GCE A Level Examiners' Report

Film Studies

A Level

Summer 2026

© WJEC CBAC Ltd. 2026



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 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)
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

[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.***

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Contents

	Page
Executive summary	**5**
Component 1: Varieties of Film and Filmmaking	**6**
Component 2: Global Filmmaking Perspectives	**14**
Component 3: Production	**23**
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	**28**

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Executive Summary

Component 1: Varieties of Film and Filmmaking

Performance in Component 1 was notably strong, with candidates demonstrating improved textual knowledge, analytical precision and time management compared with previous series. The most successful responses remained tightly focused on the question, integrated contextual knowledge effectively, and used detailed analysis to explain how meaning is constructed through film form. There was clear evidence of improved comparative skills and stronger engagement with a broader range of set films. Areas for development include the evaluation of the ideological critical approach, and greater precision when analysing elements of film form. Centres should continue to prioritise close analysis, direct engagement with question wording and the use of contextual knowledge to support, rather than replace, analysis.

Component 2: Global Filmmaking Perspectives

Candidates generally demonstrated secure knowledge of their chosen films and showed confidence in discussing representation, context, documentary practice and film movements. The strongest responses placed elements of film form at the heart of their arguments, using detailed analysis of carefully selected sequences to explore how meaning is created. Candidates who focused on depth rather than coverage performed particularly well, integrating contextual knowledge within their analysis. Weaker responses tended to rely on narrative description, broad contextual discussion or identification of techniques without explaining their significance. Future preparation should emphasise detailed analysis of fewer examples, sustained evaluation of question demands and use of specialist film terminology to explore the relationship between film form and meaning.

Component 3: Production

Component 3 showcased candidates' considerable creativity, with most centres selecting appropriate briefs and administering the assessment effectively. Short films and screenplays were generally well conceived, and assessment was often accurate, supported by detailed teacher commentary. There was a noticeable reduction in inappropriate use of music and greater confidence in screenplay formatting. However, recurring issues remained around compliance with technical requirements, including running times, word counts, storyboard quality and submission procedures. The evaluative analysis continues to be the most challenging element, with many candidates failing to focus sufficiently on the chosen brief, cinematic influences and the analysis of meaning and response in their own work. Centres should pay closer attention to assessment procedures, storyboard requirements and the structure of evaluative analyses, ensuring candidates analyse their creative decisions rather than describe production processes. Overall, the component reflected strong engagement with filmmaking and screenwriting, with many candidates demonstrating genuine passion and sophisticated understanding of the creative process.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

FILM STUDIES

GCE A level

Summer 2026

COMPONENT 1: VARIETIES OF FILM AND FILMMAKING

Overview of the Component

This component assesses candidates' abilities to:

AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of elements of film.

AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of elements of film to:

- analyse and compare films, including use of critical approaches.
- evaluate the significance of critical approaches.

Both assessment objectives are weighted equally for this component. AO1 is assessed in all sections and questions of the examination by requiring candidates to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the films studied, including relevant contextual knowledge. AO2 is assessed throughout the examination paper by requiring candidates to analyse films through the use of specified critical approaches. Section A assesses candidates' ability to use the Auteur critical approach in analysing films, Section B assesses the application of the critical approaches of Ideology and Spectatorship, and Section C assesses the use of the critical approaches of Narrative and Ideology. In addition, the ability to compare films is assessed in Section A and the ability to evaluate the significance of the Ideological critical approach is assessed in either Section B or Section C each year.

This year's examination proved to be accessible and highly engaging. Compared with previous series, there was a noticeable increase in responses that were able to show more detailed, developed knowledge and precise analytical skills, reflecting stronger textual knowledge, improved understanding of the core areas of study and greater confidence in addressing the specific focus of each question. Candidates also appeared to manage their time more successfully than in previous years. There were relatively few rubric infringements, fewer unfinished responses and a greater tendency for answers to remain closely focused on the wording of the questions. There was clear evidence that most centres have continued to respond positively to previous reports, particularly in preparing candidates for the importance of close textual analysis and the need to integrate contextual understanding effectively, although some centres still have work to do on this.

The strongest responses consistently maintained focus on the precise wording of the question, using accurate film terminology and applying knowledge purposefully rather than reproducing prepared material. These answers demonstrated a clear and very detailed understanding of how elements of film create meanings and responses, with candidates making effective use of relevant critical approaches to support analytical arguments. Successful responses also integrated contextual knowledge naturally, avoiding generalised historical discussion and instead showing how specific contexts informed interpretations of specific film texts. There was encouraging improvement in candidates' ability to analyse individual sequences in detail. Many candidates were able to move beyond narrative description and explain how filmmakers construct meaning through specific technical choices. However, some responses continued to rely on broad discussion of themes or plot summary rather than detailed analysis of film. Centres should continue to emphasise that Film Studies responses must remain rooted in the examination of the film text itself, with any

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

theoretical and contextual material used to support interpretation rather than replace close analysis.

The evaluation of the ideological critical approach remains an important area for development for some centres. Although, this year, many candidates demonstrated a stronger understanding of how to evaluate ideological analysis and applied this evaluation effectively to their chosen films, some responses continued to simply apply ideological analysis rather than evaluate the significance and usefulness of this approach to studying film or were very confused about how to answer questions like this because of poor preparation. Candidates must be taught to consider the advantages and disadvantages of this critical approach in relation to the specific films studied and other critical approaches if they are to fulfil the requirements of the specification.

The use of theory continues to require careful attention. Centres are reminded that theory is not a requirement. Some candidates incorporated theoretical terminology that was either insufficiently understood or irrelevant to Film Studies. In particular, spectatorship concepts were sometimes applied inaccurately or used as an additional layer of description rather than as a meaningful analytical tool. Centres should ensure that candidates understand that critical approaches should illuminate the study of film texts and should always be connected to specific examples from the films studied.

The range of film choices continues to be encouraging, with candidates demonstrating strong engagement with both established and less frequently selected films. Examiners welcomed a broader range of film choices than in recent years. While familiar films remained the most popular, there was an encouraging increase in responses on *Little Women, Moonlight, Promising Young Woman, Saint Maud, Mangrove and Mogul Mowgli*. Films such as *All About Eve, Imitation of Life, Nomadland, Night of the Living Dead and Beasts of the Southern Wild* appeared less often but frequently generated highly sophisticated responses.

