

A LEVEL

Moderators' report

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

H470

For first teaching in 2015

H470/03 Summer 2023 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Online courses	3
General Overview.....	4
Task 1: the language investigation	5
Applying the Assessment Objectives	7
Task 2: the academic poster.....	10
Most common causes of Centres not passing.....	12
Common misconceptions.....	13
Avoiding potential malpractice.....	13
Additional comments.....	14

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.

Online courses

We have created online courses to build your confidence in delivering, marking and administering internal assessment for our qualifications. Courses are available for Cambridge Nationals, GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Technicals (2016).

Cambridge Nationals

All teachers delivering our redeveloped Cambridge Nationals suite from September 2022 are asked to complete the Essentials for the NEA course, which describes how to guide and support your students. You'll receive a certificate which you should retain.

Following this you can also complete a subject-specific Focus on Internal Assessment course for your individual Cambridge Nationals qualification, covering marking and delivery.

GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Technicals (2016)

We recommend all teachers complete the introductory module Building your Confidence in Internal Assessment, which covers key internal assessment and standardisation principles.

Following this you will find a subject-specific course for your individual qualification, covering marking criteria with examples and commentary, along with interactive marking practice.

Accessing our online courses

You can access all our online courses from our teacher support website [Teach Cambridge](#).

You will find links relevant to your subject under Assessment, NEA/Coursework and then Online Courses from the left hand menu on your Subject page.

If you have any queries, please contact our Customer Support Centre on 01223 553998 or email support@ocr.org.uk.

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.

The NEA assessment is designed to help 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, using 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 (even though this is certainly not a prerequisite for a successful outcome). 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 work fully meets that level descriptor. Teachers should bear in mind the weighting of the Assessment Objectives, place the response within a level and give 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.

Task 1: the language investigation

This has been another interesting year for candidates exploring new topics and data sources. The moderation team have been impressed by the ingenuity of candidates who have sought to generate their own data, drawn from their own lives, and from a range of places. Topics have explored instructive language in a range of contexts (sports coaching, classroom settings, parent/child interactions, within the workplace); code-switching for dual language users and the extent to which generational factors influence this; the ways in which peers interact in mix-gender and single gender groups with a focus on discussions relating to mental health, relationships, coping with stress and hobbies/interests. It has also been impressive to see candidates engaging with a range of challenging social and political issues that we all face, with themes such as: global warming; the pandemic; immigration; modern-day oppressive regimes; the ways in which race is presented in the media; the ways in which crime is reported, and how individuals with physical, developmental or learning disabilities acquire language skills and communicate.

We saw work across the whole range of attainment, and whatever the individual outcomes, all candidates, and those involved in preparing them, are commended for their efforts and high levels of engagement. There were many highly effective submissions, with candidates showing a thoughtfulness and diligence in refining their projects and identifying appropriately revealing language frameworks to analyse in order to draw meaningful conclusions. Many centres are clearly guiding candidates to make sensible decisions as to how to approach the task and where to direct their focus in relation to the theories and concepts that might aid them in designing their project, and to purposefully analyse the data. There is a continued trend to explore theorists and concepts beyond the scope of the specification, and this has resulted in ever more convincing and critical engagement from the candidates. Similarly, more candidates are concerned with exploring contemporary social and political issues, and this has resulted in the contextual discussions becoming ever more considered and nuanced. As always, there were a large number of projects exploring aspects of pop culture, with sport commentaries, beauty magazines, reality TV, chat shows, and documentaries all continuing to provide useful data sources to explore ideas around representations of gender, the promotion of capitalist agendas, and how audiences are positioned to perceive certain social phenomena and groups in particular ways (e.g. criminals, queer individuals, immigrants and people of colour).

As in previous years, we saw several projects exploring power (often intersecting with gender), and typically these focus on political leaders and an assessment of their key speeches and also how they are represented in the media. These have tended to explore historical political figures such as Hitler, Churchill, and Thatcher, and more recent figures such as Obama, Clinton, Cameron, Blair, Trump and Johnson. This year, we saw a number of these, but rather pleasingly we also saw a move towards exploring current political leaders and how they address contemporary social issues – such as speeches on global warming, the Ukraine War, and the state of the economy. These types of projects have the added bonus in that the contexts (in the form of causes and impacts of the socio-political issues) are palpable and sources are readily available for candidates to draw on to support their contextual discussion. Of course, in the near future, with elections looming, exploring manifestos of the main parties, how they talk about policies and how they seek to represent their opposition parties will all be rich fodder for forthcoming cohorts. It has been gratifying to see how candidates have sought to engage with political figures that are not leaders of parties, such as Angela Rayner. These figures are interesting to explore, especially when they are called to comment on policies or behaviours of their superiors that they may not agree with, but are required be seen to support or downplay – for example, Johnson's or Trump's various scandals, Truss' impact on the economy, or Sunak's comments on inflation. The very best of these types of projects consider agendas, audience positioning, and how the issues are shaped by a range of contexts, and are aware of the contextual impacts that might emerge as a result of the historical moment from which the data set is taken. Those projects that focus on media representations

