



GCSE Examiners' Report

Drama
GCSE
Summer 2024

Introduction

Our Principal Examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each component.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.¹

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	Eduqas offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For unitised specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and component level. For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each component that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: Results and Grade Boundaries and PRS (eduqas.co.uk)

¹ Please note that 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.

Exam Results Analysis	Eduqas provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	Portal by WJEC
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.edugas.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Become an Examiner Eduqas

Contents

	Page
Executive summary	5
Component 1	7
Component 2	12
Component 3	15
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	19

Executive Summary

Component 1

Moderators mostly observed that candidates displayed a high level of engagement and pride in their work, with the varied choice of stimuli allowing for a creative exploration of contemporary issues. Overall, most centres continue to assess accurately, with only a few instances of mark inflation. However, centres are reminded of both objectivity and adherence to the assessment criteria when marks are being awarded.

Whilst many performances embodied a sophisticated application of performance and design skills, there are instances where some lacked cohesion and/or a relevance to the chosen stimuli. Whilst the clear articulation of ideas and creative incorporation of practitioner techniques remain evident within successful portfolios, some work lacked the depth of understanding to justify high marks. Evaluative work remains a weak area, with many candidates focusing on the rehearsal process rather than the final performance.

Discrepancies remain regarding administration, with incomplete documentation and poorly positioned cameras challenging the moderation process. The need for clear candidate identification is still not universally understood.

Component 2

A combination of new and traditional work was well received by examiners again this year, with high standards being reported in most centres. However, centres are reminded of the need to ensure proper scheduling and accurate documentation, thus ensuring that the focus can remain on the accurate examination of candidates as opposed to the correction of administrative errors.

Centres should ensure that candidates are given adequate preparation time to familiarise themselves with the text and the functionality of set and props. The use of multi-rolling and gender changes should be carefully considered to meet assessment objectives, whilst facilities should be utilised to create a theatrical experience, even with limited resources. Finally, centres should remember that the Artistic Intentions are essential for understanding candidates' objectives and should remain clear and detailed.

Component 3

In this first year of new set texts, outcomes remain comparable to previous series, with candidates showing a stronger understanding of performance compared to design.

Centres should remind candidates to read the question and understand its' requirements before seeking to write an answer. Where appropriate, responses should demonstrate a detailed understanding of character relationships with theatrical terminology also a necessity for top band outcomes. Production styles and staging concepts remain challenging for many candidates. Finally, centres should remind candidates of the need to focus on analysis and evaluation as opposed to narrative description in the live theatre review.

Areas for improvement	Classroom resources	Brief description of resource
Portfolio Writing	Guidance for Teachers	Guidance document with outline of how-to best approach creation of Portfolio
Response to Stimuli	Using stimuli to develop ideas Group work - Refining a performance	Eduqas and GCSE Bitesize interactive revision and learning resources on how to respond to a stimulus and how to refine a performance.
Creating Theatrical Spaces	Delving into Design- CPD GCSE Drama Knowledge Organisers	Available CPD courses and resources on the Drama Website
Set Design	The purpose of set design	Eduqas and GCSE Bitesize interactive revision and learning resources on set design.
Effective Administration	e-Submission FAQ's	Eduqas guidance for e-Submission, including paperwork guidance and process help.
Past Exemplar Materials	Portal by WJEC	Varied exemplar materials

DRAMA

GCSE

Summer 2024

Component 1 – Devising Theatre

Overview of the Component

Non-exam assessment: Internally assessed, externally moderated.

40% of overall qualification.

Learners participate in the creation, development, and performance of a piece of theatre using either the techniques of an influential theatre practitioner or a genre, in response to a stimulus set by WJEC.

Overall, moderators reported that Component 1 was well-handled by centres. They commented that most candidates take great pride in their work and have enjoyed the opportunity to explore issues and topics which are relevant to them. The choice of stimuli, whilst being open to interpretation, provided opportunities for candidates to creatively investigate a wide range of areas and topics.

Moderators noted that the number of centres/candidates choosing the design option for this component continues to increase and there were numerous examples of design work of an exceptional standard.