Finally, clarity and precision in written communication remain essential. Strong responses were well structured, with clear lines of argument and purposeful use of evidence. Candidates should continue to practise writing under timed conditions, ensuring that all aspects of the question are addressed and that responses remain analytical rather than descriptive.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CENTRES

To consolidate and extend candidate achievement in future series, the following strategies are advised:

- Develop candidates' ability to evaluate the ideological critical approach through explicit and specific evaluative points supported by detailed evidence from the films studied. Some candidates remain underprepared for questions requiring the evaluation of ideological analysis, and centres should continue to address this aspect of AO2.
- Ensure that if candidates are using any theoretical approaches, that these are applied accurately and purposefully. Theory should function as a tool for analysing films rather than as an objective in itself. Candidates should be encouraged to prioritise relevant Film Studies concepts and, if using theory, connect theoretical discussion directly to specific cinematic examples.
- Continue to develop candidates' confidence in close textual analysis, particularly in distinguishing between different elements of film form and explaining how technical choices create meaning.
- Encourage candidates to use contextual knowledge precisely and avoid broad historical or social claims that are not clearly connected to the films studied.
- Emphasise the importance of responding directly to the question set. Pre-prepared responses should be avoided, rather than reproduced without a clear analytical focus.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

These areas for improvement are further detailed and expanded below with specific reference to the individual examination questions.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A: Hollywood 1930–1990

This section produced many strong and lengthy responses that showed highly detailed and comprehensive knowledge of the films studied and their contexts. In addition, there was a continued development of comparison skills shown which is a key aspect of AO2 for all questions in this section. More responses this year were able to show very good knowledge of their chosen films whilst responding to the questions with complex and sophisticated comparisons that produced high-band marks for many candidates that were well prepared for the demands of this section.

The most frequently studied films remain *Casablanca, Vertigo, Bonnie and Clyde, One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest, Alien and Do the Right Thing*, with smaller numbers of candidates choosing *Some Like It Hot, All About Eve, Imitation of Life and Night of the Living Dead*. It was very pleasing to see less regurgitation of case study learning unresponsive to the questions and more sophisticated selection and comparison of information relevant to the questions set used, although this does remain an issue for some candidates.

Question 1.1

Candidates adopted a range of valid approaches to this question. Many considered the extent to which mise-en-scène expressed an auteur signature in the films and sequences studied, while others argued that aspects of film form such as cinematography, narrative or thematic content were more significant than mise-en-scène. These approaches were successful where they maintained a clear focus on the demands of the question with clear comparisons. Some candidates emphasised the contributions of creative individuals other than the director, reflecting the collaborative nature of filmmaking, while others explored wider social, cultural, political or institutional influences, including cinematic conventions and studio styles. In some responses, these contextual factors were presented as having a greater influence than individual creative figures which was often a good way of engaging with the auteur debate productively. Several candidates supported their discussion by referring to other films by the directors studied or aspects of their personal lives which enabled them to show wider and deeper understanding of auteur signatures. These references were highly effective when they informed analysis of the set films but were not necessary for a successful response.

Strong candidates demonstrated precise knowledge of relevant auteur signatures and debates around authorship in relation to their studied films. Some very strong studies of *Vertigo, Some Like It Hot, One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest and Alien* focussed on mise-en-scène, or other aspects of film form, as an integrated expressive system rather than a collection of isolated visual features, and engaged critically with the concept of auteur instead of treating authorship as an unquestioned fact. Some very strong discussions of *Casablanca, Bonnie & Clyde, Do the Right Thing and Night of the Living Dead* questioned whether their films were ‘director as auteur’ films at all and better reflected collaborative and institutional auteur approaches. They explored how recurring stylistic and thematic concerns operated alongside and within industrial, social and historical influences and showed a good understanding of the auteur debate by incorporating productive references to ideas from Cahiers Du Cinema, Sarris and Kael in close reference to their chosen films.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

A recurring weakness was confusion between mise-en-scène and other aspects of film form. Whilst there are some overlaps, identified in the specification, references to music, shot types and continuity editing as mise-en-scène shows a lack of formal understanding or attempts to avoid answering the question set. Other weaker responses referred only implicitly to auteur or made generalised assumptions about their films' authorship, assuming rather than demonstrating the relationship between visual style and authorship. Such misunderstandings inevitably limited marks where discussion moved away from the precise focus of the question.

Question 1.2

Candidates demonstrated a range of approaches in responding to this question, anticipated by the mark scheme's indicative content. Most explored how social contexts were indeed reflected in the representation of ethnicity and/or gender in the films studied, although some argued that these representations were less directly shaped by social contexts but by other factors such as auteur, genre or narrative influences. Candidates supported their arguments through discussion of formal elements and aspects of meaning and response, comparing the set films and relating textual features to representational issues. Some responses also considered wider influences on representations, including auteur perspectives, historical events, institutional practices, technological developments, cultural hegemonies and dominant aesthetic styles which were productive when relevant to the films studied.

This question elicited some of the strongest responses on the paper. Candidates demonstrated increasingly secure historical understanding and were often able to connect contextual knowledge precisely with detailed textual analysis. Gender was generally addressed more confidently than ethnicity, particularly in responses on *Vertigo and Some Like It Hot*, while several candidates produced thoughtful discussions of gender identity in *Casablanca, Bonnie & Clyde and One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. It should be noted that 'ethnicity' is not the same as 'race' and the teaching of the different terms, in relation to the films studied, may help candidates be more meaningful and productive in their analysis of represented groups.

Some candidates, however, appeared to feel obliged to discuss both gender and ethnicity regardless of the wording of the question and where discussion of one area was only weakly supported by the chosen text, arguments often became superficial. Centres should remind candidates that the 'and/or' wording of the question allows them to focus confidently on the area most relevant to their chosen films and they should not feel that they will benefit by considering both options if not relevant to their chosen films. Another common issue with weaker responses to this question were scant and superficial references to contextual knowledge; references to social expectations and changes or even specific laws and events, occasionally relied on broad or inaccurate generalisations and showed very little knowledge and understanding of the contexts of the films studied. Whilst stronger responses used comparison purposefully to extend their arguments, weaker responses made only passing comparative references or omitted comparison altogether.

Section B: American Independent Film Since 2005

The evaluation of the ideological critical approach remains an important area for development in this component for some centres. Although, this year, many candidates demonstrated a stronger understanding of how to evaluate ideological criticism in direct relation to their chosen films, some responses continued to simply describe ideological ideas rather than evaluate the significance and usefulness of this approach to studying film. Too many candidates still assume that an 'ideological critical approach' is something that filmmakers do rather than something that film students do. Candidates should be taught to consider ideological criticism as a framework for interpreting representations, values and meanings within films, while also recognising its limitations and significance as an analytical

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

method. Candidates must be taught to consider the advantages and disadvantages of this critical approach in relation to the specific films studied and other critical approaches if they are to fulfil the requirements of the specification. Stronger responses supplied clear evaluative points with precise textual evidence rather than relying on broad generalisations or merely stating that it is or is not a useful way of studying the chosen films.

