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1 Introduction

The new structure of assessment at Advanced level has been introduced for teaching from September 2008. The specifications are designed to build on the knowledge, understanding and skills established in GCSE English, GCSE English Literature and in the National Curriculum Programmes of Study for Key Stages 3 and 4.

The specifications are set out in the form of units. This Coursework Guidance is provided in addition to the specifications to support teachers in understanding the detail necessary to prepare candidates for the Advanced Subsidiary coursework unit: F672: Changing Texts.

It is important to note that the Specification is the document on which assessment is based; it specifies the content and skills to be covered in delivering a course of study. At all times, therefore, this coursework guidance booklet should be read in conjunction with the Specification. If clarification on a particular point is needed then reference should be in the first instance to the Specification.

OCR recognises that programmes of teaching and learning in preparation for this qualification will vary from centre to centre and from teacher to teacher. This Coursework Guidance is offered to support teachers and it is recognised that individual teachers may want to make modifications to the suggested materials and approaches. Further support is offered through the OCR Coursework Consultancy service for GCE English Language and Literature (see OCR website for details).
Unit F672 Changing Texts

The focus for this internally-assessed unit is the study of multimodal texts, ie texts that combine different modes of communication (speech, writing, sound, image) to create meaning.

Candidates should be able to apply both analytical and creative techniques to explore ways in which literary texts are constantly being reinvented and reinterpreted for different audiences and purposes. Through writing a commentary on their own text production, candidates should be able to demonstrate their understanding of the range of factors – linguistic, literary, presentational, cultural – that can influence meanings and effects.

Candidates study a substantial written text from any literary genre (including literary non-fiction). This original written text must have given rise to an example of a related multimodal text. Candidates are expected to:

• explore how multimodality gives rise to different possibilities for presenting meaning in texts;
• show understanding of issues related to the production and reception of texts in multimodal form;
• consider some factors (such as audience, purpose, context and interpretation) that can influence the creation of a multimodal ‘version’ of a written text;
• make use of approaches from literary and linguistic studies to reflect on what is achieved in transforming a text.

Candidates are required to produce a folder of coursework of a maximum of 3000 words with two items of work:

Task 1: Analytical study

Task 2: Multimodal text with commentary

Task 1: Analytical study

Candidates produce a written study of 1000 to 1500 words maximum exploring reasons/opportunities/problems/issues/potential for multimodal transformation of the original text, making reference to the ‘solutions’ offered in the example chosen. Consideration should be given to:

• scope of the original text for different types of multimodal text production;
• factors that have shaped the multimodal version/text (such as audience, purpose, viewpoint, interpretation);
• critical evaluation of the multimodal text/version in comparison to candidates’ reading of the original written text.
Task 2: Multimodal text and commentary

Candidates produce their own multimodal text as a re-creation of the original text, or part of the original text, with a substantial commentary on the approach taken, evaluating the outcome, (1500 to 2000 words maximum).

The multimodal text:

- should make use of at least two different modes (writing, spoken language, image, sound);
- could include elements that are produced through media other than paper-based. Options include: spoken (eg speech transcript or other speech record; scripted speech of any type); performance; image (still or moving); sound; screen-based;
- should be appropriate in length for the scope of the unit, bearing in mind the total maximum word count;
- could be one section of or part of what could be a much larger work. The focus is likely to be on one particular section or aspect of the original;
- should be recorded for purposes of internal centre assessment and so that it can be retrieved using a method that is appropriate;
- should be submitted for external moderation as a paper-based outcome.

The commentary should:

- explain the approach taken and the reasons for choices made during the stages of writing/production;
- evaluate the outcome in comparison to the original text studied and, where appropriate, to the multimodal text/version in Task 1.

