

GCSE Examiners' Report

Subject: Film Studies

Level: GCSE

Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2025



© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2024

Introduction

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

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

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

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	Eduqas offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page
Grade boundary information	<p>Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>For unitised specifications click here:</p> <p>Results and Grade Boundaries and PRS (eduqas.co.uk)</p>

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 – Key Developments in US Film	7
Component 2 – Global Film	14
Component 3 - Production	18
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	21

Eduqas GCSE Film Studies 2025

Executive Summary

The 2025 GCSE Film Studies assessment series demonstrated a generally strong performance across all components, with candidates showing clear engagement and centres providing effective preparation. Most candidates accessed the full range of questions, and rubric infringements were minimal. The overall quality of responses reflected a good understanding of the specification and assessment objectives.

Component 1: Key Developments in US Film

Candidates responded well to questions on mise-en-scène and genre conventions, though some confusion between props and costumes persists. Most were able to identify and analyse key elements effectively, with stronger responses demonstrating detailed sequence knowledge and confident use of terminology. However, genre conventions caused difficulty for some, with vague or incorrect definitions limiting marks. The extended response on gender representation was generally well handled, with many candidates making insightful comparisons between films and historical contexts. Weaker responses lacked balance or failed to link context to representation.

Component 2: Global Film – Narrative, Representation and Film Style

Performance was broadly consistent with previous years. Candidates engaged well with narrative and mise-en-scène in Section A, and many demonstrated strong analytical skills. Section B, focusing on ethnicity and cultural identity, was more challenging, particularly for those unfamiliar with the term “cultural identity.” Section C, which addressed aesthetics and typicality, saw confident responses, especially in identifying visually distinctive scenes and analysing lighting and colour. However, some candidates struggled with the concept of typicality, either within the film or in comparison to genre norms.

Component 3: Production (NEA)

This component continues to showcase creativity and technical skill. Most candidates opted for filmed productions, with a wide range of genres represented. Stronger submissions demonstrated a clear understanding of genre conventions and film form, while weaker ones relied on underdeveloped tropes. Evaluative analyses were generally well executed, with candidates referencing a variety of professional texts. However, some centres failed to apply production requirements (e.g. word/time limits), and shooting scripts were occasionally over-rewarded despite lacking detail. Internal marking was mostly accurate, though some centres lacked sufficient annotation to justify marks.

Overall key Strengths

- Confident engagement with mise-en-scène, narrative, and aesthetics in Comp 1 and 2.
- Strong comparative analysis in Comp 1 extended responses.
- Creative and technically competent NEA submissions.
- Improved time management and question focus in Comp 1 and 2.

Areas for Improvement

Component 1:

- Clarify the distinction between props and costume to avoid misidentification in mise-en-scène questions.
- Strengthen understanding of genre conventions to ensure accurate identification and analysis.

Component 2:

- Improve familiarity with the concept of cultural identity to support responses in Section B.
- Section C: Consider how typical the aesthetic of the chosen scene is of the whole film.

Component 3:

- Ensure detailed sequence-specific planning in shooting scripts and adherence to production requirements (e.g. word/time limits).
- Improve consistency and transparency in internal marking through clear annotation on the Evaluative Analysis and justification for marks awarded on cover sheets.

Film Studies

GCSE

Summer 2025

Component 1 – Key Developments In US Film .

Overview of the Component

Centres are commended for how well candidates have been prepared for this year's paper. Most candidates were able to access the full range of questions. They largely responded with the appropriate levels of knowledge both in terms of specification requirements and detailed knowledge of the films themselves.

Overall, there were few 'not attempted' or incomplete answers, suggesting candidates are coping well with the demands of the paper in the time set. There were very few rubric infringements where candidates tackled a section or question with reference to the wrong film. The preparation of candidates for the specific requirements of the questions is generally strong and continues to improve. Although there was some evidence of pre-prepared responses, particularly for Q5, and this did not serve the candidates well, particularly in accessing the higher bands.

The following content and skills were tested:

- mise-en-scène with a focus on props
- genre conventions
- representation of gender
- key developments in film and film technology
- candidates critical response to the specialist film writing
- description, explanation, analysis, interpretation and comparison

Overview of general performance across the component:

The paper did produce a full range of range of responses across the whole attainment range. The candidate responses were generally varied and strong.