A broad range of films was represented in this section, including *Joker, Captain Fantastic, Get Out, Promising Young Woman, Moonlight, Little Women, Carol and La La Land*. Examiners noted particularly strong work on *Promising Young Woman, Moonlight, Carol, Beasts of the Southern Wild, La La Land* and *Get Out* which produced thoughtful and perceptive responses.

Question 2.1

Candidates adopted a range of valid approaches in answering this question. Many argued that ideological analysis provided a valuable framework for understanding filmmakers' aesthetic choices, while others questioned its usefulness or highlighted its limitations in favour of other, more productive, critical approaches. Successful responses maintained a clear focus on evaluation, supporting their arguments with specific and precise references to aesthetic choices in the films studied rather than extensive textual analysis. Candidates drew on a range of elements of film form, with some concentrating on particular aspects such as sound, editing or performance, while others considered the contribution of film form more broadly. Most responses focused on one sequence from each film, although some referred to multiple sequences where these supported their evaluation or discussions of aesthetic styles more effectively. Candidates adopted different ideological perspectives as an example of the ideological critical approach, either discussing a range of ideas and values or focusing on areas such as gender, race or class. Many responses successfully compared ideological study of film with a spectatorship approach and were able to show some serious flaws with traditional ideological analysis of films that might assume meaning is generated by the film alone.

The strongest responses clearly understood that ideological criticism is an interpretative lens applied by the analyst rather than a set of beliefs held by the filmmaker. These candidates integrated detailed sequence analysis with sophisticated discussion of perspectives such as Marxist, Feminist or Post-Colonial criticism, evaluating both the usefulness and limitations of these approaches rather than simply applying theoretical labels. The best responses were able to clearly identify how ideological analysis might, or might not, help us to understand and appreciate the film compared to other critical approaches.

There were some excellent responses that argued that ideological analysis of aesthetic choices was essential with some films because it helped an understanding of how and why films such as *Nomadland, Captain Fantastic, Get Out and Promising Young Woman* had been made by ideologically-motivated filmmakers. Some, very successful, responses showed how ideological analysis might not be as productive as the spectatorship or auteur critical approaches for understanding and appreciating the aesthetic choices made in the construction of *La La land, Joker and Carol*.

A significant number of candidates, however, continued to struggle with these evaluative questions. Some treated ideological criticism as the filmmaker's own 'ideology', while others demonstrated knowledge of theoretical concepts without connecting them convincingly to the construction of the films. Some responses also drifted into general discussion of film form rather than maintaining focus on the relationship between aesthetics and ideology. A very common weakness was in responses that merely stated that ideological study of film is, or is not, useful without developing any explicit reasoning to support this.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Question 2.2

Candidates adopted a range of approaches in evaluating the usefulness of an ideological critical approach in explaining spectators' emotional responses to the films studied. Many linked ideological analysis to emotional engagement, considering how ideas, values and meanings can shape audience responses. Some effectively explored how emotional responses related to film aesthetics, alignment with characters or other narrative experience rather than ideological positioning. Candidates interpreted emotional responses in different ways, discussing either shared or varied spectator reactions, with some drawing on their own responses and others considering how different audiences might respond. Successful responses maintained a clear focus on evaluating ideological analysis. Many considered spectator positioning through aspects such as character alignment, narrative construction, cinematography and editing to explain how emotional responses were encouraged. Candidates also adopted different ideological perspectives, either addressing a range of ideas and values or focusing on specific areas such as gender, race or class, where these approaches were supported by relevant analysis of the films studied.

This question generated some of the strongest work in this section. Successful candidates adopted a clear position and sustained it through detailed textual analysis, linking ideological processes convincingly to audience response or in refuting the idea that ideological analysis can explain emotional responses. Particularly impressive responses were seen on *Promising Young Woman, Carol, La La Land, Nomadland and Get Out*.

Some very successful responses showed how ideological analysis can change our appreciation of films, positively or negatively, by showing how studying films like *La La Land* and *Get Out* through an ideological lens might radically change our appreciation of them and our emotional responses on second or third viewings. There were some very complex discussions of how ideological analysis of films like *Nomadland and Joker* might not explain your initial emotional responses to the film as well as an aesthetic or narrative critical approach can but might deepen and intensify emotional responses later.

Less successful responses focused primarily on emotional reactions to the films without exploring whether ideological study can help explain what might shape those responses. Some responses became very confused and insecure Media Studies-based essays, concentrating on vague ideas about, irrelevant, audience positioning and Uses and Gratifications theories rather than addressing the specific demands of the question and showing relevant knowledge of Film Studies.

Section C: British Film Since 1995

Section C generated consistently strong responses, with candidates maintaining the quality of their writing in what is often the final section they tackle in the examination. Knowledge of the prescribed films was secure, responses were generally well structured, and candidates selected an impressive range of sequences to support their arguments. Although *Trainspotting, This Is England, Fish Tank, Shaun of the Dead* and *Belfast* remained popular, examiners were pleased to see strong responses on *Saint Maud, Mangrove, Mogul Mowgli, Under the Skin and We Need to Talk About Kevin*, many of which demonstrated particularly sophisticated and complex textual engagement.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Question 3.1

Candidates demonstrated a range of approaches in responding to this question. Stronger responses identified two specific narrative devices, such as plot, character, dialogue or setting, rather than referring to narrative in general terms or trying to analyse the use of too many specific devices. Candidates adopted different approaches to the selection of narrative devices, with some exploring the same devices across both films and others focusing on contrasting examples. Both approaches were acceptable. Responses often considered 'meaning' in a variety of ways, including ideological meanings, dramatic effects and emotional responses such as tension, shock, humour or catharsis. All these interpretations of 'meaning' were acceptable and accommodated by the mark scheme. Some candidates also explored narrative meanings through aspects such as character identification, cause and effect relationship and spectator engagement. Some responses effectively explored the use of conventional or unconventional narrative structures, including devices such as ellipsis, intertextuality, character functions, causality and resolution, to evaluate how narrative choices shaped meaning.

Most candidates understood the concept of narrative devices and selected suitable examples. Binary oppositions enabled sophisticated discussion of how narrative structure generates meaning and ideology in films like *This Is England, Fish Tank* and *Under The Skin*. There were also very strong responses that focussed on the importance of character and setting construction or plot structure for generating narrative and/or ideological meaning in films like *We Need to Talk About Kevin, Mogul Mowgli, Saint Maud* and *Trainspotting*. Stronger responses analysed two narrative devices with equal depth, exploring how narrative construction shaped audience engagement and contributed to meaning whilst showing detailed knowledge of the films and the narrative critical approach.