General Comments on Component 1

- Both written and practical work was fairly assessed in most centres. The assessment was generally accurate regarding the rank order of candidates, but a minority of centres were generous with their marks when the work did not reflect the assessment band(s). Teachers are encouraged to be objective when assessing the work and be realistic in terms of candidate attainment by not awarding band 5 marks for band 4 work. Centres are reminded the best candidate in a particular cohort may not be a full-mark candidate when the assessment criteria are applied.
- Although teacher comments are not required on the candidate's work, moderators noted that where these were included, they proved helpful in indicating where and why marks had been awarded.
- Moderators noted the most time-consuming element of the moderation process involved inaccurate uploading of required documentation. Centres are reminded to check that every element of the sample is included.
- Centres need to check the positioning of the camera to ensure the performance is being recorded effectively. Moderators noted that cameras positioned at a distance from the performance, with audience obscuring the view etc, made the moderation process more challenging.
- Candidate introductions are still proving problematic. Centres need to ensure that moderators can clearly identify each candidate individually.

- Moderators noted a significant number of errors when centres added up the three separate marks for candidates. This resulted in an incorrect mark being uploaded onto to IAMIS.
- Centres are reminded to check the moderator's report which will comment on how the centre applied the marking criteria for each area. This guidance should inform centre marking for the subsequent cohort.

Assessment Overview

Component 1 is comprised of three assessment objectives;

AO1: Create and develop ideas to communicate meaning for theatrical performance.

As in previous years, moderators noted that candidates whose work was accurately placed in Band 5 demonstrated highly imaginative ideas in response to their chosen stimuli and how the initial idea was developed and researched. There was an excellent range of relevant techniques selected to demonstrate their understanding of their chosen practitioner/style. As in previous years, centres continue to experiment with a range of different practitioners/styles and the most effective work demonstrated a high level of understanding of both the practitioner/ style and how selected methods can be incorporated into a successful devised performance.

The very best work detailed the candidate's highly relevant contribution to the creation, development, and there was a sophisticated understanding of why specific performance ideas had been developed, amended and refined. However, moderators noted there were instances where the work of some candidates did not display the depth of understanding to merit the marks awarded.

As in previous years, a minority of centres used a combination of two practitioners/styles. This approach diluted the quality and understanding of the work across each of the three elements and had a significant impact on AO1.

AO2 - Apply theatrical skills to realise artistic intentions in live performance.

Moderators noted that this element, application of performance skills, produced some exceptional work. The very best work demonstrated, by both acting and design candidates, a sophisticated understanding evidenced through the way selected techniques were embodied throughout the final performance. This work demonstrated an excellent interpretation of the role/design using highly relevant aspects of the practitioner/ style to successfully realise artistic intentions.

As in previous years, the work involving some practitioners tended to focus on one specific aspect of the style. For example, there were some highly successful examples of Musical Theatre where candidates had carefully crafted song, movement and dialogue into a devised performance which fulfilled all the assessment criteria. However, some work consisted of a random selection of songs and dances displaying little relevance to the chosen stimuli, meaning the realised performance lacked shape and structure.

Centres should also note that the chosen style must allow candidates to access all the assessment criteria. For example, Physical Theatre must include dialogue and should not be comprised solely of movement.

AO4- Analyse and evaluate their own work and the work of others.

As in previous years, moderators noted the evaluation for many candidates is still the weaker of the three elements. Many evaluations still focus on the rehearsal process as opposed to the final performance. This emphasis does not allow candidates to fulfil the relevant assessment criteria and can have a significant impact on the final mark.

Comments on individual questions/sections

AO1: Create and develop ideas to communicate meaning for theatrical performance.

The portfolios were generally of a good standard. As in previous years, where centres had adhered to the specification and the assessment objectives, the quality of the work across the ability range resulted in work that allowed all candidates to fulfil their potential. However, moderators noted that a significant number of centres did not follow the specified structure and in these cases, the quality of the work was substantially diluted. Where candidates had adopted a haphazard approach, moderators noted it was difficult to recognise where the required elements had been addressed. Some portfolios contained extraneous material which had not been separated sufficiently from the main body of the portfolio, again making it difficult to assess the submission relevant to the word count. There were also an increasing number of instances where candidates exceeded the specified word count which impacted on the overall quality of the work.

Centres are reminded that the specification notes several formats which candidates can use when presenting their work and centres should choose the format which is best suited to the candidate. However, moderators observed that when the portfolio was presented in a highly visual way, it sometimes impacted on the quality of the written work. In cases such as this, it was evident that candidates had taken a great deal of care with the visual presentation of the portfolios, but this was sometimes to the detriment of the overall clarity of the submission. The most successful candidates adhered strictly to the required elements and did not include work which was not relevant to the criteria for this section. Those which explored the three sections systematically gave themselves the best opportunity to fulfil the assessment/marking criteria. Portfolios which successfully fulfilled the assessment criteria contained work which was balanced across each of the three sections as opposed to too much concentration on one section to the detriment of the other two.

