

GCSE Examiners' Report

Drama

GCSE

Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2025



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.eduqas.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- Devising Theatre	7
Component 2- Performing from a Text	10
Component 3-Interpreting Theatre	13
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	17

Executive Summary

Component 1: Devising Theatre

Portfolios (A01) were generally of good quality when centres followed the specification and assessment objectives. The most successful candidates addressed all three required sections systematically, producing well-balanced and focused work. However, some centres did not adhere to the specified structure, resulting in diluted submissions that were harder to assess. Common issues included the inclusion of irrelevant or extraneous material, unclear organisation, and exceeding the word count. Centres are reminded that penalties must be applied as outlined in the specification.

Performances (A02) were generally strong, with examiners recording numerous examples of outstanding practice. High-achieving candidates showed a clear understanding of their chosen practitioner, with effective design candidates working collaboratively with actors throughout rehearsals. Candidates who achieved lower outcomes often failed to demonstrate a consistent application of style, with most centres acknowledging this when marks were awarded.

Moderators commented that evaluations (A04) continue to show a greater disparity in attainment. Strong candidates focused on individual performance or design, using meaningful examples from the final performance to analyse and evaluate their own contribution. They avoided discussing the rehearsal process and maintained a focus on their aims, objectives, and use of practitioner and stimulus. Weaker evaluations often strayed into group work or lacked connection to initial intentions.

Component 2: Performing from a Text

Overall, performances were of a very good standard, with some examiners witnessing outstanding performance and design work. Where centres selected extracts that suited the individual strengths of each candidate, all were able to perform to their potential. However, in some cases, every candidate was given the same scene or play, which may not support individual attainment or attributes. Centres should consider a more tailored approach to extract selection, with a more individualised approach ensuring that varying abilities can still showcase their talents and achieve positively.

Component 3: Interpreting Theatre

The written examination (A03 and A04) introduced a new format this year by including the set extracts for Section A within the examination paper. Candidates performed more confidently in performance-based questions than in design, with many struggling to address staging styles such as theatre in the round. Misinterpretation of question demands, and time management were recurring issues, with many examiners reporting that candidates had spent too long on Section B responses. Strong answers were detailed, scene-specific, and used subject specific terminology, while those that lacked depth or veered off-topic achieved less favourably. Section B showed enthusiastic engagement with live theatre, though some answers were overly descriptive or relied on pre-learned content, as opposed to analysis and evaluation. Design responses needed more evaluation, while acting responses often lacked focus on performance techniques and subject terminology. Clearer understanding of theatre craft, application of analysis and a balanced approach to time allocation are seen as areas for development.

Our digital resources website has many blended learning lessons and knowledge organisers, that may help in improving on those areas outlined in the report:

Areas for improvement	Classroom resources	Brief description of resource
Component 1 Portfolio	• Eduqas GCSE Guidance for Teaching • Portal by WJEC	GfT Document, created to assist teacher sin delivering the course. Exemplar materials from previous CPD events.
Lack of consistent application of style in performances (AO2)	• Refining a performance - Eduqas GCSE Drama Revision	GCSE Bitesize interactive revision and learning resources
Tailored Component 2 pieces	• Eduqas GCSE Drama Unscrambling Scripted CPD Materials : Portal by WJEC	CPD courses materials; booklet and PowerPoint provides guidance on how to select scripts
Component 3 responses	• Eduqas GCSE SAMs • Eduqas GCSE Resources	Eduqas GCSE SAMs and Exam Walk Through materials

DRAMA

GCSE

Summer 2025

Component 1- Devising Theatre

Overview of the Component

Non-exam assessment: Internally assessed, externally moderated. 60 marks.

Component 1 is 40% of the qualification. It consists of 3 assessment objectives:

- A01 (20%)- Create and develop ideas to communicate meaning for theatrical performance
- A02 (10%)- Apply theatrical skills to realise artistic intentions in live performance
- A04 (10%)- Analyse and evaluate their own work and the work of others.

Learners are required to devise a piece of original theatre in response to a stimulus, using either the techniques of an influential theatre practitioner or the characteristics of a genre of drama.

Moderators felt Component 1 was generally well-handled by the majority of centres, with most candidates taking great pride in their work and evidently enjoying 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 a growing trend in the number of centres/candidates choosing the design option for this component, with numerous examples of exceptional design work.