Choice of text

The written text selected for study is one for which a multimodal text/version already exists, e.g. film/TV programme, audio version, CD ROM, website, illustrated book, cartoon/graphic novel/manga, computer game. In some cases this multimodal text is a version of the original text; in other cases it is based on or about the original text. In all cases, there is a written form of the original text to which the multimodal text/version can be compared. This forms the basis for Task 1: Analytical study.
# 3 Coursework Guidance

Unit F672 *Changing Texts*

Examples of study for this unit

| Example 2 | Tony Harrison, *V* | - BBC version of Harrison’s illustrated reading  
- Newspaper responses to the television film (collated in ‘V Bloodaxe Books 1985) | 1. Illustrated talk introducing the work of Tony Harrison to an American audience.  
| Example 3 | Chaucer, *The Canterbury Tales* | TV version (Sally Wainwright adaptation) | 1. Scripted excerpt from daytime TV chat show featuring *The Wife of Bath*.  
2. Item from a radio - magazine format - programme, e.g. *Woman’s Hour* on varying attitudes to marriage, for a targeted middle class, female audience.  
3. A ‘Facebook’ or similar website entry. |
| Example 4 | Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* | Baz Luhrmann’s adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* | Graphic novel treatment of key scene using a different setting. |
| Example 5 | Sir Gawain and the Green Knight | Harrison Birtwistle’s opera, see Wikipedia (Gawain) | A play script or acted version of one scene of the poem (transformation from poem to drama and also of audience and expectation). |
| Example 6 | Hillaire Belloc  
*Cautionary Tales for Children* | Contemporary illustrated children’s poetry books, for example those by Posy Simmonds (e.g. *Matilda Who Told Lies, and was Burned to Death*) and Tony Ross | A ‘health and safety film/animation’ (as in Creature Comforts) to help parents guard against some of the dangers experienced by the children in the poems. |
| Example 7 | S T Coleridge  
*The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* | - Gustav Doré illustrations  
-1975 film version (dir. Raul da Silva) incorporating the Doré illustrations  
- W S Gilbert illustrated parody *The Yarn of the Nancy Bell* | Write design brief (with examples) for *Ancient Mariner* board/computer game (may be for educational purposes – aimed at specific age group? – or simply for entertainment). |
| Example 8 | Longer ‘classic’ 19th century poetry (especially dramatic monologues) | - Interactive study websites, featuring for example *The Laboratory* and *My Last Duchess* by Robert Browning  
- Radio drama versions | Section of script for TV documentary on the social and literary background to the poems. |
| Example 9 | Travel Writing  
e.g. by William Cobbett, Daniel Defoe or Celia Fiennes | - *Great British Journeys*  
(BBC2 programme with website support)  
- *A Vision of Britain Through Time* project website | Weblog of student’s own actual, imagined or planned travel with photographs/video. |
| Example 10 | Alfred, Lord Tennyson  
*The Charge of the Light Brigade*  
- contemporary reportage of the battle | - 1968 film version (dir. Tony Richardson)  
- John Osborne screenplay, written for but not used in the film (available as an audio version on BBC Radio 4) | Secondary school History digital teaching resource pack that includes sound and images. |
| Example 11 | Shakespeare  
*Macbeth* | Recording of author James Thurber reading his *Macbeth Murder Mystery*  
OR  
“Shakespeare Retold” *BBC series* | - Script (with audio clips) of scene from television programme *Taggart* in which King Duncan is found “deid … murdered”  
- *Lady Macbeth’s Weekend* in the style of the Saturday Telegraph’s *My Weekend* series (preparing for guests etc.). |
| Example 12 | Jane Austen  
*Emma* | - Clueless (American film loosely based on the novel)  
- *Jane Austen Talking* website, on which the author answers questions from modern readers | - Scene from the novel rewritten as film/play script and updated to modern British “teen-speak”; audio clips and/or annotated transcript to illustrate phonological features (e.g. rising intonation). |
| Example 13 | War Poetry (for example, the poems of Wilfred Owen) | - The film of *Oh What a Lovely War*  
- The Imperial War Museum website on *The Great War* | Production notes or a design folder for a production of R C Sherriff’s *Journey’s End*. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14      | George Orwell | *Animal Farm* - 1950s American cartoon version  
- BBC2 film *George Orwell – A Life in Pictures* | 1. Two animals present their ‘video diaries’ of particular episodes.  
2. A ‘Start the Week’ type interview with George Orwell discussing the advantages of literary allegory to present political points. |
| 16      | Selection of Romantic Pastoral poetry, e.g. *The Passionate Shepherd to His Love* | - Dating websites (including one especially set up for Welsh dairy farmers!)  
- Pastiche versions of pastoral / romantic poetry, for example by C Day Lewis and Lawrence Ferlinghetti | passionateshepherd.com website advertising the romantic possibilities and delights of a modern rural lifestyle (may include time-share opportunities, spa facilities etc.) |
| 17      | Sue Townsend | *Secret Diary of Adrian Mole* - Film/TV adaptation  
- Play (adapted from her novel by the author)  
- Reviews on ‘Amazon’ website | A magazine article: ‘Adrian Mole 25+ Years On’, comparing the cultural, social and linguistic landscapes of 1982 and 25+ years later. |
| 18      | Multi-cultural poetry | - Study Guides, paper-based and interactive (web and CD ROM)  
- BBC Bitesize Revision | Authentic transcript of students’ real discussion of what they have learnt from study.  
Commentary should explore the challenges of creating a transcript and analyse the features of spoken language. |
| 19      | Shakespeare | *Twelfth Night* - *Animated Shakespeare* cartoon version  
- KS3 Study Guides  
- Channel 4 film version | *Mis-Match of the Day* analysis by Gary Lineker, Alan Hansen and Mark Lawrenson of one of the more obviously slapstick scenes, e.g. fight between Sir Andrew and Sebastian (plenty of action re-plays) |
| 20      | Robert Harris | *Pompeii* - Translation of Pliny’s eyewitness accounts of aftermath of the eruption of Mount Vesuvius (audio book)  
- Extracts from the Lonely Planet on Pompeii | Resource website of images, sounds and readings about Pompeii aimed at visitors to the city. |

