AO2 and/or AO3 in the formulation of the investigation and to determine the focus of the investigation • lacked organisation and did not prioritise the analysis section • produced posters that were too brief or contained copied content from the investigation • produced posters that did not address the purpose or audience • produced posters that did not use some form of visual tools • were presented in an un-edited condition.

Most common causes of centres not passing

There have been a number of examples this year where centres have given AO1 marks within Level 5, where candidates have produced work that contains a number of typos, lapses in expression or does not adopt a consistently academic register. The moderation team have observed that much of the work would have benefitted from more careful editing, which had this occurred, might have justified the Level 5 mark. Additionally, where candidates have over-committed to detailed and often personal contexts in the introductory sections, resulting in very brief analysis of the data, we have found instances of overmarking. Part of the requirement of AO1 is to prioritise the focus on the data analysis, and where this is not achieved it should be reflected in the mark.

Generally, the moderation team have felt centres are marking the posters accurately. However, there is still a reasonably large minority of centres where posters have been universally over or under-rewarded, or where the mark given for the posters aligns with the achievement of the investigation, and not the level of achievement for the poster itself. Centres should be reminded that it is very possible for posters to be more or less successful than the investigation. During this series, it seems to be the case that most often where centre and moderator marks do not agree, it is because of the approach to marking posters.

Common misconceptions

In general, this series has seen far greater confidence in the design and production of both tasks, demonstrating that centres and candidates are more comfortable with both formats. There are still instances of the academic posters containing cut and pasted content, which is sometimes not addressed within the internal assessment. If a candidate completely copies sections from the investigation, then they cannot achieve beyond Level 1. If they copy some sections, but re-word and refocus others, then they can achieve up to Level 3. The quality of purposeful visual tools and transformation of register will then determine whether they are at the bottom or top of the appropriate level (based on how much content has been copied). Another common misconception within the academic posters is the tendency to focus on aesthetics rather than the synthesis of content (the priority) and the use of visual tools to present information or provide contextualisation.

Avoiding potential malpractice

The independent nature of the language investigation means that there is less likelihood of plagiarism between candidates within centres. However, now that there are several series worth of OCR and centre generated exemplars available, centres should be alert to derivative topics and approaches. This is more of a consideration for written text-based sources as their content is by nature unchangeable, and candidates may be drawn to the same interpretations as work that has been produced in previous series. Centres can avoid this potential malpractice issue by encouraging candidates to choose other sources, but explore similar topics, or change the focus and use similar sources. Candidates should also make sure that they use appropriate referencing systems and attach bibliographies (citing all secondary sources) to make sure that all sources are appropriately credited. Where candidates are generating transcripts from real-life scenarios, centres should make sure that appropriate safeguarding and ethical considerations are addressed (especially if the data requires access to vulnerable individuals).

Helpful resources

Setting up a Language Investigation

Approaching the Language Investigation task

Independent Investigation of Language in Use

Additional comments

Administration:

There have been a number of late submissions this year, and examples of samples being sent with inadequate postage or via an untracked postal method which has resulted in missing and delayed work. There have also been several instances of incorrect marks being inputted into the system and cases where candidate numbers have been missing from work. Each of these errors has the potential to cause delays to the moderation process, and in the case of postal mistakes could result in candidate's work being lost.

The following represents best practice in the presentation of candidate folders:

- Folders should be securely bound with treasury tags/ or staples.
- Please avoid loose sheets of paper or plastic sleeves.
- All front sheets should be attached to the front of the folder and all details should be correctly recorded: name of centre, centre number, candidate name, candidate number, task titles and intended audience for the academic poster.
- Word counts should be recorded.
- Bibliographies and (relevant) appendices should be attached to the folder.
- The academic posters should be word processed and preferably on A3 paper (even if this means sticking two A4 sheets together).

Internal standardisation:

Most centres had undertaken some form of internal standardisation, and this was generally a key factor in ensuring accurate allocation of marks.

Best practice for both first and second markers is to:

- annotate scripts in the margins
- provide summative comments linked to achievement within each AO
- address both strengths and limitations of the work within comments
- differentiate comments of different markers using different coloured pens or using signatures
- clearly identify which mark has been decided upon where marks have been contested
- make sure final marks on the front sheet and within summative comments match and are correct.

For further help with this there is a free H470/03 NEA Internal Standardisation course on OCR Train.

Supporting you

Post-results services

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website.

Keep up-to-date

We send a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates.
If you haven't already, sign up here.

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website or visit OCR professional development.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. Find out more.

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an Interchange username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

Find out more.

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit
ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder
ocr.org.uk
/ocrexams
/ocrexams
/company/ocr
/ocrexams

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.


I like this


I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.