Comments on individual questions/sections

A01: Create and develop ideas to communicate meaning for theatrical performance

As in previous years, moderators noted that those 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 also 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 tangibly incorporated practitioner/style understanding within the final performance, evidencing 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 and development, highlighting 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. Several centres are still doing mood board style portfolios, which run the risk of not focusing on the specific content required, as well as making the wordcount ambiguous. As in previous years, stage 2 remains the weakest, with candidates not clearly addressing how ideas from the chosen practitioner/genre had been incorporated into the piece to communicate meaning. Whilst the understanding was often apparent in the realisation of the piece, candidates were unable to analyse and evaluate why a specific technique had been chosen or the intended impact they were seeking within the final performance. Often coverage of how the practitioner was applied appeared as a list of techniques rather than how they had incorporated into the rehearsal process. Frequently the design portfolios did not focus on the design, rather discussing plot or characters, and in these instances, were often overmarked as they did not fulfil the AO criteria. Conversely several performance candidates using Brecht referenced a lot of Brechtian staging devices as opposed to focusing on Brechtian performance techniques.

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. Several moderators also commented on work exceeding the stipulated word count of 900 words. Please note that work exceeding the word limit by over 100 words must have a penalty applied, as outlined in the specification.

AO2: Apply theatrical skills to realise artistic intentions in live performance

Moderators noted that, like in previous years, this element produced some exceptional work. The very best work, demonstrated by both performance and design candidates alike, showed a sophisticated understanding of theatrical techniques, tangibly evidenced within 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. Although examiners witnessed some exceptional work using practitioners such as Berkoff and Paper Birds, the work of certain practitioners such as Emma Rice lacked both the understanding and the facilities to produce a piece of work that truly reflected the style.

As in previous years, the work involving some practitioners tended to focus on one specific aspect of the style. In some highly successful instances of Musical Theatre, for example, candidates had carefully crafted song, movement and dialogue into a devised performance, therefore fulfilling all of the assessment criteria. However, in other less successful instances of the same style, work consisted of a random selection of songs and dances, displaying little relevance to the chosen stimuli and the final performance lacking shape and structure. Centres should also note that the chosen style must allow candidates to access all the assessment criteria. Physical Theatre for example, must include dialogue and should not be comprised solely of movement. Candidates who play masked or mute characters need to find opportunities to display facial expressions and vocal skills respectively. Examiners also commented that some performances, in the style of horror or comedy, were less successful because they lacked a coherent performance skill.

This series included several centres that had produced some very sophisticated design work, with the number of candidates choosing sound design increasing. The very best candidates were not just creating playlists but creating their own sounds and underscores for challenging practitioners such as Artaud. Centres are reminded to check the specification for the minimum requirements for design candidates, with examiners reporting that several costume candidates did not include hair and make-up as part of their design. Centres are also reminded that performance candidates must adhere to the specified timings outlined in the specification.

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. Candidate need to analysis and evaluation where, in the final performance, they were responsible for highlighting the stimulus and practitioner. As in previous years, a significant percentage of candidates focused on the rehearsal process as opposed to the final performance.

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. Moderators noted that a significant number of centres failed to upload them.

Key points

- 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 where these were included, they proved helpful 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 with optimal effectiveness. Moderators noted that cameras positioned at a distance from the performance, with audience obscuring the view etc did make the moderation process more difficult.
- Candidate introductions are still proving problematic. Centres need to ensure that moderators can be sure who each candidate is.
- 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. Several moderators noted that some centres had not followed the guidance issued the previous years and as a result the same errors when assessing candidate's work were repeated.

DRAMA

GCSE

Summer 2025

Component 2- Performing from a Text

Overview of the Component

Non-exam assessment: externally assessed by a visiting examiner.

Component 2 is 20% of the qualification. It consists of 1 assessment objective:

- A02 (20%)- Apply theatrical skills to realise artistic intentions in live performance

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

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

Overall, examiners reported that, as in previous years, the work was generally of a very good standard, with some examiners privileged to experience some outstanding performances and design. It was also noted that a significant number of centres choose work by contemporary playwrights, which produced work that many candidates across the ability range were able to identify with.

Examiners noted that there was also some excellent exploration of the work of more traditional playwrights, such as Ibsen's *Doll's House*. Centres that were the most successful explored subtext and control of dialogue to show expert understanding of character and relationship. Comedies such as *Blithe Spirit* and *Teechers* demonstrated an excellent understanding of performing comic characters, along with comic timing. 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.

Although several warnings and reminders have been issued, examiners continue to note that a significant number of candidates had been given texts which clashed with their Component 3 texts.

Comments on individual questions/sections

A02- Apply theatrical skills to realise artistic intentions in live performance

Examiners were privileged to view some outstanding performances which demonstrated excellent and highly effective application of skills and interpretation of character/design. The very best work showed a mature understanding of the performance script, with every effort taken to produce a polished and refined piece of theatre. 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. However, there were instances 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 or 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 such as *Bouncers*, negatively impacted the work of some candidates. An example was noted during a performance of *Be my Baby*, where a candidate played Matron in one scene and Dolores 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 to consider whether that change can fulfil the assessment objective: *Excellent and fully effective and fully coherent interpretation of character sustained throughout the performance*. Examiners also commented that several centres had given candidates extracts from plays which were far too difficult for the individual such as *Journey's End* and *The Tempest*. 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.