The most common weakness was imbalance between the two narrative devices. Candidates frequently analysed one in considerable depth before treating the second only briefly or mentioned many devices without analysing any of them in much depth. Others relied on relatively simple concepts such as linear structure without fully exploring their significance, while weaker responses drifted into plot description or broad ideological discussion. Some candidates identified Formalism and Structuralism as narrative devices rather than analytical approaches and needed to specify which devices or narrative elements they were referring to more clearly.

Question 3.2

Candidates adopted a range of effective approaches in responding to this question. Many focused on one key sequence from each film, identifying specific elements of cinematography and linking these to the construction of messages and values. Stronger responses demonstrated precise analysis of formal elements, with some concentrating on aspects such as framing, camera movement or shot type, while others considered a wider range of techniques. Many candidates explored how cinematography, and possibly other aspects of film form, contributed to wider narrative and contextual meanings while maintaining a clear focus on how messages and values were established. Some responses considered how spectators might develop similar or differing interpretations of the same formal choices, which was often relevant to the films studied. Candidates varied in their approach, with some examining a single key message or value and others exploring multiple meanings. Responses were most successful when they prioritised detailed analysis of the specified sequences rather than broader discussion of the films as a whole.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

This question produced some of the strongest responses on the paper. Candidates demonstrated very confident understanding of cinematography and generally employed accurate technical terminology throughout. The focus on messages and values encouraged detailed discussion of ideology rooted firmly in visual analysis rather than abstract theoretical commentary in most responses. *We Need to Talk About Kevin* and *Mogul Mowgli* produced particularly sophisticated responses, especially where candidates explored visual representations of identity and ideological positioning. There were many excellent discussions of very specific aspects of camera movement, lens selection, lighting and framing and how these produced very precise ideological positioning in films such as *Under the Skin, Saint Maud, Fish Tank* and *This Is England*. In contrast, some responses generated more general discussion, with candidates finding it harder to sustain detailed analysis or making very superficial references to film sequences. A minority of candidates drifted into discussion of broader aspects of film form rather than maintaining a sustained focus on cinematography or other aspects of form that would have been better to keep a rigorous focus on. Other weaker responses were rich in knowledge but lighter in analysis, identifying techniques without fully explaining how they conveyed meaning.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

FILM STUDIES

GCE A level

Summer 2026

COMPONENT 2: GLOBAL FILMMAKING PERSPECTIVES

Overview of the Component

The Component 2 paper provided candidates with a broad range of opportunities to demonstrate both secure knowledge and understanding of their chosen films and the ability to apply this knowledge analytically to the questions.

The questions were accessible to candidates who had prepared thoroughly. There was clear differentiation between the assessment objectives throughout the paper. Candidates were expected not only to demonstrate accurate knowledge of their set films, relevant contexts and specialist terminology (AO1), but also to apply this knowledge through focused analysis and evaluation in response to the specific wording and demands of each question (AO2). The strongest responses demonstrated a clear understanding that knowledge of a film is most valuable when it is used to develop a sustained argument and explore how meaning is constructed.

A consistent strength across the paper was the quality of responses from candidates who placed film form at the centre of their analysis. Successful candidates demonstrated confidence in discussing cinematography, editing, sound, mise-en-scène and performance, using accurate subject-specific terminology to explain how filmmakers construct meaning. This was evident across all sections, with strong responses exploring issues such as representation in Global Film, digital debates and filmmaker intention in Documentary, and realism vs expressionism, and experimental approaches within Film Movements. The most successful candidates were able to integrate contextual understanding naturally, using this knowledge to enhance rather than replace detailed textual analysis.

The strongest responses moved beyond description of narrative events or identification of film techniques. Instead, candidates selected well-chosen sequences and analysed them in detail, exploring how the interaction between film form, context and meaning shaped audience interpretation. These responses maintained a clear focus on the question throughout and developed coherent, evaluative arguments. In several areas, candidates demonstrated sophisticated understanding of complexity and nuance, recognising that representations, stylistic choices and documentary approaches can operate in multiple ways depending on context and interpretation.

A recurring feature of less successful responses was the tendency to demonstrate knowledge of the films without applying it sufficiently to the question. Some candidates relied on narrative description, contextual information or the identification of techniques without explaining their significance. Across the paper, some responses attempted to include too many sequences, which often resulted in broad coverage rather than detailed analysis. While this demonstrated secure familiarity with the texts, it limited opportunities for candidates to explore how meaning was constructed in specific moments.

Candidates are encouraged to select fewer, carefully chosen sequences and explore them in greater depth. Detailed analysis of a specific moment, supported by precise subject terminology and closely linked to the requirements of the question, is more effective than a broad survey of multiple scenes. Candidates are encouraged to prioritise the relationship between film form and meaning, ensuring that technical vocabulary is used analytically rather than descriptively. Contextual and theoretical knowledge should also be integrated into

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

arguments rather than presented as separate areas of discussion. Continued emphasis on depth, precision, evaluation and the construction of meaning through film form will support candidates in producing even stronger responses.

There was clear evidence of effective teaching and learning across all areas of Component 2. Candidates demonstrated secure knowledge of their chosen films and, in many cases, an impressive ability to engage thoughtfully with demanding concepts relating to film form, representation, context and critical debate.

It is always encouraging to read responses that reflect genuine passion, curiosity and enthusiasm for cinema, particularly where candidates have embraced films and topics that may initially appear challenging. Many responses showed an appreciation of the richness and diversity of the specification, with candidates confidently discussing a wide range of cinematic styles, movements and cultural contexts. It is also pleasing to see that the revised film choices are now well embedded within centres, with candidates responding confidently to the newer set films. Centres may wish to use the exemplar material from this examination series to support future planning and standardisation, while also taking the opportunity to refresh schemes of learning and explore the wealth of engaging films and approaches available within the specification.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A: Global Film (two-film study)

Question 1.1

Areas of strength

This question proved accessible and was answered well by many candidates, allowing them to demonstrate knowledge of film form across both set films. The strongest responses engaged directly with the evaluative nature of the question by debating the extent to which sound was more important than visual style in creating meaning. These candidates explicitly addressed the phrase ‘how far’, developing balanced arguments that considered the significance of sound alongside other aspects of film form, such as cinematography, mise-en-scène and editing. Many high-performing candidates reached nuanced conclusions, sometimes arguing that the balance differed between the two films, while others made insightful comparisons between the two texts. Across all films studied the best answers discussed how sound plays an important role in anchoring spectators to both protagonists and narratives.

Areas for development

Less successful responses often demonstrated secure knowledge of the films but did not fully engage with the demands of the question. A common weakness was treating the task as an opportunity to write generally about visual style or aesthetics while giving limited attention to sound. Conversely, some candidates accepted the statement without considering the contribution of other aspects of film form, resulting in one-sided arguments. Where candidates rejected the statement outright responses were sometimes generic and lacked sustained evaluation of the importance of sound in creating meaning. Some answers became descriptive, retelling events from several scenes rather than analysing how film techniques communicated ideas. Candidates also frequently attempted to cover too many sequences from both films, limiting the depth of analysis. This breadth-over-depth approach often prevented candidates from demonstrating detailed understanding of the relationship between film form and meaning and reduced opportunities to apply precise technical vocabulary effectively.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should pay close attention to evaluative command words such as ‘how far’ and ensure their responses develop a balanced argument throughout. Even when disagreeing with a statement, it is important to acknowledge the role of the element identified in the question before evaluating the contribution of other aspects of film form. Candidates are encouraged to select a small number of well-chosen sequences from each film rather than attempting to reference numerous scenes. This allows for more detailed exploration of techniques and their effects, leading to stronger AO2 performance. Maintaining a clear focus on how meaning is created, rather than simply identifying techniques or recounting narrative events, will help candidates produce more analytical and convincing responses that remain closely aligned to the question.

Question 1.2

Areas of strength

This was the most popular question and was generally answered well, reflecting secure preparation by many centres. The strongest responses recognised the evaluative nature of the question and explicitly addressed ‘how far’, developing balanced arguments rather than making straightforward assertions about gender representation. High-performing candidates selected one or two key characters from each film and explored them in depth, using detailed textual evidence to analyse how representations of gender were constructed through cinematography, mise-en-scène, performance, editing and sound. These responses demonstrated confident use of subject-specific terminology and maintained a clear focus on the relationship between film form, representation and meaning. The most perceptive answers considered the concept of reinforcement, recognising that the presence of gender stereotypes does not necessarily mean that a film endorses them. Instead, candidates evaluated how contextual factors and filmmakers' intentions could challenge or critique stereotypical representations. It was pleasing to see thoughtful responses on the newer films *Parasite*, *Worst Person in the World* and *Portrait of a Lady on Fire*, demonstrating sophisticated engagement with these ideas.

Areas for development

Less successful responses often relied on narrative description or broad comments about gender roles, with limited analysis of how representations were constructed through film form. Whilst many candidates identified stereotypical male and female characteristics, these observations were not always developed into analytical discussion supported by specific sequences. Some responses adopted an overly simplistic or 'black and white' interpretation of gender, overlooking the complexities of representation and the influence of social, cultural or historical contexts. A further weakness was the tendency to discuss a wide range of characters from each film rather than selecting the most relevant examples for detailed analysis. As a result, responses often lacked depth and failed to sustain a clear line of argument. Limited use of specialist film terminology also reduced opportunities to demonstrate analytical understanding, with some candidates focusing almost exclusively on character and narrative rather than the contribution of film form to the construction of representation.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should ensure that they respond directly to evaluative wording such as ‘how far’ by constructing a balanced argument throughout their response. Rather than simply identifying gender stereotypes, candidates should consider whether the films reinforce, question or challenge these representations and support their judgements with detailed analysis. Selecting one or two key characters from each film allows for more sustained exploration than attempting to discuss multiple characters superficially. Responses should consistently analyse how film form—including cinematography, mise-en-scène, editing, sound and performance—constructs representations of gender, using accurate subject-specific terminology throughout. Greater attention should also be given to contextual influences and filmmakers' intentions, particularly when considering whether stereotypical representations are presented critically or reinforced. Focusing on fewer, carefully chosen sequences and analysing them in greater depth will strengthen AO2 performance and enable candidates to produce more nuanced, well-supported arguments.

Section B Documentary

Question 2.1

Areas of strength

This question was answered well by many candidates, demonstrating an improved understanding of the Digital Debates area of the specification. Stronger responses engaged directly with the focus of the question by exploring the relationship between digital technology and creative freedom, rather than simply identifying examples of digital techniques. These candidates demonstrated secure knowledge of how digital technology had been used within their chosen documentary and supported their discussion with detailed analysis of carefully selected sequences. The most successful responses considered how digital technology influenced aesthetics, production methods and audience engagement, while maintaining a clear focus on the concept of creative freedom. Some excellent responses recognised that digital technology does not always create entirely new filmmaking practices but instead makes existing processes, such as editing, filming or post-production, more efficient, flexible and accessible. The very best answers demonstrated particularly nuanced understanding by evaluating both the opportunities and limitations presented by digital technologies.

Areas for development

Less successful responses often demonstrated a general awareness of digital technology but lacked precision when discussing its application within the chosen documentary. Some candidates described documentary techniques or production processes without establishing a clear link to digital technology or explaining how these contributed to creative freedom. Others spent considerable time discussing filmmaking before and after the digital era, resulting in broad historical comparisons that were only loosely connected to the demands of the question. While these responses often contained relevant knowledge, they did not consistently evaluate the impact of digital technology within the specific film studied. A further weakness was the reliance on illustrative examples that were identified but not analysed in sufficient depth. Limited use of subject-specific terminology and a lack of detailed reference to film form also restricted opportunities to demonstrate higher-level analytical skills and fully address the evaluative nature of the question.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should ensure that they maintain a clear focus on the wording of the question by exploring how digital technology has affected the documentary filmmaker's creative freedom, rather than simply describing documentary techniques or technological developments. Responses should move beyond identifying examples of digital technology to analyse how these choices influence aesthetics, production, representation and meaning. Careful selection of a small number of relevant sequences allows candidates to develop more detailed analysis and apply accurate subject-specific terminology when discussing cinematography, editing, sound and post-production processes. The strongest responses evaluate both the opportunities and the potential limitations of digital technology, demonstrating an understanding that creative freedom is shaped by a range of artistic, technological and institutional factors rather than technology alone.

Question 2.2

Areas of strength

This question provided candidates with an effective opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of how documentary filmmakers communicate messages and values through film form. The strongest responses established a clear line of argument from the outset, identifying the key messages and values of the chosen documentary and supporting these with well-selected textual evidence. Rather than attempting to cover the whole film, successful candidates focused on a small number of significant sequences, allowing for sustained analysis of documentary techniques alongside wider aspects of film form, including cinematography, editing, sound and mise-en-scène. These responses integrated analysis and evaluation effectively, showing how technical choices shaped audience understanding of the filmmaker's intentions. The most perceptive answers, particularly on *Stories We Tell*, demonstrated sophisticated engagement with the relationship between messages, values and context, evaluating how documentary form could reinforce, question or complicate the perspectives presented. Accurate subject-specific terminology was used consistently to support well-developed analytical responses.

Areas for development

Less successful responses often identified a range of messages and values but did not develop these into sustained analytical discussion. Rather than explaining how the filmmaker communicated ideas through documentary techniques and film form, some candidates simply accumulated examples or summarised the content of the documentary. These responses tended to become descriptive and lacked the precision needed to demonstrate higher-level analytical skills. In some cases, candidates focused almost entirely on the issues or themes raised by the documentary without considering how meaning was constructed through cinematography, editing, sound or other aspects of film form. Limited use of specialist terminology also restricted the depth of analysis in lower-scoring responses. Some candidates spent considerable time discussing filmmaker’s theories that was not required for this question and answers became diluted by incorporating unnecessary details.

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should begin by identifying a small number of significant messages or values before exploring in detail how these are communicated through documentary techniques and wider aspects of film form. Responses should remain analytical throughout, explaining how cinematography, editing, sound, archive material, interviews or other documentary conventions shape audience interpretation and communicate the filmmaker's intentions. Using accurate subject-specific terminology consistently will strengthen both AO1 and AO2. Candidates are advised to focus on fewer, carefully selected sequences rather than

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

attempting to cover multiple examples superficially, allowing for more sustained analysis and evaluation. Consideration of the documentary's social, cultural or historical context should also be integrated where relevant to support discussion of the filmmaker's messages and values. Maintaining a clear focus on how meaning is constructed, rather than simply identifying themes, will lead to more convincing and sophisticated responses.

Section C: Film movements- Silent Cinema

Question 3.1

Areas of strength

This question was answered confidently by many candidates and produced some outstanding responses across all film options. The strongest answers demonstrated a secure understanding of realist and expressive film styles and engaged thoughtfully with the relationship between the two, rather than treating them as entirely separate concepts. Many candidates developed balanced discussions that explored how sequences combined realist and expressive elements, with some making effective reference to André Bazin where it enhanced rather than dominated the analysis. Successful responses selected one or two visually striking sequences and analysed them in depth, using accurate subject-specific terminology to explore cinematography, mise-en-scène, editing, lighting and performance. The highest-scoring responses integrated contextual understanding naturally into their analysis, explaining how stylistic choices reflected the cultural, historical or industrial context of the film. There is clear evidence of effective teaching and learning throughout all the films selected, it was great to see some very perceptive responses on *Spies* but all films were supported by sustained evaluation and detailed textual evidence.

Areas for development

Less successful responses often demonstrated knowledge of realist and expressive film styles but lacked sustained analysis of how these styles were realised through film form. Some candidates relied on general descriptions of Bazin's theories or provided lengthy accounts of German Expressionism as a historical movement without linking these ideas directly to the chosen sequences. Where theoretical knowledge was included, it was sometimes applied mechanically and did not strengthen the argument. A common weakness across several film options was the tendency to discuss too many sequences. Rather than developing detailed analysis of one or two carefully selected examples, candidates often referred to multiple scenes, resulting in descriptive coverage and repetition of similar stylistic points. This was particularly evident in responses on the Keaton shorts and *Sunrise*, where broad knowledge of the films was demonstrated but opportunities for critical exploration were limited by the breadth of examples selected. In these cases, depth of analysis was often sacrificed for coverage.

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should focus closely on the wording of the question by selecting one or two visually striking sequences that provide opportunities for sustained analysis. Detailed exploration of a small number of examples is more effective than referencing numerous scenes superficially. Responses should analyse how cinematography, mise-en-scène, editing, lighting, sound and performance contribute to realist and/or expressive styles, using accurate subject-specific terminology throughout. Where relevant, perspectives such as Bazin's ideas should be integrated naturally to support analysis rather than included as isolated knowledge. Candidates should also avoid lengthy historical accounts of film movements unless these are directly linked to the chosen film and sequence. The strongest responses demonstrate how stylistic choices create meaning within their specific cultural and historical contexts while maintaining a clear focus on the demands of the question. Sustained

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

analysis, supported by carefully selected textual evidence, will enable candidates to access the highest levels of both AO1 and AO2.

Question 3.2

Areas of strength

This question produced many high-quality responses and allowed candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the relationship between film and context. The strongest responses identified key social issues with precision and explored how these were reflected using film form. Whilst the question focused on social issues, many candidates successfully recognised the close relationship between social, political, cultural and historical contexts, integrating these confidently into their discussion. The best responses focused on one or two carefully selected sequences, enabling detailed analysis of cinematography, mise-en-scène, editing, performance and other aspects of film form. These responses used accurate subject-specific terminology throughout and maintained a clear focus on how meaning was constructed. The most sophisticated answers went beyond identifying contextual influences to evaluate how filmmakers represented and commented upon contemporary social issues.

Areas for development

Less successful responses demonstrated some awareness of the relevant social issues but often described them in broad or general terms without developing a clear analytical argument. In many cases, candidates identified contextual information accurately but did not explain how these issues were reflected through the film's stylistic choices. As a result, discussion of context frequently became detached from analysis of film form, limiting opportunities to demonstrate AO2. Some responses relied heavily on narrative description or historical knowledge with only limited reference to cinematography, editing, mise-en-scène or performance. Some candidates struggled to identify the most significant social issues influencing the film and instead produced responses that lacked precision or focused on unrelated contextual information. In these instances, candidates were unable to establish clear links between the film, its historical context and the filmmaker's creative choices, resulting in descriptive rather than analytical responses.

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should ensure that contextual knowledge is always integrated into analysis of the film rather than presented as separate background information. Responses should identify a small number of significant social issues then explore how these are communicated through aspects of film using accurate subject-specific terminology throughout. Selecting one or two carefully chosen sequences will enable more sustained analysis than attempting to reference numerous examples across the film. Candidates should also recognise that social issues may encompass political, cultural and historical concerns where these are directly relevant to the film and support the argument with precise textual evidence. Maintaining a clear focus on how the filmmaker reflects contemporary social issues, rather than simply describing the context itself, will strengthen analytical depth and improve performance against AO2.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Section D Film movements – Experimental Film 1960-2001

Question 4.1

Areas of strength

This question was answered well by many candidates and generated a wide range of thoughtful and well-supported responses. The strongest candidates maintained a clear focus on the visual aspect of experimentation, selecting carefully chosen sequences that enabled detailed analysis of cinematography, mise-en-scène, editing, lighting, framing and composition using accurate subject-specific terminology. Successful responses engaged fully with the evaluative wording of the question, addressing 'how far' by weighing evidence both for and against the film being considered visually experimental. Rather than simply identifying unusual stylistic features, they evaluated their significance in relation to the film. Particularly strong responses on *Memento* recognised that while the film is visually experimental, its narrative structure also contributes to its experimental nature, producing nuanced and balanced arguments. Excellent responses on *Cléo from 5 to 7* integrated discussion of the French New Wave, auteur theory and changing definitions of experimentation, while responses on *Fallen Angels* frequently demonstrated sophisticated technical analysis of cinematography and visual style.