- How ideas were researched, created and developed in response to the chosen stimuli

Moderators noted that candidates used the range of stimuli and produced some interesting and challenging work based on their choice. The very best work clearly articulated how ideas had been created and developed citing a highly relevant individual contribution. There were occasions where the link to the stimulus was tenuous without justification. Similarly, individual contributions were weak and lacked development.

- How ideas from the chosen practitioner/genre were incorporated to communicate meaning.

As in previous years, this tended to be the weakest section. The very best work focused on articulating how the chosen techniques had been “incorporated highly creatively” as opposed to describing the technique, giving little indication of how the chosen technique conveyed meaning. This area was significantly weaker for candidates which had chosen the design option.

- How ideas had been developed

The very best work focused on specific amendments/refinements which had a significant impact on the quality of the work during the rehearsal process. The most successful work focused on two/three amendments, analysing and evaluating the significant impact these changes had on the performance piece.

AO2 - Apply theatrical skills to realise artistic intentions in live performance.

The performances were generally of a good standard with some outstanding examples of good practice at some centres. The most successful candidates, both in acting and design, demonstrated a clear understanding of the chosen practitioner. Similarly, where the design work was of a very high standard it was evident the designer had worked consistently with the actors throughout the rehearsal process.

The chosen style was often not clear in the case of weaker candidates but this was, generally, acknowledged in the centre marking. Group timings were not adhered to within a minority of centres. We would remind centres to adhere to the specified timings as these make a significant contribution in helping candidates shape and structure their final performance.

As in previous years it was apparent in a small percentage of groups, that a candidate had been misplaced. For example, a candidate who had learnt the work had been placed within a group where the others consistently forgot their lines or were under rehearsed. Whilst the board recognises the difficulties and logistics of organising the realised performance, the structure and composition of a group can have a significant impact on the candidate’s final mark. The structure of the group should be considered at the beginning of the process. Most centres ensured that candidates were provided with a suitable space and simple design elements, for example, costume and music, which had a significant impact on the overall performance. Whilst we acknowledge that not all centres have ‘excellent’ facilities, we would encourage centres to use simple lighting, costume, music/sound and basic set to help create a sense of theatricality. However, we would ask centres not to use extended blackouts and numerous set changes, which have a significant impact on the structure and flow of the final performance.

Whilst candidates are marked/moderated on the quality of their work, we would remind centres that if the final performance has to be performed in a classroom, part of the assessment criteria states, “the performance space is used imaginatively to communicate meaning”. It would be helpful if desks could be rearranged, and wall boards covered to help create a sense of theatricality. As technology improves, moderators noted that candidates are increasingly using lighting, projections, sound, and music to enhance the quality of the final performance.

AO4- Analyse and evaluate their own work and the work of others.

The evaluations tended to be more polarised in the level of attainment. The successful work clearly focused on the evaluation and analysis of performance/design skills, highlighting successful and unsuccessful elements of the piece, role/design interpretation and individual contribution to the work as a whole. This work concentrated wholly on their individual performance as opposed to the group. It focused on the final performance and did not veer back into the rehearsal process. Clear and meaningful examples from the final performance were referenced to illustrate key points.

The weakest section for many candidates tended to be how their individual performance contributed to fulfilling their initial aims and objectives by referring to the practitioner and stimulus. Candidates need to analyse and evaluate where, in the final performance, they were responsible for highlighting the stimulus and practitioner.

Centres are reminded that candidates are allowed to use two sides of A4 bullet points. However, these should be uploaded with the rest of the work for any selected candidates.

Finally, we would like to thank centres for all their hard work in preparing candidates for this component.

DRAMA

GCSE

Summer 2024

Component 2: Performing Theatre

Overview of the Component

This component is worth 20% of the qualification.

Non-exam assessment: Internally assessed, externally moderated.

Learners are required to participate in a performance based on the study of two significant, ten-minute extracts from a text, which have been performed professionally and/or written for theatrical performance. An examiner marks the performance which focuses on three key strands:

- Application of performance/design skills to realise artistic intentions.
- Interpretation and engagement to realise artistic intentions.
- Contribution to the performance as a whole to realise artistic intentions.