However, it was noted by a few examiners that several centres had significant gaps between the two scenes, where the candidates went off to stage and interacted with the audience. This not only impacted on the time space allocated for the exam but in many cases, negatively impacted the candidate's performance. Centres are reminded that even with a design candidate, the two scenes should flow seamlessly with the minimum of disruption. 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 as every effort had been made to make it a theatrical experience, candidates achieved high marks. Centres are reminded that if set and props are to be used, please ensure candidates have rehearsed with them prior to the day of the exam. Furthermore, ensure that candidates are wearing suitable footwear, as this can impede the movement within the performance. Although much improved from the previous two years, examiners 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. Candidates will receive more marks for learning a small proportion of the script, even if it falls under the specified time, as opposed to just reading from 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, 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.

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 the generic “use my movement and voice to create a character”. 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 examiner’s understanding of the design in performance.

Overview of the Unit

Comments on individual questions/sections

Key Points

- Centres should check their school’s calendar thoroughly before submitting or 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.
- Visting examiners will not conduct vivas with GCSE design candidates for the current specification
- 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 Unit two is an external exam and should be treated accordingly, examiners reported that some centres treated the exam with a sense of nonchalance and were overly relaxed in their approach. Whilst examiners recognise it is a stressful day for both candidates and teachers alike, it is disconcerting to see students eating or using their phones while other candidates are performing.

DRAMA

GCSE

Summer 2025

Component 3 – Interpreting Theatre

Overview of the Component

Written examination: 1 hour 30 minutes

Component 3 is 40% of the qualification. It consists of 2 assessment objectives:

- AO3 (30%)- Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how drama and theatre is developed and performed.
- AO4 (10%)- Analyse and evaluate their own work and the work of others.

This component requires learners to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of how drama and theatre is developed and performed through the study of a performance text and through responding to live theatre.

This was the first year where the set extract for questions in Section A was included on the question paper. This change was made to eliminate inconsistencies regarding the use of different editions of set texts and to simplify the process of cross-referencing during the examination. Recognising that this new arrangement may have negatively impacted on some candidates, particularly those who had rehearsed using different formats or who were unfamiliar with working directly from the provided extract, the mark scheme was amended accordingly to ensure fairness. Adjustments were made to accommodate potential disparities in candidate performance resulting from this change.

The questions in the paper were well-balanced, offering a balanced focus on both acting and technical design elements. However, examiners observed that, overall, candidates demonstrated a stronger understanding of acting compared to design within their set texts. Many struggled to accurately identify the use of *theatre in the round* and to design effectively for this theatrical style. Misinterpretation of questions remained a common issue, with some candidates addressing areas not specified in the rubric or failing to meet the specific demands of the question. While many candidates completed both sections, a noticeable number spent disproportionately long on Section B, which in some cases led to rushed or underdeveloped responses in Section A.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A

- Q.1 (i) This opening question was very accessible, with nearly all candidates earning full marks. However, its simplicity meant it did little to differentiate between candidates, suggesting a solid understanding of the basic dramatic terms or concepts being assessed.
- (ii) In the second part, candidates generally demonstrated a sound understanding of rehearsal techniques. However, a recurring issue was the confusion between *rehearsal techniques* and *performance skills*, with some candidates referring to vocal and physical skills (e.g. tone or movement) rather than describing strategies used in the rehearsal process. This distinction must be reinforced in future teaching to ensure clarity.
- Q.2 (i) Responses to this question were generally well-structured and competent. Most candidates were able to identify a character's motivation effectively and earned the available marks. This showed secure knowledge of character analysis and interpretation.
- (ii) There was a noticeable lack of clarity around the term *emphasis*. Many candidates misunderstood it, often discussing how tone could be used to "emphasise" certain lines or emotions, without explicitly analysing the impact of emphasis itself in terms of dramatic delivery. A clear differentiation between tone, volume, and emphasis needs to be embedded further through practical classroom work and model responses.
- Q.3 (i) Candidate performance varied. While some provided insightful descriptions of character traits within the scene, others strayed into generic character summaries or motivations unrelated to the specific moment in question. There is a need to maintain a scene-specific focus when analysing character.
- (ii) This costume and makeup question was generally answered with confidence. Garment details were often rich and descriptive, allowing candidates to access the higher marks. However, responses around makeup were sometimes lacking, with some stating "no makeup" or omitting it altogether. Candidates should be encouraged to consider subtle elements such as a flushed face or age-related makeup to enrich their answers.
- Q.4 This question yielded a wide range of responses, highlighting disparities in candidate understanding of set design and its application to performance. Several key trends emerged:
- Sightlines overemphasised: Many candidates focused excessively on sightlines and audience visibility, sometimes at the expense of engaging meaningfully with the scene's visual environment.
 - Stage shape and abstract design: Considerable time was spent describing the type of stage i.e. in the round, often without linking the choices to the scene's needs.
 - Minimalist staging: Many candidates selected minimal staging but then struggled to offer content-rich responses due to the absence of detail to discuss.

- Innovative ideas not fully developed: There were imaginative uses of projections and digital screens (e.g., hanging screens or behind-the-audience designs), but these were frequently underexplored or lacked specific placement or function within the scene.
- Common technical elements: Revolving stages, hydraulics, and lighting used to establish location were common and accepted by the mark scheme. However, candidates often failed to explain their significance or integration with the narrative.
- Misunderstanding of "staging": A notable number interpreted staging as character movement rather than scenic design or prop placement, indicating a need for further clarification in teaching.
- Stronger responses: The best candidates provided extremely detailed accounts of specific set items, their condition, colour, and placement. These responses offered layered analysis and imaginative interpretations of the scene's demands.
- Off-task responses: A small number of candidates mistakenly referenced the wrong scene; however, the mark scheme did accommodate this where appropriate.
- Overall, candidates must be encouraged to provide precise, justified, and scene-specific detail in design-related questions.

Q.5 This question, which assesses a candidate's broader knowledge of the play through the exploration of a specific character trait, was among the most successfully answered.

- Appropriate scene selection: Most candidates selected suitable extracts and developed clear, well-supported analyses.
- Common errors: A small number mistakenly wrote about the scene already discussed in Questions 1–4, however this year the mark scheme was adjusted to allow for this.
- Effective structure: Most candidates examined two key scenes, either consecutively or by weaving them into a comparative structure. This showed excellent planning and conceptual understanding.
- Vocal reference: While vocal techniques are important, many unnecessarily included these when not required, missing opportunities to elaborate on more relevant physical and spatial skills.
- High-quality responses: Strong answers referenced proxemics, gesture, facial expression, and movement in detail. Quotation usage was often apt and analytical.
- Terminology: Many candidates demonstrated an excellent grasp of drama-specific vocabulary, strengthening their evaluative and analytical responses.

Section B: Response to Live Theatre

Candidates were given the opportunity to respond to either acting or design elements from a live or digitally streamed production. As in previous years, this section revealed a genuine engagement with performance and a diverse range of productions.

Question 8.1 (Design Focus)

- Positive trends: Many candidates explored set and props with enthusiasm. The use of digital theatre (e.g. online performances) was successfully integrated and fully accepted.
- Weaker responses: These typically involved mere description with little linkage to intended meaning or audience impact.

- Evaluation framework: Stronger candidates followed a clear evaluative structure—identifying what was seen, its symbolic or thematic meaning, the effect on the audience, and their personal response.
- Common issue: Some answers lacked a personal or evaluative response, reducing their effectiveness. Emphasis on interpretation and analysis, rather than description, needs to be further reinforced.

Question 9.1 (Acting Focus)

- Common weaknesses: Many responses leaned too heavily on recounting the plot or character background rather than focusing on the acting techniques employed.
- Performance skills: The best candidates identified and evaluated a wide range of performance techniques (e.g., gesture, timing, use of space), linking them to audience impact and character development.
- Time management: A notable issue was the length of responses. Many candidates seemed to tackle this question first, resulting in overly long answers that compromised the depth and quality of their Section A responses.
- Prepared responses: Some candidates presented what appeared to be pre-learned essays, which did not always align with the question. This affected marks due to lack of relevance.

Summary and Recommendations

- Terminology and clarity: Greater emphasis is needed on understanding and applying key drama terms (e.g., emphasis, rehearsal technique vs. performance skill, staging).
- Scene specificity: Candidates must root their answers in specific scenes with detailed justification of their creative choices.
- The best answers combined both depth and breadth ensuring well balanced responses to the question which required extended answers.
- Time management: Candidates must be taught to divide their time more effectively between Sections A and B.
- Live theatre analysis: Encourage analytical frameworks to structure responses clearly, particularly in evaluating design and acting choices.

This cohort demonstrated enthusiasm, creativity, and commitment with increased emphasis on precision, detail, and analytical depth.

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@eduqas.co.uk

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

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

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.eduqas.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 | Eduqas](#)

Eduqas 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