of political figures are most successful when they place the data source within the context of its production, again focusing precisely on the agendas of the media outlet (in both general and specific terms) and how the representations they make help them to achieve these purposes. Focusing on what is said, what is omitted, what assumptions and attitudes are taken for granted, etc. is all key to fully appreciating the ways in which the audiences are meant to receive and respond to the content.

We also saw a large number of projects on gender, and many projects revisited familiar ground on beauty standards; gender roles being reaffirmed via toy advertisements and children's literature; and the imbalance of power in representation in relation to sports coverage and commentary roles. These are all relevant and appropriate topic areas, and are clearly richly rewarding for those candidates who enjoy this area of study. However, there were still occasions where the data sets simply were not rich enough in language features to support a rigorous analysis. Advertisements and magazine covers are perhaps the most limited of all the sources that candidates typically seek to engage with, and it is crucial that candidates understand that they will need to work with a large number of these data sources in order to be able to have enough 'words' to actually comment on. In addition, while visual methods of communication might be considered briefly, this should not dominate any analysis, and where this has been the approach adopted by candidates, it has significantly limited the level of success of the investigation.

Some of the strongest gender-focused projects that have emerged in recent years are those that look at the representation of transgender people, and those that focus on the linguistic performance of gender – where suddenly many of the “out-dated” theories on gendered language become very relevant again. There has also been a movement to considering the ways in which queer individuals communicate, and a couple of very engaging and thoughtful pieces were seen on the different ways in which heterosexual and homosexual individuals communicate with one another on the TV programme *First Dates*. Other projects have also focused on homophobic language on social media, and how extreme and explicit comments, as well as subtle and coded offensive comments, can go undetected, or at least unchallenged. This type of project is disturbingly revealing about our modern contexts, and so is a valuable area to explore.

We are also still seeing lots of projects using fiction texts to explore representations of gender, power dynamics in the workplace, relationships etc. Many more of these are treating these sources as examples of represented speech or as products of producers who have particular agendas, shaped by exterior contexts, but we have still seen a number where characters and relationships/exchanges between characters are treated as real examples of language use. These types of projects can be problematic, as there are several inbuilt pitfalls which candidates can fall into – which always start with treating the characters and language use as real-life examples. It is highly recommended that any candidate who wishes to undertake such a project is given a very clear steer about how to deal with the data source, and there are swift interventions should they appear to be unable to focus on represented language use. They may need to be encouraged to take on another project, which draws on a non-fiction data source, if it seems likely working with a fiction source may result in them being unable to fulfil their potential. Similarly, topics on song lyrics seem to have yielded more successful projects this year, but this is still a difficult data set to use if there is not enough data from which to draw meaningful conclusions. The stronger projects use a catalogue of lyrics from a range of popular artists at different points in time – for example pre- and post- #MeToo. Some candidates have sought to pad out the data by splitting their focus on a single song's lyrics and how it has been covered in the media, and on the whole this is unlikely to be especially successful. This is because the nature of the two data sets, who produced them, the reasons they have been produced and the audiences for whom they have been created are not the same – and fundamentally the way that one review responds to the song can only provide some limited context on reception, has no influence over the creation of the lyrics and can only retrospectively engage with the representations and meanings therein.

We have also seen an increase in candidates taking a reader/listener response approach to analysing data through surveying what audiences think about certain words or aspects of discourse from other sources (most often fiction texts or advertisements) and then trying to draw conclusions from these comments in relation to what meanings are present in the data set. These candidates would be better served by simply analysing the data directly as this enables them to apply methods, theories and contexts in a more focused way. Invariably those who take on a peer response activity, lose focus of the data itself and the conclusion are not especially satisfying, as a result.