General Comments on Component 2

- Centres should check their school's calendar thoroughly before submitting/accepting an exam date.
- Many examiners felt that a significant number of centres did not have the specified paperwork available on the day of the exam. Centres must check what forms are required and which forms need to be signed. The examiner will clearly outline the necessary paperwork requirements in their initial email.
- Centres are reminded that programme proformas and artistic intentions should be sent to their examiner at least two weeks before the visit.
- Visiting examiners will not conduct vivas with GCSE design candidates.
- Performances should be uploaded onto SURPASS within 14 days of the final performance.
- All candidates should introduce themselves at the beginning of each performance, stating name, role and candidate number.
- Although most centres recognise Component two is an external exam and should be treated accordingly, examiners reported that some centres treated the exam with nonchalance and an overly relaxed approach. Whilst examiners recognise it is a stressful day for both candidates and teachers, it is disconcerting to see students eating throughout the performances and using their phones whilst other candidates are performing.

Assessment Overview

Overall, examiners reported that, as in previous years, the work was generally of a very good standard, with examiners considering themselves privileged to experience some outstanding performances and design. There was a breadth of new texts evidenced this year which was particularly pleasing. These included playwrights Morgan Lloyd Malcolm, Ryan Calais Cameron, Arinze Kene, Sonali Bhattacharyya, Claire Dowie, Ali Taylor and Anya Reiss. Work by these playwrights seemed to work well for young actors and gave them the opportunity to meet the requirements of band 5.

Examiners noted that there was also some excellent exploration of the work of more traditional playwrights. For example, there were some excellent performances using the work of Harold Pinter. Centres that were the most successful explored pauses and silence, utilising these to show expert understanding of character and relationship. Comedies such as *The Importance of Being Earnest* and *Blithe Spirit* demonstrated an excellent understanding of performing comic characters and comic timing.

Where all candidates across the ability range were able to fulfil their potential, examiners noted that extracts had been carefully selected to suit everyone's ability. There were instances however where every candidate had been given the same play or scene which is not necessarily the best way to support pupil attainment, as one specific scene/play may not cater for each individual candidate's skills or ability. As in previous years, examiners felt that multi-rolling (other than in clear ensemble work for example, Bouncers, Shakers, Teechers etc) did impact on the work of some candidates. For example, in *Blood Brothers*, a candidate played Edward in one scene and Mrs Johnson in the second. Whilst the specification does not specify candidates cannot multi-role it does put additional pressure on candidates to fulfil the assessment objectives for two separate characters within a brief performance. Similarly, when changing the gender of a character within a play, centres are reminded whether that change can fulfil the assessment objective; "Excellent and fully effective and fully coherent interpretation of character sustained throughout the performance".

Examiners noted that it was useful when centres choose extracts that showed a clear development in character, such as a moment at the beginning of the play and a moment at the end of the play. This allowed candidates to showcase their range of skills and show a high level of understanding of the shifting dynamics of the relationships between characters. Most centres ensured that candidates had a specified performance space, basic costume, set/props and some lighting and sound. One examiner commented that in the best centre they visited, candidates performed in a small classroom but every effort had been made to make it a theatrical experience. The candidates had been taught extremely well and as a result achieved high marks.

Centres are reminded that if set and props are to be used, please ensure they have rehearsed with them prior to the day of the exam. Also ensure that candidates are wearing suitable footwear as this can impede the movement within the performance. Some examiners noted that a minority of centres had significant gaps between the two scenes. Centres are reminded that even with a design candidate the two scenes should flow seamlessly with the minimum of disruption.

Although much improved from the previous two years, examiners also reported that a significant number of candidates were still unsure of their lines and relied on scripts, which made it very difficult for them to fulfil the assessment criteria. For those who have chosen acting as their skill, knowing their lines is a basic requirement for this component. We would remind centres that scripts should not be used where possible. Candidates will receive more marks for learning a small proportion of the script, even if it falls under the specified time rather than just reading a script.

The number of candidates opting for the design option continues to grow. As with Component 1, the very best design work showed a close collaboration between actors and designers throughout the rehearsal process. Although facilities vary, some examiners noted that some outstanding work had been viewed in centres with limited facilities but with highly imaginative design ideas. The weakest design work tended to be by candidates who had chosen the design option but had little or no understanding of the basic requirements. Centres are reminded to familiarise candidates with the minimum requirements for Component 2 to ensure all specified criteria are fulfilled. For example costume, hair and make-up for one character. Centres are also reminded that the size of the group and length of the performance must be adhered to.