Note: These examples are offered as illustrations only.

Sample approaches to study
| Example 12 | Jane Austen *Emma* | - Clueless (American film loosely based on the novel)  
- Screenplay of film (available on the internet)  
- *Jane Austen Talking* website, on which the author answers questions from modern readers | - Scene from the novel rewritten as film/play script and updated to modern British 'teen-speak'; audio clips and/or annotated transcript to illustrate phonological features (e.g. rising intonation) |
**Task 1: Analytical study**

The notes for each section below are presented as bullet points; candidates must present this information in continuous prose.

### Scope of original text for multimodal text production

- easily up-dated ‘surface’ features of original text: carriages become convertibles, portraiture becomes photography, balls become parties in the Valley
- themes and characters are ‘universal’: romantic story of over-confident heroine, mistaken matchmaking, flirtation
- novel has a ‘closed’ conventional ending: comedies end with marriage
- novel has notable ‘set-pieces’ to punctuate the narrative
- plot is very complicated in terms of characterisation and misunderstandings, but static in terms of movement/events

### Factors shaping the multimodal version(s)

- novel is told in third person but from Emma’s point of view
- film uses voice-over (Cher/Emma in first person)
- both narrative methods emphasise the central character’s misplaced confidence in her understanding of events and people
- film maintains narrative pace by having Cher introduce many scenes and characters in voice-over
- movement (in car or on foot) also marks the opening of many scenes
- modern instant communication (mobile phones) used to suggest action occurring here, there and everywhere
- film has more ‘open’ ending (although it’s a fairly traditional/conservative one) with Cher’s catching of the wedding bouquet anticipating her own wedding
Critical Evaluation and Comparison

- direct comparison of the dialogue in selected scenes, e.g. Emma/Cher in carriage/car with (Mr) Elton

- comparison of the openings in setting the (thematic) agenda:
  ‘Emma Woodhouse, handsome, clever, and rich, with a comfortable home and happy disposition, seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence; and had lived nearly twenty-one years in the world with very little to distress or vex her’

- compared with the (images of) the trappings of a successful consumerist lifestyle displayed in the opening of the film

- treatment of issues in both versions: power(lessness) of women; class, wealth, snobbery; paternal influence etc.