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. 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 meet with the highest levels of success judiciously select language frameworks which are most relevant to the specific data which they have chosen to analyse. In this way they can demonstrate high levels of discernment in relation to how those language levels interact to offer insights into the data and the thematic/topical focuses that the data is representative of. The selection of frameworks is most effective when it draws on theoretical concepts, and it is advised that candidates engage with the theoretical elements when designing their project to provide this strong rationale for the language features they choose to focus on. Generally, candidates working at the highest levels demonstrate a sophisticated command of academic register and technical terminology, although it is the quality of the analysis that occurs as a result of these factors, and not the ability to effectively label features and write in a verbose fashion, which determines success.

The moderation team have noted that both the labelling of language features and the security of academic writing has been less precise this year, and there is also a sense that many candidates are not giving themselves enough time to proof-read and edit their work. During the 2022 series, this had also been noted, and because of the pandemic and time-pressures and loss of learning, it was accepted as a hopefully aberrant occurrence. However, as this trend does seem to have continued, there is some benefit to highlighting subject terminology, addressing mislabelling, advocating more advance terms, and ensuring that feature spotting is supported by rigorous analysis. Similarly, engaging in reviews and progress checks may help candidates to see the value of editing and refining their work before their final submission. It is also important that when considering a higher-level mark for AO1, the quality of the writing is considered carefully: where lapses in expression, loss of clarity in the analysis, and feature spotting occurs without depth of analysis, then a Level 5 mark is unlikely to be acceptable.

We have found that most candidates are able to adopt a sensible approach to organising their investigation, using section headings and sub-headings for each of the language frameworks or focus areas. As such, it is only at the lower levels we tend to find that candidates are unable to offer an orderly approach to the task. However, even candidates working at the lower level are often able to secure higher AO1 marks than for the other AOs, because they have been able to logically order the content and write with some (basic) clarity. Tables, charts and graphs remain a helpful tool for candidates who are particularly interested in taking a quantitative approach to their analysis, and they certainly aid in reducing the amount of description of features that can occur within the analysis section.

Unfortunately, there is still a tendency for centres to allow the submission of considerably over-long responses, and this is still not always being addressed in the allocation of the AO1 mark. Indeed, we do sometimes receive comments on the work explaining that although the work is over-long, everything in it is relevant and is reflective of the candidate's exemplary knowledge, which is a problematic approach for the centre to take. Over-long responses are problematic on a number of levels, but the key one is that a candidate is not showing discernment in what they choose to focus on, if they are simply writing about

everything of interest in the data. It is important that editing and refining and selectivity are promoted. Not only does it support the development of these skills for more advanced study or within a professional setting, but if success is measured on the basis of these lengthy responses that have clearly covered more ground as a result, it has a distorting effect on perceptions of success of those candidates who have worked within the reasonable word count parameters. This can mean highly successful investigations are under-rewarded as a result and this in turn can have a suppressing effect on the marks allocated at all levels of achievement within your cohort.

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 investigations are those where candidates have engaged with theories and concepts from the outset, using them to design the investigation, to aid in selecting appropriately revealing data sources and the language frameworks which will offer meaningful points of interpretation, and have been woven through the analysis and conclusions. It is useful for candidates to introduce the theories they are working with - the key ideas they raise and how this determines how they will analyse the data – within the introduction section. Less successful candidates tend to delay the introduction to the theory until the analysis section, where the engagement is patchy and often superimposed rather than interwoven.

There is no particular preference as to which theorists are worked with, but interacting with the relevance of the theory explicitly is a mark of a candidate who is able to engage more critically. We tend to see the more traditional theorists such as Crystal, Tannen, Lakoff, Cameron, Zimmerman and West, and Grice, Goffman and Fairclough, which are taught on the syllabus, and there is always considerable evidence that the theories are well understood, as they are often appropriately applied. However, as has been mentioned previously we are seeing more theorists outside of the scope of the specification, and this is usually a marker of a candidate who is working at the higher levels. The moderation team frequently find occasion to be impressed by the breadth of autonomous research that many candidates undertake, and it often translates that having undertaken this considerable wider reading, these candidates are able to offer nuanced, sophisticated and lively critical engagement. These sources may not be always easy to locate, and it is definitely worth building a bank of resources in your centres when your industrious candidates come across interesting finds.

Generally, we have found that while some candidates are able to use one or two theorists to excellent effect, most need to engage with a wider range of theories in order to demonstrate the level of knowledge and critical engagement required to achieve in the higher levels. Given breadth or depth can aid you in achieving into Level 4, this does seem to be the most sensible approach to adopt – especially where the data resists interpretation via the theories that have been initially identified.

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.*

Advice in previous years has been: *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.*

It is important that contexts are integrated early in the introduction, as this aids in establishing a sense of purpose to the investigation. For example, if a candidate was seeking to focus on the ways in which the Boris Johnson 'Partygate' scandal had been represented in the media, there would be a

lot of sense in explaining why the issue was so controversial for so many people and why certain media outlets have a particular agenda in covering the issue in the way that they did. This can then help to contextualise why the investigation seeks to explore how audiences are positioned in particular ways when political scandals occur.

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 in the production of that data. Less useful contexts are those that seek to explain why a candidate is personally interested in the topical area (in the manner of 'I have always liked football, so I thought it would be interesting to see how football managers talk in interviews' or 'I want to be a law student and am interested in politics, so I wanted to see...'). A caveat to this is that candidates who are using data from their own lives will need to address how their position might impact the integrity of the study.

Context is an aspect that can be dealt with in a rather heavy-handed way, and at the lower levels often candidates simply 'dump' some context in the introduction or in the analysis section, without seeking to use it as a means to engage with the data. It may be a useful exercise to ask candidates to print copies of their investigations and go through highlighting the context comments to see if it is overly lengthy, unnecessarily personalised, unhelpfully placed or unintegrated, and then they can work on editing and refining the sections so context can be more purposefully addressed (this can also be done with the AO2 content).

Task 2: the academic poster

The academic poster is assessed against AO5, and the purpose of the task is to synthesise the key information from the investigation to suit the needs of a generally academic audience or a specific audience that has been identified by the candidate. The focus of the task is to draw out the key content of the investigation and this means the emphasis should be on the analysis and findings section. There should be an introductory section that contextualises the purpose, aims, hypothesis and key focuses of the investigation. There should also be a concluding and evaluative statement provided, where the project findings are summarised and the success of the project is considered. Parts of the introduction and concluding section can use bullet points, as long as the meaning and key content is clear. The analysis and findings should be supported by more detailed discussion and can also be enhanced using tables and charts. Visual tools should be implemented both to communicate information (such as tables of results or images of data sources) and to increase the visual appeal.

As was the advice in previous years, the audiences can be narrow and niche such as a comic convention audience, or a sixth form conference for prospective students, or social media group (perhaps focusing on abuse online for example). Irrespective of the audience type, the visual and written information needs to respond to the audience's needs and expectations, and as such the register, language choices, glossing of technical terms, and the formatting and graphological features all need to be carefully considered. It is useful to think of the audience as having never read the investigation, and as such, enough coverage of the key elements needs to be provided in order to help this audience to be able to have a good understanding of what the investigation sought to achieve and what was learnt.

The most successful posters do all of the above, but typically less successful posters are characterised by not focusing on the analysis and findings, not utilising the 750-1000 word count effectively, disorderly formatting and organisation of the content, a lack of glossing or adaptation of the language to suit the audience, and a lack of attention to visual elements. There is often a perception that less successful posters simply have not had enough time spent on them, and this is made clear by a lack of editing, or underdeveloped or incomplete sections, or lack of care taken over the formatting. Unfortunately, it did seem that this year we saw more examples of posters which did not reach the level of success of the investigations due to the reasons outlined above, and since this task represents a quarter of the marks, it seems a shame to miss the opportunity to give this task the attention it deserves. It has also been noted that there seems to have been an increase in candidates cutting and pasting some (and sometimes significant) amounts of content from the investigation. This approach seemed to be on the decline in the last couple of series, pre and post-Covid-19, so it seems unfortunate that we should have a return to this. Please do respond to any examples of this in your centres by only giving a mark in Level 1 if all of the content is copied, and placing in Level 2 if a significant amount is. It can be helpful to have a slightly earlier deadline for the investigation to provide a break between finishing the investigation and starting the poster, so there is time to reflect on the outcomes and therefore increase the likelihood that candidates can formulate ways to summarise the content in a fresh way, rather than feeling they are merely regurgitating the content.

Final words:

As has been previously mentioned, the moderation team have fully enjoyed engaging with candidates' work and have been impressed with the considerable range of topics and approaches that have been explored.

Candidates who did well generally:	Candidates who did less well generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriately focused on the tasks • adopted a consistently academic register and used a range of appropriately applied language terms • refined and set achievable aims, hypothesis and concise methodology supported by AO2 and AO3 considerations • identified appropriate language frameworks to focus on in relation to the data source(s) • produced a coherently structured report that had clear headings and sub-sections (and tables/graphs where appropriate) • focused on the analysis section and offered detailed and nuanced analysis of the data sets, supported by AO2 and AO3 interpretations • had engaged with a range of AO2 in detail and explored concepts and theories beyond the scope of the A Level specification • provided conclusions that convincingly assessed the extent to which the initial hypothesis had been observed in the data and considerations as to why it may not have done • evaluation the investigation in relation to 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) • utilised visual tools to aid in communicating information and to provide aesthetic appeal • demonstrated a commitment to careful editing of both pieces of work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 selected inappropriate language frameworks • had not engaged with AO2 and/or AO3 in the formulation of the investigation and to determine the focus of the investigation • had not engaged consistently with AO2 or had selected inappropriate theories/concepts to interpret the data • 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 • produced un-edited investigations and posters.

Most common causes of Centres not passing

This has been an interesting year in terms of an increasing diversification of topical areas, data sets and approaches. However, not all topics or data sets are appropriate for English Language study, and it is important that the Text and Task Approval Service is used by centres to gain approval of titles, especially where they are exploring new areas, or areas that could be risky in terms of focus on language discussion. This is potentially more important for candidates who are typically working at the lower levels, as certain 'personal interest' projects can result in candidates losing sight of the purpose of the task – to explore how language is used and for what purposes. Examples of the types of projects that we have seen at the borderline of the U/E grade are typically ill-constructed projects on:

- football managers' interviews and how their tone/manner/the discourse is reflected in how the players play. This is not something that could be proven
- gamers' language used to explore gender dynamics/ typical gendered language representation, using very brief and poorly selected data sets
- screenplays/TV scripts/transcriptions of programmes, where the candidate seeks to explore how interactions between characters are representative of gender or power relations in real life, with the focus being on plot elements and non-verbal communication rather than on how and why producers would seek to represent dialogue in the ways that they do
- fictional texts exploring a range of themes, such as gender relations, power dynamics, mental health issues, discrimination etc – where again the focus is on aspects of plot instead of how and why language is used by producers to characterise characters and dialogue is used to replicate real-life exchanges
- media topics – gender in a range of product adverts for example – where the data set is simply too limited to draw convincing conclusions.

Many of these projects (with the exception of the football manager one) can be successful, and we do see examples of such projects across all levels of attainment. However, candidates need to be guided as to how they need to work with the data for such projects, with early interventions when it is clear they have not worked with enough data, or they are tending to treat fictional instances of language use as if they are real-life examples, or they are working to prove the unprovable (as in the case of the football manager project).

Other reasons for projects meeting with less success include:

- over-committing to the introductory section – so the analysis and conclusions become more limited
- focusing on a personal interest context – as opposed to contexts that might have had an influence on the language features within the data set, or that might be used to aid interpretation of the data
- showing a lack of careful editing and refining of the investigation – impacting the AO1 quality
- producing investigations with a low word count
- showing a misunderstanding of the purpose of the poster – which is to draw out the key elements of the investigation, with a prioritisation of the findings and conclusions (with contextualising introductory sections)
- producing posters that do not use the recommended word counts (often too few words)
- producing posters that have not been carefully edited
- producing posters where significant sections have been copied from the investigation.

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. The advice remains: 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 given. 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).

OCR support



[Setting up a Language Investigation on Teach Cambridge](#)

Additional comments

Administration:

Unfortunately, there have been a number of late submissions again this year. There have also been several instances of incorrect marks being inputted into the system and cases where candidate numbers have been missing from work. It also seems that there have been more centres this year that have sent work that has been inadequately bound together, with a large number of centres that have sent the folders as loose sheets of paper. Each of these errors has the potential to cause delays to the moderation process, and in the case of inadequately bound work, could result in candidates' work being muddled and inappropriate moderation decisions being made where folders become mixed up.

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 printed in colour on A3 paper (even if this means sticking two A4 sheets together).

Internal moderation:

Most centres had undertaken some form of internal moderation, 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 with comments on AO skills and at the level these are achieved
- provide summative comments linked to achievement within each AO and a mark for 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 on where marks have been contested
- make sure final marks on the front sheet and within summative comments match and are correct.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

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](#).

Access to Scripts

For the June 2023 series, Exams Officers will be able to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts' for all of our General Qualifications including Entry Level, GCSE and AS/A Level. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin 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 for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

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.

[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**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/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.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.