Areas for development

Less successful responses often demonstrated a general awareness of experimental filmmaking but did not maintain a clear focus on the visual emphasis of the question. Some candidates discussed narrative experimentation or unconventional storytelling in detail without sufficiently analysing the visual techniques through which experimentation was achieved. Other responses became descriptive, recounting events within key sequences rather than examining how cinematography, editing, mise-en-scène or composition contributed to an experimental style. Whilst many candidates selected an appropriate sequence, analysis was sometimes limited to identifying techniques without evaluating their significance or explaining their impact on meaning. In some responses, technical terminology was used inconsistently or lacked precision, reducing the depth of analysis. Candidates also occasionally attempted to cover several sequences, resulting in broad observations rather than sustained critical exploration of one carefully chosen example. This limited opportunities to demonstrate the detailed analytical skills required for the highest marks.

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should pay careful attention to the wording of the question, ensuring that discussion remains focused on visual experimentation rather than experimental narrative or themes alone. Responses should address the evaluative phrase 'how far' by considering arguments both supporting and challenging the view that the film is visually experimental before reaching a justified conclusion. Selecting one well-chosen sequence allows candidates to develop detailed analysis of cinematography, mise-en-scène, editing, framing, lighting and composition using accurate subject-specific terminology. Where contextual or theoretical ideas, such as auteur theory or film movements, are relevant, these should be integrated naturally into the analysis rather than included as separate background information. Candidates are encouraged to prioritise depth over breadth by analysing fewer examples in greater detail. Sustained evaluation of how visual techniques create meaning and contribute to experimentation will strengthen AO2 and produce more sophisticated, well-supported responses.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Question 4.2

Areas of strength

This question provided candidates with a clear opportunity to explore character construction through the lens of experimentation, and all film options offered suitable examples for discussion. The strongest responses maintained a clear focus on how the character was constructed, rather than simply discussing the character's role or importance within the narrative. These candidates demonstrated detailed understanding of how experimental uses of film form, including cinematography, editing, narrative structure, performance and sound, contributed to the creation of complex and unconventional characters. Successful responses selected one key character and explored them in depth, supporting arguments with precise textual evidence and appropriate subject-specific terminology. The successful responses on *Memento* were offering sophisticated discussions of Leonard's unreliable perspective, fragmented understanding of reality and duality. There were some excellent responses on *Mulholland Drive*, with highly detailed analysis of Diane/Betty, incorporating ideas surrounding film theory, auteur approaches and aesthetics, while responses on *Fallen Angels* effectively linked experimental character construction to wider themes, contexts and meanings.

Areas for development

Less successful responses often focused on describing the character or explaining their function within an experimental film rather than analysing the specific ways in which the character was constructed. While candidates frequently demonstrated secure knowledge of character traits and narrative events, they did not always explore how experimental aspects of film form shaped audience understanding of the character. Some responses made relevant points but lacked development, with limited reference to cinematography, editing, performance, mise-en-scène or other formal techniques. A common weakness was attempting to discuss more than one character, despite the question requiring detailed exploration of a single key character. This often resulted in a broader but less developed response, preventing candidates from achieving the depth required.

Suggestions for improvement

Candidates should ensure they respond directly to the wording of the question by selecting one key character and exploring in detail how that character is constructed in an experimental way. Responses should move beyond describing the character's role, personality or narrative importance and instead analyse how film form creates meaning around the character. Detailed discussion of cinematography, editing, performance, sound, mise-en-scène and narrative perspective should be integrated throughout, supported by accurate subject-specific terminology. Candidates should avoid broad discussions of the film's overall narrative structure unless these directly contribute to the construction of the chosen character. Selecting a single character allows for more sustained analysis and a more convincing argument. Where relevant, candidates should consider wider themes, contexts and theoretical approaches, but these should be used to enhance analysis rather than replace detailed examination of the film itself. Depth, precision and sustained focus on character construction will enable stronger AO2 responses.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

FILM STUDIES

GCE A level

Summer 2026

COMPONENT 3: PRODUCTION

Overview of the Component

Most of the work reflected the selected production briefs clearly and administrative aspects were successfully completed by most centres. Assessment tended to be accurate and there were some detailed and useful comments on the coversheets to show the rationale for awarding marks.

It is important to follow the submission guidelines for IAMIS in the labelling of work and the compression of files to meet the maximum upload file size of 1GB. Please note, we cannot accept zip folders.

Some assessors did record on coversheets where the assessment procedures (page 40 of the specification) had been applied, which is excellent practice, and we would like to see this being adopted more widely. However, moderators were still applying assessment procedures, and it would be good to see more centres doing this where appropriate.

There were still some examples where short films and screenplays either failed to reach the minimum running time or word count, or exceeded the maximum running time or word count, but the coversheet did not mention this or the impact on assessment. For written work the annotations should clearly indicate where assessment had ceased.

Some written work did not have word counts added, it is helpful for both moderation and centre assessment when candidates include this.

Scenes in a screenplay should be numbered and then the storyboard should be headed with the scene number and precise point which is being visualised for ease of cross-referencing. This would also make it clear to the candidate that it is a specific section of the screenplay which is being storyboarded; too many candidates attempted to storyboard the whole screenplay in twenty shots.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Making a short film remains a highly successful option for many candidates, with moderators seeing much to celebrate. There were some interesting and creative responses to all the briefs on offer. It was pleasing to see that virtually all centres were using the correct briefs. We look forward to seeing the creativity that the new briefs will bring next year.

Far fewer short films used music inappropriately this year. For some there was still an over-reliance on one music track to carry the narrative, and a music video style piece was produced which is not appropriate.

The use of credit sequences at the start and/or end of the short film to fill the minimum time requirement was less prevalent this year, but this was still the case with some candidates and must be avoided.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Screenplays were assessed with a high degree of accuracy this year with most candidates using the master scene script format aided by programmes such as Celtx. There was some excellent work where it was clear that candidates had carefully considered narrative structure and characterisation.

Candidates mostly described the mise-en-scène, characters and action in ways that were easy to visualise, there were however still too many examples of prose writing which was not visual. Not all candidates described the characters; this is vital for visualisation.

Some candidates wasted words on detailed camera instructions, and this is to be avoided. Narratives that were dialogue based and lacked description of mise-en scène, character and action, were over-rewarded in some cases.

Too many candidates exceeded the maximum word count and as the resolution could not be assessed, this affected the assessment of structural elements. Teacher annotations should clearly indicate where 1,800 was reached and assessment ceased.