- ironic method in both texts – comic revelations/realisations

- the ‘older brother’ (Knightley/Josh) role in both versions

- direct comparison of ‘equivalent’ characters

- social/moral contexts
### Task 2: Multimodal text and commentary

**Approach taken**

- one scene from novel: dialogue re-written/updated to contemporary English ‘teen-speak’ (or similar)
- film adaptation had updated novel to 1990s America and teenage styles of utterance (e.g. Cher’s frequent exclamation of “As if!”)
- interesting to ‘re-invent’ the text for yet another new audience
- opportunity to combine literary and linguistic approaches
- literary understanding: the dynamics of interaction between the characters and the conventions of the different genres
- linguistic knowledge: features of speech, both natural and scripted; lexical choices/idiolect/sociolect
- multimodal text production: scope for recording (and re-recording) features of accent/pronunciation/intonation

**Reasons for choices**

- choice of scene/conversation: place in the novel and significance in terms of plot and characterisation
- choices of language for the dialogue: register; lexis; typical features of spoken language (agenda-setting, topic management, ‘face’ and politeness strategies)
- particular/contemporary features of interest: intonation patterns, pronunciation, idiolect/sociolect/dialect
- difficulties in representing speech and speech sounds
- scope for multimodal production: spoken-recorded excerpts from dialogue

**Evaluation of outcome**

- how well does transformation work in comparison with the original scene from the novel?
- how does transformation compare with film version?
- what do multimodal versions have which the original text lacks?
- what, for example, has been made explicit which Jane Austen’s prose communicates implicitly?
- what’s happened to irony?
### Example 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S T Coleridge</th>
<th>Gustav Doré illustrations (1876)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Rime of the Ancient Mariner</em></td>
<td>- 1975 feature film version (dir. Raul da Silva) incorporating the Doré illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- W S Gilbert illustrated parody (1866) <em>The Yarn of the Nancy Bell</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Write design brief (with examples) for *Ancient Mariner* board/computer game (may be for educational purposes – aimed at specific age group? – or simply for entertainment)
- Web-log / video diary kept by Ancient Mariner
- Transcribed and audio-taped extracts from Counselling / psychotherapy sessions for the Mariner, who is suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder.

### Task 1: Analytical Study

The notes for each section below are presented as bullet points; candidates must present this information in continuous prose.

**Scope of original text for multimodal text production**

- Coleridge himself made several versions and variations
- ‘Fantastic’ story, inviting fantasy-style illustration / re-interpretation
- Supernatural / inexplicable occurrences
- Framed narrative, allowing layers and ‘cutting’ between them
- Coleridge’s marginal Notes in the original, parallel to the poetic narrative but also adding other dimensions, are a further invitation to extra layers of interpretation
- ‘Open’ ending: the Wedding Guest is not the first to be told the Mariner’s story, nor will he be the last
- Wedding Guest is enigmatic – might he or the wedding have a ‘back-story’?
- Geography of the Mariner’s journey is complicated and confusing: pictorial representation could ease this difficulty
- Complex issues of sin / guilt / penitence / penance are raised: any re-interpretation might try to clarify these, or alternatively might subordinate them to narrative drive, according to audience
Factors shaping the multimodal version(s)

1. ‘Serious’ treatments.
   - Original text is in seven parts – it’s episodic – so that ‘tableaux’ (and accompanying headings) are already in place
   - Doré illustrations emphasise the other-worldly / fantastic / archaic nature of the story
   - STC is widely perceived as archetypal ‘Romantic’ figure
   - Imagery and thematic content of the poem often seen as parallel to events and difficulties in Coleridge’s life
   - Images from other works of Coleridge lend themselves to use (e.g. *Kubla Khan*)

2. Parody.
   - WS Gilbert version for an established audience (regular readers of *Fun* magazine and *Bab Ballads*)
   - Gilbert’s mission to deflate pomposity and pretension (especially the aesthetic sort) e.g. first G&S collaboration is *Patience*, a skit on Oscar Wilde.
   - Gives the narrator a voice with features of accent and dialect
   - Cartoon illustrations
   - Uses ballad metre, and imitates Coleridge’s skilful internal rhyming

Critical Evaluation and Comparison

- Original text concentrates on ballad aspects – narrative and descriptive - and begins with no pre-amble or explanation
- Poem is full of visual/pictorial and auditory effects: scope for direct comparison of how Coleridge’s language is ‘translated’ into other media. For example, how does the version studied deal with “As idle as a painted ship/Upon a painted ocean”?
- Doré illustrations emphasise the strangeness (‘other-ness’) of the Mariner, especially his staring eyes. Plenty of scope for comparison of presentation of the Mariner
- Treatment and/or foregrounding (or otherwise) of moral/ethical/religious issues
- Gothic/horror aspects
- Dialect and archaic language: how are these dealt with?
- The poem’s difficulties – how does the transformation text deal with any other problems set by the original text?
Task 2: Multimodal text and commentary

Approaches taken / Reasons for Choices

1. Design brief (with examples) for Ancient Mariner board/computer game
   - Clear multimodal opportunities
   - Layers of narrative and symbolism could be represented by double journeys in a board game: the Mariner’s geographical journey and the (emotional/psychological) journey made by Coleridge
   - Chance / Luck / Fate significant in the poem and also in any game
   - Wording of the poem – especially any of the particularly well-remembered (or mis-remembered) quotes – well suited to use on cards and other ‘props’ of the game

2. Web-log / diary kept by Ancient Mariner
   - Language of the poem automatically central
   - Chronological and spatial/geographical elements can be clarified
   - First-person recount retained
   - Possible to reflect and anticipate as well as to narrate/describe

3. Transcribed and audio / recorded extracts from Mariner’s counselling/psychotherapy
   - Lexis of psycho-analysis/therapy combined with Mariner’s idiolect
   - Psychological aspects of poem’s symbolism explored
   - Opportunity to use knowledge of spoken language from Unit 1
   - Mariner’s compulsion to tell his story
   - Effect on the listener – whether Wedding-Guest or Psychotherapist

Evaluation of outcome

- ‘The poem is generally regarded as one of the ‘greats’ in the literary canon. Judging from the study undertaken, what are the literary and linguistic features which give the text this status?
- How well does transformation work in conveying essential elements of the original poem?
- What are difficulties of the poem?
- Which aspects (if any) of the original have been lost or rendered less central?
Candidates are required to submit a coursework folder of a maximum of 3000 words. There are two tasks.

**Task1: Analytical study (20 marks)**

Candidates produce an analytical study of one literary text and a related multimodal text in order to demonstrate knowledge, analysis and critical understanding.

Candidates are assessed on:

**AO1:** select and apply relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study, using appropriate terminology and accurate, coherent written expression;

**AO2:** demonstrate detailed critical understanding in analysing the ways in which structure, form and language shape meanings in a range of spoken and written texts;

**AO3:** use integrated approaches to explore relationships between texts, analysing and evaluating the significance of contextual factors in their production and reception.