How the assessment performs compared with previous series:

This was the second session to examine the updated specifications it was felt that performance was broadly in line, with perhaps a marginal improvement, with previous sessions. I would again like to take the opportunity to thank the teachers involved in the delivery of Film Studies and the preparation of their candidates. Your hard work was apparent in the way that the large majority of candidates were able to approach the paper with an evident degree of confidence.

Comments on individual questions/sections

SECTION A: US Film Comparative Study

Popular film choices were *Dracula*, *Rebel Without a Cause* and *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*. There were a few *Singin' in the rain* responses, and very few on *Pillow Talk*.

Q.1 This question proved relatively straightforward for most candidates. There were occasional examples where 'benefit of the doubt had to be considered' in terms of what one would consider to be a "key" prop, although these were few and far between. The problem encountered in previous years with the correct interpretation of the word "identify" were not present as the nomination of a prop encouraged specificity.

There was a marginal recurring issue concerning confusion around the term prop and its part of the broader term *mise-en-scène*. Some candidates mistakenly identified elements of costume, which although part of *mise-en-scène* cannot be considered a prop. Centres should also be mindful to prepare candidates thoroughly for terminology such as *mise-en-scène* and its constituent elements. As a result, some candidates registered no marks because they had not actually identified or discussed a prop.

Additional guidance to candidates would be to carefully select the example in 1a since this question is often directly linked to 1b. Candidates are advised to read through all the questions in each section in full before completing the first one, as this choice can have an impact on how they approach subsequent questions.

(b) Relevant responses were of a generally good standard. Candidates were able to discuss how and why a particular prop had been used. There were a range of responses that linked the prop with narrative, character, genre and spectator impact. Where candidates faltered was in a lack of detail in their explanation, repetition and failing to make direct links between the prop and the meaning created. Candidates should be encouraged to consider as to whether they have made 4 mark worthy points within their explanation. Candidates should also avoid being too general in their response here. A noticeable minority suffered as a result of their incorrect choice in part a). A detailed examination of an aspect of costume was very difficult to reward in any meaningful way here. This further emphasises the importance of care in the selection of the example in 1a since this question is often directly linked to 1b.

- (c) The standard of response varied depending on two factors: the detail from a chosen sequence and the variety of the aspects of mise-en-scène at the candidates' disposal. Candidates who had thoroughly prepared 1 (or more) sequences were able to access bands 4 and 5 more readily as they had plenty of examples and a wider variety of mise-en-scène to discuss. This detailed knowledge of specific sequences also facilitated a wider use of terminology. The weaker candidates tended to repeat what they had done for question b) with some additions, which is rewarded but rarely in the higher bands. Weaker candidates were often limited in their response by only being able to address a limited range of mise-en-scène.

Centres are reminded that mise-en-scène should be considered in the following main aspects: props, costume, hair and make-up, positioning, performance, colour and lighting. Discussing one example from two or three of these aspects should enable candidates to access Band 4 & 5 more readily. Those candidates that considered the collective influence of the relevant elements of film produced almost exclusively examples of Band 5 answers. Many exemplary responses dealt with a range of aspects of mise-en-scène and how they combined with other elements to make meaning, sometimes exceeding the expectations of GCSE.

Overall mise-en-scène proved to be the more accessible of the two topics examined in Section A. The majority of candidates were able to access satisfactory or better marks in explaining the use of mise-en-scène in their chosen film. There were many strong responses with candidates confident using discussing props and mise-en-scène, despite the occasional confusion between prop and costume, but overall, this question was handled well.

Question 2

Popular film choices: *The Lost Boys*, *E.T.*, *Ferris Bueller's Day Off*. There were some on *Grease* and very few on *When Harry Met Sally*.

- (a) The response here proved much more problematic than that of 1a, the use of “convention” caused some confusion for candidates. Centres should be clear on the requirement for candidates to be able to understand and interpret this term. Many candidates did not seem to know that “genre conventions” are the typical individual aspects or tropes that are associated with particular genres. Candidates who struggled with this tended to just repeat the genre name, for example “a genre convention is sci-fi” or “a convention of horror films is horror”. Such responses are not focussed enough and have not identified elements that contribute to these overall descriptions. These examples aside the bulk of candidates were able to successfully identify a relevant trope.
- (b) The quality of responses to this question was good despite the issues identified in 1a. There were a variety of approaches rewarded, from contextual symbolism, a narrative role, character development and industry and audience requirements. Where candidates faltered was again in a lack of detail or examples in their explanation, repetition and failing to make direct links between genre conventions and their importance. Candidates should be encouraged to consider as to whether they have made 4-mark worthy points within their explanation. As in question 2a, centres should remind candidates to be carefully in selecting the example in a since this question is often directly linked to 2b.

- (c) This question was answered well despite the issues identified in 2a. Candidates were able to produce responses that dealt with a range of appropriate genre tropes and their usage. Candidates were able to produce answers that considered their chosen film in terms of how genre conventions were used both typically, and how they were subverted' and in some cases the hybridisation of multiple genre types. Overall, it proved to be a much more accessible question than the responses to part a) sometimes suggested. With many Band 4 & 5 answers allowing candidates to really demonstrate their knowledge and understanding. Candidates who had thoroughly prepared one (or more) sequences were able to access bands 4 and 5 more readily as they had plenty of examples to discuss. This detailed knowledge of specific sequences also facilitated a wider use of terminology.

Band 4 & 5 responses successfully discussed how the film makers employed genre conventions to both meet and subvert spectator expectations. The discussion of the hybridisation of genre tropes in, for example, *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (film noir, horror and sci-fi) was another commonly successful response. Satisfactory responses were able to engage with genre conventions in terms of their presence and usage in typical and expected ways. The weaker candidates tended to repeat what they had done for question 2b with some additions, which is rewarded but rarely at the higher levels.

Weaker candidates were often limited in their response by only being able to address a limited selection of genre conventions or poor recall of specific sequences. Centres are reminded that genre conventions embrace the typical 'ingredients' of a given genre film, elements covering aspects of narrative, character, themes, props or significant objects and aspects of aesthetics and style. Candidates are well served if they can discuss a variety of these elements areas when called upon to produce a sequence(s) specific detailed 10 mark analysis. Many of the exemplary responses were able to deal with three or more of these aspects and how they combined with other elements to make meaning, sometimes exceeding the expectations of GCSE.

Overall, this question did prove less accessible to more candidates than expected. There still remains confusion between genre and genre conventions, meaning that some candidates did not gain marks where they could have done. This is not unprecedented as similar issues were identified in previous sessions where the phrase genre convention was used. Centres are reminded that their candidates should be familiar with the glossary and language of the papers to support confident literacy in the exam. There was often an understanding - candidates who did not gain a mark for a) would often go onto to b) and accurately describe why filmmakers use genre conventions and link it specifically to conventions used in their chosen film. 2c was often dealt with well as well (in comparison to 2a).

This question caused the most issues overall.

Question 3

Popular film choices: *Dracula* & *The Lost Boys*, *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* & *E.T.*, *Rebel without A Cause* & *Ferris Bueller's Day Off*. There were some on *Singin' In The Rain* & *Grease* and very few on *Pillow Talk* & *When Harry Met Sally*.

It was pleasing to see many strong responses from the chosen films on offer with a clear understanding and engagement with the central "representation of gender" contextual theme. As in previous years, the emphasis is on comparison between the two films and eras. This was present in most answers and resulted in many strong responses. Candidates who made a clear choice of comparable characters between the two films more readily accessed the higher bands. Where this was done with a clear grasp on the changes in context marks were high. Careful selection of what to discuss here went a long way to supporting a successful response. For example, dealing with the change in gender roles and expectations between the two eras lent itself readily to direct comparison. Many exemplary answers dealt well with one or more areas prompted by the bullet points. The most sophisticated responses were able to compare the films within their contextual era, some of these responses went beyond GCSE level. Some excellent teaching of content and technique was readily apparent in many responses.

Where candidates were less strong was a lack of a clear comparison or an imbalance in discussing the two films. They either chose characters that did not readily lend themselves to comparison or merely considered each film in isolation. Additionally, there were some examples where there was clear recall of the historical eras of the films but the link between this and the films themselves was not really explored or compared. Other successful approaches drew well on detailed reference to relevant aspects of film form and how their role changed with the changing representations. Candidates should be reminded that in this question that comparing their two chosen films is the key to success.

Overall, there were some excellent responses, however some candidates seemed to focus on the first bullet point without answering the question, i.e. attempting to place the films in their social and / or historical context without focusing on the representation of gender. Nevertheless, this question proved to be very accessible with most responses able to make links and comparisons using gender. There were some excellent responses at the top end of the range with candidates able to explore how and why gender representation had changed in their chosen films.

Section B: Key Developments in Film and Film Technology

Question 4

This section generated responses across the full range of possible marks. Most candidates responded well to the questions. Please encourage candidates to consider the question carefully and prepare as thoroughly as they can, with accurate recall of dates and names.

Section C: US Independent Film

Popular film choices: *Whiplash* and *The Hurt Locker*.

Question 5

Again, this year very few candidates this year failed to engage with the specialist film writing. Where a minority of candidates did not make reference to the specialist film writing it seemed to be a genuine lack of knowledge or preparation rather than a misunderstanding of the question.

The open request to discuss their “response” facilitated clear and personal discussions from most candidates. The stronger responses were able to discuss the specialist film writing in a nuanced way that dealt with both positive and negative criticism. Candidates who produced strong responses were able to make arguments that were rooted in detailed evidence from the films. Where candidates produced weaker responses, they tended to describe the writing and recall the film rather than responding to it.

Thorough preparation for these extended response questions is good practice; however candidates should also be prepared to be flexible in response to the approach required. Where centres chosen text is one of the two general pieces - 'Finding the Frame' by Gustavo Mercado and 'What Makes a Film Independent?' by Rona Murray, candidates should be encouraged to be critical as to the application of the ideas in these pieces to their chosen films.

Nevertheless, it was pleasing to see not just the reasonably wide range of film choice here, but also the general level of engagement with the specialist film writing. It is good practice for candidates to state their chosen piece at the start of their answer. Most candidates were able to engage on an informed and personal level with the chosen specialist film writing. The better responses were both varied and personal in their arguments and clearly backed this up with evidence from the film. Centres are reminded that assessment at both AO1 and AO2 depends on the use of detailed reference to elements of film to justify any mark worthy assertions a candidate may make.

Overall, last year there seemed to be a lot of students who were obviously prepped on previous questions and were answering those questions rather than the question that was set. This was not as apparent this year, possibly due to the open nature of this year's question "discuss your reaction..." as this allowed for a much wider range of approaches. The responses have improved somewhat on last year, although many of the answers are still structured as agree/disagree. Whilst this is not an issue for this paper the better answers considered more about how the specialist writing shaped the candidate's understanding or response to the film, rather than simply 'I agree with this' or 'I disagree with this'. The specialist writing is being embedded into the answer in a more succinct and developed way and some answers showed confident knowledge of some quite complex critical thinking.

Summary of key points

Credit and thanks are due to teacher's professionalism in preparing candidates for this session and their effective delivery of the content.

In conclusion:

- In question 1 and 2 (a) candidates should be clear as to the requirement of an identified example.
- Candidates should be familiar and conversant with the concept of genre conventions.
- Candidates need detailed sequence specific knowledge and examples of the key elements of film form.
- A good general understanding and appreciation of the films, particularly in terms of genre and context, is also important.
- In question 3, the ability to compare as a practiced skill is as important as the content-based knowledge.
- In question 5 a personal and informed response, guided by the approach set out in the question is required.
- In a very demanding component efficient planning and timing is essential.

GCSE FILM STUDIES

GCSE

Summer 2025

Component 2

GLOBAL FILM: Narrative, Representation and Film Style

Overview of the Component

Component 2 of the course is divided into three distinct sections – each of which focuses on a particular aspect of the specification. Section A requires candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of narrative in relation to one of the global English language films; Section B focuses on representation in a film not in the English language; Section C pertains to film style in a contemporary UK film.

Each section of the exam is sub-divided into parts. AO1 and AO2 are assessed across all sections of the exam – either in isolation in the case of lower tariff questions (such as 1a, 1b etc.) or together in the higher tariff question such as 1d, 2c and 3d.

The most frequently used films for the three sections were as follows:

- Section A – *Slumdog Millionaire/District 9*
- Section B – *Tsotsi/Wadjda*
- Section C – *Attack the Block/Skyfall*

All films from the specification were used by candidates.

This year, the focus of each section was as follows:

- Section A – setting/location and mise-en-scene
- Section B – character and ethnicity/cultural identity
- Section C – aesthetics and typicality

Centres are reminded that the full specification should be taught. This year, most candidates were able to access the full paper, though a small number seemed ill-equipped to discuss ethnicity/cultural identity in Section B, and some were less assured when addressing typicality in Section C.

The demand of this particular paper was consistent with that of previous series. As such, the distribution of marks is in line with previous years.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A

Section A of this year's exam focused on setting/location and mise-en-scene. This was a four-part question. **1a** required candidates to identify a key setting or location. Examiners were encouraged to have broad expectations as to what candidates would identify as a key setting/location. Many were precise (such as identifying the slum in *Slumdog Millionaire*) whilst others were less exact (for instance, identifying Germany). Both approaches were awarded accordingly.

For **1b**, candidates were required to describe this setting/location. Centres should take note of the fact that 'describe' simply requires candidates to identify appropriate features. Given that this is the case, many candidates achieved the maximum four marks for pointing out four distinct features of the setting/location. However, others took an alternative route by providing a more detailed description of fewer features. Both approaches were valid and rewarded accordingly. Overall, this was a successfully answered question with many candidates achieving the maximum marks.

For **1c**, candidates were asked to explain why the filmmakers chose to use this setting/location. Many candidates appropriately discussed the contextual implications of their chosen setting/location, and this often allowed them to access the marks in Band 4 and 5. Responses that were deemed to be 'basic' or 'satisfactory' often relied on the functionality of the setting/location as opposed to addressing its narrative implications and/or its contribution to the filmmakers' wider intentions.

For **1d**, candidates were asked to explore how mise-en-scene is used to create meaning. As has often been the case in previous series, candidates were often very assured in discussing mise-en-scene and did so to a high standard. As AO1 and AO2 are both assessed here, it was essential that candidates demonstrated an understanding of film form and applied their knowledge when analysing at least one key sequence. The strongest candidates were able to articulate how elements of mise-en-scene (very often costume, lighting and colour) help to construct meaning for the audience in specific sequences; less-assured responses often neglected to discuss sequences in detail or at all. Centres are reminded that they should make it explicit to candidates that sequence analysis is an essential part of the higher tariff questions and a failure to do so will limit their ability to access a mark in excess of Band 3

Section B

Section B focused on character and ethnicity/cultural identity.

For **2a**, candidates were required to identify a key character from their chosen film. Examiners were encouraged to treat all identified characters as key in the eyes of the candidate and therefore the overwhelming majority were rewarded accordingly.

For **2b**, candidates were required to explain the character's ethnicity/cultural identity. For most candidates, this was a question that they were able to confidently answer. Examiners were asked to reward candidates for either pointing out a series of aspects of their chosen character's ethnicity/cultural identity (for example, their race, age, gender, origins, community identity etc.) or for giving more detailed explorations of one or two aspects. Where candidates seemingly struggled with this question, it was because of not understanding the term 'cultural identity'. As this is a phrase used in the specification, centres are reminded of the need to cover this in their teaching.

For **2c**, candidates were required to discuss the representation of ethnicity/cultural identity in one (or more) key sequence from their chosen film. As with 1d, AO1 and AO2 are both assessed here, and so it was essential that candidates demonstrated an understanding of film form and applied their knowledge to their analysis. Whilst many were able to do so to a high standard, on the whole this question was answered with less confidence than 1d. Using the bullet points provided to support candidates would have been beneficial to those whose marks were in level 1 and 2 as, oftentimes, these candidates were hindered by a lack of specificity in their responses. Centres should be making it clear to candidates that they should take note of any and all instructions provided on the question paper.

Section C

As always, Section C focused on aesthetics.

This year, **3a** required candidates to identify one visually distinctive scene from their chosen film. Examiners were instructed to consider any scene as visually distinctive in the eyes of the candidate; as such, almost all candidates were able to achieve a mark here.

For **3b**, candidates were asked to describe what makes this scene visually distinctive. In keeping with the approach taken to the assessment of 1b and 2b, candidates were awarded for identifying four visual features of the scene or for providing a more detailed description of fewer visual features. As such, most candidates were able to achieve a number of marks for this question with many meeting the required standard for maximum marks.

For **3c**, candidates were asked to explain how lighting and colour contribute to meaning in their chosen scene. Examiners were instructed to treat 3c as entirely independent from 3b as it was reasonable for candidates to have identified colour and/or lighting in 3b and this should not have been held against them.

For **3d**, candidates were required to address typicality. There were two possible interpretations of this. For the most part, successful candidates explored typicality *within* their chosen film. For example, some were able to discuss how a particular sequence in *Submarine* is at odds with the overall style of the film, or how the sequence in Istanbul contrasts with those in London in *Skyfall*. However, it was also possible to explore how typical or otherwise the visual style of their chosen film is in comparison to others from the genre. This was an approach taken by several candidates who had studied *Skyfall* (as they were able to compare it to other films from the franchise) and *Attack the Block*. Both approaches were valid and were rewarded accordingly. There is a growing confidence amongst candidates when discussing aesthetics in their chosen films which is pleasing to see.

NEA For internally assessed NEA/CA components

Component 3 Production

Overview of the Component

This component assesses candidates in their ability to apply knowledge and understanding of elements of film to the production of a genre-based film or screenplay (AO3) as well as applying knowledge and understanding of elements of film to analyse and evaluate their own work in relation to other professionally produced work (AO2).

The work consists of a genre-based film or screenplay option, a shooting script (for the screenplay option) and an evaluative analysis. The genres available are outlined in the specification and reflect the genres studied throughout the course.

It is always a pleasure to see the range of responses in this component – candidates and centres are embracing this creative opportunity in response to the briefs set out for this component. Again, there continues to be a rise in the centres offering the genre choice to candidates, as well as the opportunity to film or write productions. As a result, there continues to be more film-based submissions.

Tasks

Comments on tasks/questions relating to candidate performance/meeting assessment criteria

There were a wide range of genres chosen for both the screenplay and filmed options. At the top of the rank order, candidates demonstrated a confident grasp of genre conventions. At the lower end of the rank order, candidates sometimes relied on tired tropes that lacked narrative or characterisation, such as a character being chased for the entire sequence for the horror genre. The use of these tropes, in this manner, often did not reflect the texts referenced in the Evaluative Analysis and frequently lacked development regarding narrative.

It was encouraging to see in the Evaluative Analyses that candidates had gone beyond just using core exam texts as their basis for their own work. It is clear candidates and centres are embracing the creative element of this component and the variety of professional texts cited demonstrates this.

There continues to be an increase in the number of filmed options seen compared screenplays. Candidates demonstrated an often sophisticated understanding of key elements in the filmed productions.

For the shooting script option, candidates should submit a detailed plan of how their chosen section of would look on screen. This should demonstrate their knowledge, understanding and application of all key elements and beyond. They can use the template available but can go beyond this. Excellent (top band) submissions demonstrated an understanding of how a range of key elements will create meaning on screen, such as special effects, key props, score, lighting, positioning, camera movement, angle, shot and pace; it should show how all these elements will work together to create meaning for the spectator. The lower band examples merely listed a series of camera shots with durations and possibly the use diegetic sound. As these lacked detail, it was difficult to envisage how this would appear on screen and therefore they are 'basic' or 'limited' in scope.

Some centres did not seem to be aware of the production requirements outlined in the specification. In particular these related to time and word limits, and the penalties required to be applied if those production requirements are not met or are exceeded. All centres are reminded to check the specification carefully to ensure candidates are meeting the production requirements in the submitted NEA work.

All centres are advised to include word counts on any written work submitted to demonstrate the production requirements had been met and any penalties (if required) have been applied. Word counts & time limits can be found in the specification.

Task marking

Comments on approaches to internal marking

- Most centres demonstrate good practice in clearly annotating all written work, including the evaluative analysis, and linking detailed summative comments on the coversheet using the language of the marking criteria. This clearly demonstrates how and why the final mark was awarded.
- Although not always possible, it was clear some centres had completed internal moderation, and this does seem to support more accurate final assessment.
- In some cases, written work had not been annotated at all. It is therefore extremely difficult for the moderation team to understand how and why the final mark had been awarded. In many of these cases, the work had been generously assessed because the assessor had not tracked the final mark using annotations and noting where there were rewardable examples within the work.
- The best practice showed, with very specific references to the work, how and why the final mark had been awarded. Some centres used the coversheets very effectively, using time stamps from the filmed productions and explaining on the coversheet how this matched the mark/band awarded.
- As noted above, assessment of the shooting scripts tended to be generous in some cases in relation to the amount of detail included from the key elements. It should be comparable to the filmed productions and consider all the key elements in some detail.
- The evaluative analysis should also comment on both the screenplay and the shooting script choices. In some cases, work was being over-rewarded for simply listing what had been achieved in the production rather than considering the creative choices made based on the genre and audience.
- [Specification with marking criteria and production requirements](#)
- [Production Briefs 2023-2026](#)

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: [GCSE Film Studies | 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