Storyboards still present many issues and tend to be assessed too generously, although there were some excellent examples of detailed and carefully considered work.

Some candidates were not using images shot in landscape (see page 35 of the specification which details this as a requirement) and this affected the efficacy of the cinematography as the size of the frame was limited; this was also the case with some short films that were shot in portrait.

Repetitive shots and lack of detail in the written information was still an issue where it was clear that the storyboard was an afterthought; candidates need to be aware that key elements are being primarily demonstrated through the storyboard, and they can lose out on valuable marks.

Shot length and pacing was a problem for many candidates, careful checking of this is needed, as well as the labelling of shot types, too many candidates are still mis-labelling shots. Mise-en-scène is important here too and this should match the descriptions given in the section from the screenplay that is being visualised in the storyboard.

Some candidates, but not enough, considered non-diegetic sound and had some appropriate and specific music choices. This was also the case with camera movement, and these are areas for improvement with the storyboard work.

The storyboard is an opportunity to show the characters visually and use key elements to create a connection between protagonist and viewer; some candidates did not take this opportunity and did not show the characters clearly, often choosing to shoot from too far away, of from behind the characters, not using close-ups of faces and this limited the effectiveness of the storyboard. Candidates should also consider continuity; too many were unintentionally breaking the 180-degree rule.

Where characters are not shown at all, the storyboard became a series of establishing shots which did not match the screenplay, only low bands in the marking grid are available for such work. The use of toys in storyboards as protagonists is problematic as facial expression, gestures and posture and shot composition cannot be fully realised. Candidates should write their screenplays with the availability of actors in mind.

There were too many examples of non-submission of storyboards or unfinished work, and this limited the marks available for key elements. Where storyboards are missing, the assessment procedures in the specification make it clear that only a band 1 can be awarded for key elements.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

The evaluative analysis is the other problematic part of this component. There are still too many screenwriters who didn't write about their work in relation to professionally produced screenplays, including those for short films and consider the art of screenwriting. Without this, their work cannot be awarded a mark in the higher bands.

Too many candidates included a lengthy introduction describing the story and aims of the piece, this is not required, instead a better starting point would be a short analysis of how the work meets the chosen brief.

There are still too many evaluative analyses which do **not** mention the brief and a few candidates did not mention a brief on the coversheet either, and this made assessment difficult.

The focus should be on the analysis of the meaning and response created by the specific use of key elements and narrative devices in the candidate's own work with cinematic influences (their own choices, approximately two films, and the 80+ minutes of the set short films) woven into that analysis. Too many candidates made generalised or vague statements that were quite meaningless, forgetting the how, where and why in relation to the influence on their own work.

Some candidates described the short films in isolation wasting valuable words needed for the analysis of their own work. Candidates should not discuss how the short films did not influence the work, or how the candidate's work was different from them, this cannot be considered meaningful.

Too many candidates described the production process and discussed how the work could have been improved; neither of these things are required. There is no need to describe narrative theory in this piece.

It is not advisable for all candidates at the centre to study the same short films as limitations will inevitably arise for some candidates. Access to more of the set short films would enable greater opportunity to discuss 80+ minutes in a meaningful way. The short film log on the coversheet should only list the short films to be discussed in the evaluative analysis, ideally in the order that they appear in the analysis.

There was an excellent example where a running total of the minutes of set short films was included in the teacher annotations; this is an approach that should be widely adopted.

Many candidates demonstrated a wealth of wide filmic knowledge, choosing excellent and appropriate cinematic influences, showing real engagement with the subject. Cinematic influences must be films; we are still seeing far too many television programmes.

There is a suggestion of an effective structure for the evaluative analysis in the updated Guidance for Teaching document on the Eduqas website, with exemplars illustrating this approach on the secure portal.

Please do enter the work of your exceptional candidates into the Moving Image Awards short film, animation and screenplay categories.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

Short Films:

- Check the minimum and maximum running time. The time must be narrative time and credit sequences cannot be counted. A resolution after the maximum running time cannot be assessed and this will affect the mark for structural elements.
- Refer to assessment procedures on page 40 of the specification.
- Do **not** over-use music tracks so that the work resembles a music video.
- Shoot in landscape.

Screenplays:

- Add a word count and refer to assessment procedures if work is too short or too long.
- Follow Master Scene Script layout as outlined on page 35 of the specification.
- Do not include camera and editing instructions or non-diegetic music.
- Screenplays should be entirely visual and should not contain any thoughts or feelings.
- Candidates cannot produce a screenplay for an animated short film, see page 34 of the specification.

Storyboards:

- Shots should be presented in landscape mode, see page 35 of the specification.
- Hand or digitally drawn images cannot be accepted for assessment.
- Indicate camera movement where necessary.
- Add detail of non-diegetic sound.
- Use close-ups of characters for characterisation and to create alignment.
- Check the pacing by ensuring that shot durations are not too long.
- Use the correct number of shots rather than making up the time with long shot durations.
- Use people rather than inanimate objects as substitutes.
- Very few marks are available for key elements if a storyboard is not submitted, band 1.

Evaluative Analyses:

- This needs to be annotated by the assessor. Indicating the running time of the set short films covered is excellent practice.
- Include a word count. Show where assessment has stopped if more that 1,800 words.
- Refer to assessment procedures on page 40 of the specification when assessing work which is too short or too long, or which does **not** meaningfully discuss 80 minutes of the short films; record this on the coversheet.
- How the short film differs from the candidate's own work or did not influence the work cannot be considered meaningful comments.
- Award a band 2 mark if the set short films are not considered at all.
- Cinematic influences must be films. There should be a minimum of two for the higher bands to be awarded.
- Screengrabs of the influences alongside the work of the candidate are useful.
- Do **not** include a lengthy introduction which outlines the plot, aims and intended audience.
- Refer to the chosen brief and discuss how the work meets it.
- The focus should be on the analysis of the meaning and response created by the specific use of key elements and narrative devices in the candidate's own work with cinematic influences woven into that analysis; do not discuss the influences separately.
- Do **not** discuss how the work differs from the set short films or how they weren't influential.
- Do not describe narrative theory.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

- For screenwriters, the third bullet point of the marking grid is concerned with the relation of the work to professionally produced screenplays, including those for short films. These must be included and the art of screenwriting discussed in relation to the candidate's own work. Screengrabs of both screenplays would be a useful illustration.
- Do not include a description of the process of production or discuss what could have been done to improve the work.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026

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: 029 2240 4301
Email: film@eduqas.co.uk
Qualification webpage:
https://www.eduqas.co.uk/qualifications/film-studies-asa-level/#tab_keydocuments

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 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 CBAC Ltd.2026



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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2026