**Assessment**

**Step 1: Determine the band**

1. Match evidence of achievement against the descriptors for the assessment grid.

2. Use the best fit method, balancing strengths against limitations, to establish the appropriate band.

*Note that assessments refer to bands and do not correlate to grades.*
**Step 2: Determine the mark**

To determine the mark within the band, consider the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Award mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on the borderline of this band and the one below</td>
<td>at bottom of band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just enough achievement on balance for this band</td>
<td>1 mark above bottom of band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– middle of band or 1 mark above middle (5 marks in band)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 1 mark below top of band (4 marks in band)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistently meets the criteria for this band</td>
<td>at top of band</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final mark will reflect the balance of achievement and will take into account the dominant assessment objectives. The relative weighting of the assessment objectives is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 672</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>AO4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task 1: Analytical study (20 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 5 16–20 marks</th>
<th>AO 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• excellent, coherent and consistent application of relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• critical terminology, appropriate to the subject matter, accurately and consistently used;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistently accurate written expression, meaning is consistently clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• excellent, well-developed and consistently detailed critical understanding demonstrated by analysing ways in which structure, form and language shape meanings in a range of texts including multimodal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• detailed and consistently effective use of integrated approaches to explore relationships between texts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• excellent and consistently effective analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of texts, as appropriate to the task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 4 12–15 marks</th>
<th>AO 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• well structured application of relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• critical terminology, appropriate to the subject matter, used accurately;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• good level of accuracy in written expression, only minor errors which do not inhibit communication of meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• developed, clear critical understanding demonstrated by analysing ways in which structure, form and language shape meanings in a range of texts including multimodal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• developed use of integrated approaches to explore relationships between texts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developed, clear analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of texts, as appropriate to the task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 3 8–11 marks</th>
<th>AO 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• some competent application of relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• some competent use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• generally clear written expression but there are inconsistencies that inhibit communication of meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• some competent critical analysis of ways in which structure, form and language shape meanings in a range of texts including multimodal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• some use of integrated approaches to explore relationships between texts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• some competent analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of texts, as appropriate to the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        |           | • limited attempt to apply relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study;  
|        |           | • limited use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter;  
|        |           | • mostly inconsistent written expression, errors that inhibit communication of meaning. |
|        | **AO 2**  | • limited attempt to develop critical analysis of ways in which structure, form and language shape meanings in a range of texts including multimodal. |
|        | **AO 3**  | • limited attempt to use integrated approaches to explore relationships between texts;  
|        |           | • limited attempt to develop analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of texts, as appropriate to the task. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 1</th>
<th>0–3 marks</th>
<th><strong>AO 1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        |           | • little or no attempt to structure argument with little or no or irrelevant exemplification;  
|        |           | • little or no use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter;  
|        |           | • mostly inconsistent written expression, errors that inhibit communication of meaning. |
|        | **AO 2**  | • little or no attempt to develop critical analysis of ways in which structure, form and language shape meanings in a range of texts including multimodal. |
|        | **AO 3**  | • little or no attempt to use integrated approaches to explore relationships between texts;  
|        |           | • little or no attempt to develop analysis and evaluation of the influence of the contextual factors on the production and reception of texts, as appropriate to the task. |
Task 2: Multimodal text and commentary (20 marks)

Candidates produce their own piece in multimodal form based on the original text, with a supporting commentary, in order to demonstrate expertise and creativity in the subject.

Candidates are assessed on

**Multimodal text: 15 marks**

AO4: demonstrate expertise and creativity in using language appropriately for a variety of purposes and audiences, drawing on insights from linguistic and literary studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 5</th>
<th>AO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12–15 marks</td>
<td>• excellent level of expertise and creativity demonstrated in writing for a variety of purposes and audiences; • excellent, effective and detailed use of insights drawn from linguistic and literary study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 4</th>
<th>AO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9–11 marks</td>
<td>• good level of expertise and creativity demonstrated in writing for a variety of purposes and audiences; • developed, clear use of insights drawn from linguistic and literary study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 3</th>
<th>AO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6–8 marks</td>
<td>• some expertise and creativity demonstrated in writing for a variety of purposes and audiences; • some use of insights drawn from linguistic and literary study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 2</th>
<th>AO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3–5 marks</td>
<td>• limited level of expertise and creativity demonstrated in writing for a variety of purposes and audiences; • limited use of insights drawn from linguistic and literary study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 1</th>
<th>AO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–2 marks</td>
<td>• little or no expertise and creativity demonstrated in writing for a variety of purposes and audiences; • little or no use of insights drawn from linguistic and literary study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary: 5 marks

AO1: select and apply relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study, using appropriate terminology and accurate, coherent written expression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 5</th>
<th>AO 1</th>
<th>• excellent, coherent and consistent application of relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study; • critical terminology, appropriate to the subject matter, accurately and consistently used; • consistently accurate written expression, meaning is consistently clear.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>AO 1</td>
<td>• well-structured application of relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study; • critical terminology, appropriate to the subject matter, used accurately; • good level of accuracy in written expression, only minor errors which do not inhibit communication of meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>AO 1</td>
<td>• some competent application of relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study; • some competent use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter; • generally clear written expression but there are inconsistencies that inhibit communication of meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>AO 1</td>
<td>• limited attempt to apply relevant concepts and approaches from integrated linguistic and literary study; • limited use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter; • mostly inconsistent written expression, errors that inhibit communication of meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>AO 1</td>
<td>• little or no attempt to structure argument with little or no or irrelevant exemplification; • little or no use of critical terminology appropriate to the subject matter; • inconsistent written expression, little or no communication of meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervision and Authentication

- Sufficient work must be carried out under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate the coursework with confidence.
- Teachers must verify that the tasks submitted for assessment are the candidate’s own original work and should only sign the declaration of authentication if this is the case; they may not qualify the authentication in any way.

Supervision

There are three different stages in the production of the tasks:

- planning;
- first draft;
- final submission.

The permitted level of supervision is different at each stage.

Planning

It is expected that the teacher will provide detailed guidance to candidates in relation to the purpose and requirement of the task. This could include discussion on:

- selection of appropriate material;
- an appropriate and effective title;
- recommended reading;
- possible structure;
- how to resolve practical and conceptual problems;
- research techniques;
- time planning and deadlines;
- how the teacher will monitor progress throughout the process to ensure that candidates are proceeding to plan and deadlines.
First draft

What teachers can do:

- review the work in either written or oral form, concentrating on the appropriateness of the title and content; structure; references.

What teachers cannot do:

- give, either to individual candidates or to groups, specific detailed advice and suggestions as to how the work may be improved in order to meet the assessment criteria;
- check and correct early drafts of sections or the completed tasks.

Examples of unacceptable assistance include:

- detailed indication of errors or omissions;
- advice on detailed specific improvements needed to meet the criteria;
- the provision of outlines, paragraph or section headings, or writing templates specific to the task;
- personal intervention to improve the presentation or content of the coursework.

Final submission

Once the final draft is submitted it must not be revised:

- in no circumstances are ‘fair copies’ of marked work allowed;
- adding or removing any material to or from coursework after it has been presented by a candidate for final assessment would constitute malpractice.

Authentication

Teachers in centres are required to:

- sign the authentication form to declare that the work is original and by the individual candidate;
- provide details of the extent and nature of advice given to candidates;
- declare the circumstances under which the final work was produced.

Submission of marks to OCR

- Centres must have made an entry for the unit in order for OCR to make the appropriate moderator arrangements.
- Marks may be submitted to OCR either by EDI or on mark sheets (MS1).
- Deadlines for the receipt of marks are:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>10 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>15 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers and Examinations Officers must also be familiar with the general regulations on coursework; these can be found in the OCR Administration Guide on the OCR website (www.ocr.org.uk).
Standardisation and Moderation

The purpose of moderation is to ensure that standards are aligned within and across all centres, and that each teacher has applied the standards consistently across the range of candidates within the centre.

- All coursework is assessed by the teacher.
- If coursework is assessed by more than one teacher, marks must be internally-standardised before submission so that there is a consistent standard across all teaching groups in the centre.
- Marks must be submitted to OCR by the agreed date, after which postal moderation takes place in accordance with OCR procedures.

The sample of work which is submitted for moderation must show how the marks have been awarded in relation to the assessment criteria.

Coursework word length

- the maximum permitted length of work in a folder is 3000 words;
- if a folder exceeds this length it must not be submitted to OCR;
- teachers in centres must return the folder to candidates before assessment so that adjustments to length can be made;
- if folders of excessive length are submitted, they will be considered in breach of the instructions and could be subject to a malpractice investigation by OCR.

Quotations

If quotations are used, they must be acknowledged by use of footnotes (quotations and footnotes do not form part of the word count).

Bibliography

All work must be accompanied by a complete bibliography. This must include, for books and periodicals, page numbers, publishers and dates, and for newspaper or magazine articles, titles, dates and sources (where known). Video and audio resources used must also be stated. For material taken from Internet sources, the full address is required. So that teachers can authenticate candidates’ work with confidence, teachers are required to obtain a copy of all Internet materials used. If, for any reason, a candidate has used no additional resource material, a statement to this effect must be included. (The bibliography does not form part of the word count.)

Minimum Coursework Required

- If a candidate submits no work for the unit, then A (Absent) should submitted on the coursework mark sheets.
- If a candidate completes some work for the unit then this should be assessed according to the criteria and an appropriate mark awarded; this could be zero.
Coursework Re-sits

Candidates who re-sit a coursework unit **must** submit a completely new piece of work for **Task 2: Multimodal text and commentary.**
6 FAQs

- Can teachers select the coursework texts for the candidates, rather than allowing candidates a free choice?

Yes, they can. OCR recognises that programmes of teaching and learning in preparation for this qualification will vary from centre to centre and from teacher to teacher. It is therefore just as acceptable for teachers to recommend the coursework texts as it is for candidates to select the texts themselves.

- Can teachers/candidates use texts that are not listed in the Coursework Guidance document?

Yes, they can. The examples of texts in the Coursework Guidance document are suggestions. Teachers can create groupings of example texts that best suit their own teaching programmes and their learners’ interests provided that the selections meet the requirements of the specification.

- What’s the word limit for the coursework units?

Units F672 and F674 each have a word limit of 3,000 words. Folders in excess of 3,000 words must not be submitted to OCR. Quotations, footnotes and bibliographies do not form part of the word count.

- The new regulations state that ‘sufficient work must be carried out under direct supervision’. What is considered ‘sufficient’?

OCR recognises that the amount of direct coursework supervision will vary from centre to centre. The requirement is that there needs to be sufficient supervision to enable the teacher to sign the authentication form with confidence, i.e. to know that a candidate’s work is entirely their own.

- What can teachers do in respect of checking drafts?

Teachers can

- review the work in either written or oral form, concentrating on the appropriateness of the title and content; structure; references.

Teachers cannot

- give specific detailed advice and suggestions as to how the work may be improved in order to meet the assessment criteria
- check and correct early drafts of sections or the completed ‘Own multimodal text’.

- What’s the word limit for the multimodal text with commentary?

The total word limit for this coursework unit is 3000 words. For the multimodal text with commentary task we recommend 1500 to 2000 words depending on how many words are used for the analytical task. It is possible to be flexible on word count within this task but as a general guideline the multimodal text should be the same length or longer than the commentary. We recommend that the commentary should not be less than 500 words. So if 1500 words are
available for this task the distribution between the multimodal text and the commentary could be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multimodal text</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **If candidates choose to re-sit a coursework unit, do they need to write on a different set of texts?**

  No, they don’t. Candidates who re-sit a coursework unit must submit a piece of completely new work for Task 2. The new work for Task 2 can be based on the same original and multimodal texts but the task (multimodal with commentary) must be different to that previously submitted and assessed.

- **What if we submit coursework that is too long?**

  If work of excessive length is submitted, it will be considered to be in breach of the instructions and could be subject to a malpractice investigation by OCR.