Undoubtedly the best work across the ability range in both performance and design indicated that candidates had been given sufficient preparation time to rehearse and refine their work which resulted in polished, final performances.

Examiners noted that a significant number of candidates had been given texts which clashed with their Component 3 texts. Centres have been repeatedly reminded of this. **The text chosen for Component 2 must contrast in date written for the text chosen for Component 3. This is a requirement stipulated by OFQUAL and failure to adhere will result in candidates being penalised 5 marks.**

Comments on individual questions/sections

AO2- Apply theatrical skills to realise artistic intentions in live performance.

Examiners noted that a significant percentage of candidates applied performance skills effectively. The very best performance work utilised vocal and physical skills effectively, with mature interaction between performers. Design work which was deemed excellent demonstrated sensitive application which made a significant contribution in enhancing the mood and atmosphere.

Both performance and design work which demonstrated a high level of understanding showed an excellent understanding of character/text. The performance/design was focused, sustained throughout and had been thoroughly researched and rehearsed.

Where the individual contribution both in performance and design was excellent, it fully enhanced the overall piece.

Artistic Intentions

The artistic intentions, although not assessed, form an integral part in assisting the examiner in assessing the realisation of artistic intentions.

Examiners reported that the standard of the Artistic Intentions forms continue to improve. Most centres had followed guidance and encouraged candidates to focus on specific areas as opposed to generic commentary, such as “use my movement and voice to create a character”.

Centres are reminded that where candidates performed multiple characters, it is useful to clearly outline the interpretation of each character within the artistic intention form. This helps the examiner gain a clearer understanding of their aims and objectives.

Design candidates can and should include additional material. For example, lighting plots and mood boards, to support their design in performance. Although not assessed, additional material for design candidates can aid the examiners understanding of the design in performance.

Finally, we would like to thank centres for all their hard work in preparing candidates for this component.

DRAMA

GCSE

Summer 2024

Component 3- Interpreting Theatre

Overview of the Component

Written examination: 1 hour 30 minutes

40% of the qualification

This was the first year for the new texts, with an additional two texts being offered for study; centres can now choose from a wider range of plays representing a broad variety of genres and themes.

The questions in this year's paper were balanced with a focus on both acting and technical elements. Examiners noted that on the whole, the candidates' understanding of acting continued to outweigh their understanding of design within their set text; particularly their ability to identify a specific theatrical style and design for their specified style.

Some candidates continue to read the questions incorrectly and focus on areas which are either not specified in the rubric or do not fulfil the requirements of the question. However, the majority of candidates timed the paper well and completed both sections effectively giving detailed responses.

General Comments

General Comments on Component 3

- This year was the first year with the new set texts. The full range of texts are being studied by centres, with Noughts and Crosses proving very popular.
- On the whole the design element of the paper continues to present the most challenge to candidates which is impacting on the ability of some to reach the top marks.
- It is clear that the majority of centres are providing candidates with positive experiences in a creative environment, allowing them to enjoy their GCSE Drama course whilst enriching their knowledge and understanding.
- Centres are reminded of the range of resources, such as exemplar material and forthcoming Professional Learning sessions which are available to view and book on the EDUQAS website.
- Centres are reminded of the range of resources available, such as exemplar material and forthcoming Professional Learning sessions, all of which are available to view and book on the EDUQAS website.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A

- Q.1** (i) Most students answered this reasonably well, covering a range of movement techniques such as gesture, facial expression and gait. Some students strayed away from the opening of the extract despite the rubric clearly stating the beginning.
- (ii) Some students gave their reasons in their answer to part one which they then repeated in their answer to part two, which of course used up valuable time in the examination.
- Q.2** (i) On the whole, this question was well answered. However, there was a wide range of interpretation of what some candidates understood by character. Some gave a general summary of the character in the play; others focused more on the character motivation within the extract.
- (ii) On the whole, the second part of the question was quite well answered. Occasionally candidates did not always link the statements about voice to the observations they made in the first part of the question.
- Q.3** (i) This question was generally well answered, with candidates successfully describing the atmosphere of the extract.
- (ii) Lighting and sound design was attempted well by most candidates with the very best candidates linking the lighting and sound to the atmosphere noted in (i). Many candidates suggested lighting and sound which was justified against other things rather than just atmosphere and in some answers, there were inaccurate references to the wrong types of lanterns.
- Q.4** This question was generally well answered with candidates successfully describing the relationship between the two characters in the set extract. However, a few candidates failed to give a balanced response to both characters and focused their response on one character only.
- The most successful responses demonstrated an excellent and perceptive understanding of character relationships, using purposeful references to support their ideas.
 - Voice: The most successful responses focused on key lines and gave vocal suggestions discussing tone, tempo, volume, accent, pause, and explaining how vocal technique could communicate the subtleties in the relationship between the characters.
 - Movement: The strongest responses tracked through the extract focusing on key moments, discussing quality of movement, gesture, facial expressions, stillness, proxemics, and how movement could communicate interaction and relationship.
 - Top mark answers displayed a detailed and discerning understanding of interaction within the extract.
 - On the whole candidates displayed a sound understanding of drama terminology.

Q.5 This question caused some issues for a number of candidates. The majority chose a suitable extract however, many did not understand traverse staging and consequently their answers were unclear and disjointed. A minority of candidates discussed the scene specified for Q.1-4. Q.5 should demonstrate a candidate's wider knowledge of the play.

- The majority of candidates were aware of the stage used for the original production. A small percentage of candidates spent too long discussing this area, which impacted on the quality of their response. A brief sentence or two is all that is required to fulfil this element of the question. Centres are reminded that information regarding the original staging of the new texts can be found on the EDUQAS resources website.
- There were some excellent answers with candidates clearly using the traverse purposefully and displaying a mature understanding of the broad opportunities offered by this type of stage.
- Many candidates clearly did not understand the traverse stage and often it was unclear what stage candidates were referring to in their answers.
- Some candidates wrote equally on each bullet point resulting in ideas for actual set and props being slightly limited due to time constraints.
- A small percentage of candidates discussed the play in general as opposed to the specified section.
- A small percentage of candidates discussed other design elements, for example, lighting and sound, which impacted on the quality of their final response.
- A significant percentage discussed a general overview of how set and props could be used in the whole play instead of focusing on the chosen extract and highlighting specific key moments.
- The best answers produced detailed and imaginative responses covering all specified areas. These candidates gave a detailed and perceptive description of the set and props and linked these ideas effectively to key themes and messages. Their ideas were linked to relevant knowledge, understanding and use of drama terminology.

Section B

As in previous years, candidates had been given the opportunity to view live or online versions of live productions, which evidently had inspired and excited them. Both the design and acting option were generally well answered, with the majority of candidates following the required rubric.

Q8.1

On the whole, this question was well answered. There was quite a range in the length of moments chosen and consequently the detail that candidates provided. A number of candidates gave a description of what the lighting was actually doing with only a reasonable level of analysis and evaluation. Some candidates found it difficult to articulate their own personal response.

- A small number of candidates only discussed one moment as opposed to the specified two.
- Some candidates failed to state the production they had viewed.
- Some candidates gave detailed plot summaries which are not required and used up valuable time.
- Candidates tended to describe as opposed to analysis and evaluate.

Q9.1

Again, on the whole, this question was well answered. There was quite a range in the length of moments chosen and consequently the detail that candidates provided. Some candidates talked about a single utterance made by an actor and discussed the effectiveness of this whilst others worked through a much longer scene, providing a much more detailed response. Quite often personal response to the actor's performance were tagged on at the end of a number of responses rather than as an ongoing element within the response.

- A small number of candidates only discussed one moment as opposed to the specified two.
- A small number of candidates discussed different actors/characters in the two chosen moments.
- Some candidates failed to state the production they had viewed.
- Some candidates gave detailed plot summaries which are not required and used up valuable time.
- Candidates tended to describe as opposed to analysis and evaluate.

Finally, we would like to thank centres for all their hard work in preparing candidates for this component.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 02920 404299

Email: drama@edugas.co.uk

Qualification webpage: [GCSE Drama | Edugas](#)

See other useful contacts here: [Useful Contacts | Edugas](#)

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: <https://www.edugas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/>

Regional Rep Team

Our regional team covers all areas of England and can provide face-to-face and online advice at a time which is convenient to you.

Get in contact today and discover how our team can support you and your students.
[Regional Support Team | Edugas](#)

Edugas Qualifications

We are one of the largest providers of qualifications for schools, academies, sixth form and further education colleges across England, offering valued qualifications to suit a range of abilities. Each and every one of our qualifications is carefully designed to engage students and to equip them for the next stage of their lives.

We support our education communities by providing trusted qualifications and specialist support, to allow our students the opportunity to reach their full potential.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk