

GCE A Level Examiners' Report

Film Studies

A Level

Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd. 2025



Introduction

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

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

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

Further support

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

¹ Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

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

Contents	Page
Executive summary	5
Component 1	7
Component 2	15
Component 3	28
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	32

Executive Summary

General Overview

Candidate performance showed a marked improvement in handling critical approaches, particularly auteur and ideology. Stronger responses were characterised by precise, structured writing and thoughtful engagement with the set film. However, weaker submissions often relied on pre-prepared content, lacked analytical focus, or misapplied theoretical frameworks. Centres are advised to reinforce the importance of answering the specific question set and integrating theory meaningfully with textual analysis.

Component 1

Strengths:

Improved understanding of auteur approaches and ideological analysis.
Comparative essays were more complex and better structured.

Areas for improvement:

Misuse of spectatorship theory and vague ideological references.
Overuse of biographical summaries or plot recounting.

Recommendations:

Teach ideological approaches with application to the chosen films for Sections B and C
Emphasise structured, focused writing and responses that focus on the question.

Component 2

Strengths:

- Gender representation was well explored in Global film.
- Some effective use of prescribed theorists in Documentary.
- Strong engagement with expressive vs realist modes in silent cinema.

Areas for improvement:

- Some confusion between editing and cinematography.
- Some misidentifications of theory in documentary.
- Lack of sequence-specific analysis in weaker responses.
- Some confusion over film movements and over-reliance on auteur theory in Experimental.

Recommendations:

- Reinforce correct theorist use for Documentary,
- Align film choices with recognised movements for Experimental and deepen contextual understanding.
- Apply core and specialist areas to key sequences.

Component 3: Production (NEA)

Strengths:

- Creative short films and screenplays showed thoughtful engagement with briefs.
- The assessment was generally accurate.

Areas for improvement:

- Storyboards lacked detail and visual clarity.
- Evaluative analyses were sometimes overly descriptive.

Meaningful references to 80 mins worth of short films in the Evaluative Analysis were not always evident.

Recommendations:

- Ensure correct formatting, word counts, and running times.
- Improve storyboard quality and visual storytelling.
- Focus evaluative analysis on key elements and cinematic influences.
- Consider diversifying film choice and teaching some of the new films added to the specification.

FILM STUDIES

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT ONE: 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 using critical approaches
- evaluate the significance of critical approaches.

Both assessment objectives are weighted equally by the mark schemes of this component.

AO1 is assessed in all sections and questions of the exam by requiring candidates to show knowledge of the films studied and their relevant contexts.

AO2 is assessed throughout the exam paper by requiring candidates to analyse films using critical approaches. Section A assesses the ability to use the Auteur critical approach in analysing films, Section B assesses the ability to apply the critical approaches of Ideology and Spectatorship and Section C assesses the use of the critical approaches of Narrative and Ideology. The ability to compare films is assessed in Section A and the ability to evaluate the significance of critical approaches is assessed in **either** Section B **or** C each year.

This year's paper was accessible and allowed all candidates the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the subject content. A continued improvement across the whole paper was discernible, if better in some areas than others. The most successful responses were those that engaged directly with the question set and applied knowledge purposefully to the films studied. In contrast, weaker responses often relied on pre-prepared essays or case studies that were only loosely relevant, resulting in a lack of focus and a limited ability to meet the assessment objectives. While many candidates demonstrated real passion for the subject, there is a clear need in some cases for further practice in answering the specific question rather than simply reproducing memorised content.

Film Studies remains a discipline rooted in the analysis of films, and candidates should be consistently reminded to use formal, contextual, and conceptual knowledge in service of exploring meanings and responses in relation to specific films. Across the paper, some responses included lengthy theoretical definitions, plot recounting, or filmmaker biographies that, while demonstrating surface-level knowledge, did not advance the analysis or meet the demands of the question. Stronger responses integrated formal analysis with conceptual, textual and contextual understanding, and offered clear evidence of thoughtful engagement with both the question and the films.

There was notable improvement this year in the handling of some critical approaches, particularly auteurism and ideology. There were many detailed and complex comparisons of films that applied an auteur approach highly successfully and showed extensive and deep understanding of the films and their contexts. Similarly, there were many excellent applications of ideological analysis to films in all sections of the paper, where relevant to the question. However, despite noticeable improvements in this, some candidates still struggled to evaluate ideological analysis in a precise and substantiated way. Centres should ensure that candidates are taught to use ideological criticism as an interpretive tool, supporting claims with well-chosen textual evidence and considering the value of this approach to film study.

Too many responses still relied on vague or superficial references to race, gender, or capitalism without anchoring those ideas in specific cinematic moments. Similarly, use of theory—especially spectatorship—was often muddled or inappropriate, sometimes drawing from disciplines outside the specification with little meaningful purpose. This is especially true where Audience theories from Media Studies are often used very poorly when trying to discuss Film spectatorship. Students need support in understanding that any theories used should be relevant to Film Studies and should illuminate the film text, not replace analysis. Auteur theory, too, was sometimes misunderstood, with weaker responses defaulting to biographical summaries. Stronger responses avoided reductive director-centred readings, instead analysing aesthetics and critical perspectives with more nuance and a wider understanding of the auteur debate.

Finally, clarity and structure in writing remain vital. Responses benefit from being precise, focused, and clearly organised. There was a noticeable improvement in the more complex structuring of comparative responses in section A which really helped candidates develop more sophisticated answers to the questions. As ever, centres should emphasise the value of answering the specific question asked, rather than applying generalised or rehearsed content, and continue developing students' ability to write critically under timed conditions.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CENTRES

To improve candidate achievement in future series, the following strategies are advised:

- Develop candidates' knowledge of ideological criticism with more explicit and specific evaluation, supporting claims with relevant filmic evidence. Despite some clear improvements this year, some candidates were not able to evaluate the ideological critical approach, and this is a teaching gap that those centres must look to address.
- Too many candidates used inappropriate 'theory' from other academic disciplines that do not really allow them to engage with the subject content as published in the specifications. The use of 'theory' and terminology connected to spectatorship debates is often poorly understood and not applied meaningfully to films. It should be remembered that theory is to be used as a tool of analysis and linked to filmic examples, not used as an end in itself.
- Foster a more detailed, accurate and nuanced understanding of the auteur critical approach, avoiding simplistic biographical or historical summaries unconnected to critical opinion or film aesthetics.
- Emphasise the significance of precise and purposeful writing to enhance clarity and analytical depth. Ensure candidates address the question set and do not simply download pre-prepared answers and case studies without a focus on the question.

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

1.1

This question required candidates to engage with a key aspect of the auteur debate by evaluating the extent to which a director shapes the aesthetics of the films studied, as opposed to other influential factors such as collaborative contributions, contextual conditions, or prevailing stylistic trends. Successful responses were those that rooted their arguments within a critical understanding of auteur theory, drawing directly from the relevant theoretical and historical contexts outlined in the specification. Most candidates responded effectively by, most commonly, referencing films such as *Vertigo*, *Casablanca*, *Some Like it Hot*, *Bonnie and Clyde*, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, *Do the Right Thing* and *Alien*, demonstrating how these films offered opportunities to explore both the director's authorial signature and the impact of external or collaborative influences. Although less popular, studies of *Imitation of Life*, *All About Eve* and *Night of the Living Dead* allowed candidates to construct some very interesting debates about the influence of genre upon aesthetics. The question allowed for detailed sequence analysis and comparison between films across the Classical and New Hollywood periods which is essential for this section of Component One.

Stronger responses were characterised by their analytical depth, drawing on formal elements such as mise-en-scène, sound, cinematography, and editing to examine directorial influence. These candidates made confident use of auteur theory, citing key critics such as Andrew Sarris and Pauline Kael, and critically evaluated the debate surrounding individual authorship versus collective authorship. Many high-achieving essays effectively considered other contributors—such as specific cinematographers, production designers, or editors—and the extent to which their roles complicate the auteur critical approach. Candidates often produced insightful comparisons across time periods, genres, and production contexts, with films such as *Casablanca*, *Do the Right Thing*, and *Imitation of Life* facilitating thoughtful discussions of the intersection between aesthetic choices and sociopolitical or historical contexts. Films like *Alien* and *Bonnie and Clyde* also enabled some of the most detailed contextual engagement seen in recent years.

Weaker responses often lacked sufficient engagement with debates, failed to move beyond very simplistic explanations of directors' influences upon aesthetics or failed to connect context and aesthetics in a meaningful way. Some answers leaned heavily on plot summary or biographical information about directors without applying this to the formal construction of the films' aesthetics. Others offered generalised commentary on Classical Hollywood or auteurism without supporting analysis drawn from specific sequences or scenes. In many of these responses, limited use of film terminology and an underdeveloped understanding of collaborative authorship weakened the critical focus expected at A-level. Overall, the question proved very accessible, but more successful responses were able to integrate theoretical knowledge with detailed textual and contextual analysis.

1.2

This question asked candidates to compare the extent to which the films they studied demonstrated personal freedom within the context of the New Hollywood era. Candidates approached the notion of "personal interests" in a range of valid ways, including thematic preoccupations, aesthetic choices, representational decisions, and industrial or production constraints. The best responses framed their arguments around the tension between the commercial and collaborative nature of film production, and filmmakers' individual voices. Candidates often structured their essays in complex ways by comparing and contrasting competing filmmakers' interests within the production of each film, which allowed for meaningful comparative discussion, and many engaged thoughtfully with how shifting industrial conditions in the 1930s - 80s created space for new forms of creative expression.

Some candidates successfully challenged the question and argued that some Classical filmmakers, such as Hitchcock, had more freedom for personal expression than some New Hollywood filmmakers.

Stronger responses clearly distinguished between the characteristics of Classical and New Hollywood cinema, often exploring this through films such as *Bonnie and Clyde*, *Alien*, *Vertigo*, and *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. These candidates demonstrated secure and very detailed historical and contextual knowledge, especially of the decline of the studio system, the weakening of the Production Code, changing cultural landscapes and the influence of New Wave Cinemas. Many articulated the idea of personal vision using critical frameworks such as Sarris's notion of "interior meaning," and some offered detailed formal analysis to support their arguments—analysing, for instance, the thematic tension and visual style in *Alien* as a reflection of generic hybridity, collaborative production and Scott's auteurist sensibility. Effective responses also placed films in discourse with their wider cultural and political moments, evidencing strong conceptual understanding of how New Hollywood, generally speaking, opened space for more subversive or individualistic content.

Weaker responses tended to rely too heavily on generalised comparisons, simplistic and narrow explanations of contextual influences or plot summaries, with limited engagement in detailed analysis or stylistic critique. Some struggled to explain the institutional or cultural frameworks that define Classical and New Hollywood and often misunderstood or misapplied concepts such as auteur theory. References to censorship, such as the Hays Code, were often superficial or historically inaccurate. In some cases, credit was given to directors for stylistic traits without any critical interrogation of collaborative input or industrial context. A number of candidates focused too narrowly on isolated sequences (such as opening credits, sometimes without even mentioning the film's narrative) at the expense of broader thematic or formal analysis. Overall, while most candidates were familiar with the films and debates, more precise contextual and theoretical integration would strengthen middle- and lower-band responses.

SECTION B

2.1

This question required candidates to evaluate the usefulness of ideological analysis in enhancing their appreciation of the studied films. While the specification allows for a range of critical perspectives, this question explicitly invited engagement with ideology as a formal analytical tool. Stronger candidates understood that the focus was not solely on ideological themes but on how ideological analysis could develop appreciation of film aesthetics, representations, narratives, meanings and responses. Many candidates framed their answers through comparison with other critical approaches—such as spectatorship, aesthetic or contextual analysis—which often led to more insightful, evaluative arguments or were able to identify specific advantages and disadvantages of ideological analysis regarding the films studied.

Stronger responses demonstrated a clear grasp of ideology as a critical methodology, using it flexibly to interrogate their appreciation of the texts. Films such as *Joker*, *La La Land*, *Get Out*, and *Promising Young Woman* featured prominently, with standout essays examining neoliberal, racial, and feminist ideologies in nuanced ways and being very precise in identifying how ideological analysis had improved, or in some cases spoiled, their appreciation of the films. These responses often showed confident use of critical terminology, and where sequence analysis was included, it anchored evaluative points with precision. Some candidates made effective use of social, political and cultural contexts to support their arguments. In particular, comparative studies—such as pairing *La La Land* with *Get Out*—enabled strong ideological contrasts and allowed for thoughtful debate around ideological intent and effect.

Weaker responses tended to adopt ideological positions without sufficient critical distance, often treating ideology as content rather than as a critical approach. Unfortunately, again, some candidates seemed completely unprepared to be able to evaluate the ideological critical approach despite all past Examiners Reports raising this and offering advice to teachers. Some candidates engaged in broad, undeveloped references to theoretical constructs—such as Critical Race Theory or Marxist ideology—without successfully applying these ideas to specific textual features. In several cases, analysis became disconnected from the films themselves due to a lack of sequence-based examples. There was also some confusion over the evaluative nature of the task, with candidates sometimes describing ideological elements rather than assessing their interpretive usefulness or by making rather circular and redundant arguments that ideological analysis helps you understand ideologies in films without showing how this might develop appreciation. A number of responses would have benefited from clearer structure, more precise terminology, and closer attention to how ideological meaning is constructed through formal film language.

2.2

This question required candidates to assess the value of ideological analysis in interpreting cinematographic choices. The most effective responses clearly identified key elements of cinematography—such as framing, lighting, camera movement, and composition—and considered how these could be ideologically charged. Candidates were invited to evaluate whether ideological readings offer the most insightful lens for understanding these choices, or whether narrative, genre, or aesthetic intentions might offer more persuasive interpretations. This encouraged a comparative critical approach, demanding both technical precision and conceptual depth.

The strongest answers demonstrated a well-balanced understanding of cinematographic language and ideological frameworks. These candidates selected scenes where visual strategies clearly communicated ideological meanings—such as class, gender, race, or political resistance—and were able to discuss these with accuracy and insight. Films like *Captain Fantastic*, *Promising Young Woman*, and *Little Women* inspired particularly thoughtful feminist and socio-political readings. High-level responses frequently drew on a well-integrated knowledge of the ideological critical approach and engaged in subtle, evaluative comparisons between films. Importantly, they used terminology fluently and precisely, avoiding generalisations and grounding their arguments in detailed, sequence-specific analysis. A simple but highly effective approach to answering this question very well by some candidates was to consider, by precise reference to selected shots, how the closing sequences of *Nomadland* and *Beasts of the Southern Wild* can be read ideologically or, perhaps, better explained through narrative analysis as poignant, emotional resolutions to human dramas.

Weaker responses, by contrast, often drifted away from cinematography into broader discussions of mise-en-scène, editing, or performance. Although these aspects are interconnected, many responses lost focus on the question's central requirement: the ideological implications of cinematographic technique. Some candidates overused theoretical jargon—particularly from spectatorship theory or general ideological discourse—without applying it meaningfully to visual detail. Others misapplied key terms or confused cinematography with broader film form. Films such as *Get Out* and *Captain Fantastic* were sometimes analysed through excessive plot summary or superficial technical references (e.g., listing shot types without explanation). In weaker responses, this led to vague assertions and underdeveloped arguments, with limited understanding of how camera work might be interpreted ideologically or explained by other critical approaches.

SECTION C

3.1

This question required candidates to analyse how settings contribute to the dramatic impact of the films they studied, considering relevant elements such as place, time period, and broader socio-cultural contexts depending upon the films studied. Candidates approached this in varied ways: some focused narrowly on very specific physical locations, while others adopted a broader interpretation, viewing setting as a narrative device that shapes character development and thematic meaning.

Popular film choices included *Trainspotting*, *Shaun of the Dead*, and *This is England*, where candidates generally demonstrated a comfortable grasp of how settings influence narrative storytelling and dramatic experience. Some of the new films like *Belfast*, *Saint Maud*, *Mogul Mowgli* and *Mangrove* inspired some of the most sophisticated responses as candidates demonstrated how settings impacted upon or reflected character psychology and, consequently, spectator alignment and allegiance. *We Need to Talk About Kevin*, *This is England*, *Fish Tank* and *Under the Skin* prompted some extremely insightful analyses linking settings to symbolic expressionism, ideological commentary and thematic concerns that helped create dramatic tension.

Stronger responses stood out through their nuanced yet detailed engagement with settings, avoiding simplistic or formulaic interpretations. These candidates explored settings as dynamic sites of conflict, identity, and cultural resonance, often situating locations within wider social or historical contexts. They employed detailed filmic analysis, citing specific sequences and using precise terminology to demonstrate how settings reinforce narrative arcs, create narrative tension and relief or reflect character transformations. Films such as *Fish Tank*, *Kevin*, and *This is England* were used effectively to anchor arguments, with stronger essays illustrating how repeated returns to key locations could deepen understanding of character motivations and themes, and therefore spectator experience. Additionally, these essays often balanced localised interpretations with national or cultural perspectives, showcasing a very mature and holistic approach to the dramatic functions of setting.

Conversely, weaker answers tended to provide superficial or generic comments on the 'dramatic quality' of settings without deeper analytical insight. Many responses struggled to link setting explicitly to drama, resorting to broad statements or plot summary rather than focused exploration of cinematic techniques or narrative purpose. Some candidates seemed unable to discuss narrative entirely, while others were hesitant to engage with settings as an aspect of film, limiting the depth of their work. There was also a tendency for repetition, particularly on popular films, where responses sometimes became formulaic and lacked the critical nuance seen in stronger submissions. Overall, these weaker essays would have benefited from more detailed scene analysis and clearer use of film-specific vocabulary.

3.2

This question required candidates to examine how sound and performance convey messages and values in their chosen films. Candidates were asked to analyse how these two elements contribute to the overall meaning and thematic concerns within the films. Popular choices such as *Trainspotting*, *This is England*, *Under the Skin* and *Fish Tank* offered rich opportunities for detailed scene analysis. While newer titles like *Saint Maud*, *Mangrove*, and *Mogul Moggli* were less commonly selected, they nevertheless prompted thoughtful and insightful responses when chosen. There were some excellent responses that showed a wide understanding of the formal elements but chose to argue that very specific elements of sound or performance such as music, dialogue, foley, facial expression and gesture were most important - this often led to very detailed and focussed responses. Overall, the question engaged candidates' ability to link audio-visual techniques with ideological meaning.

Stronger responses demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of both sound and performance as integral to film meanings and responses. These candidates seamlessly integrated detailed formal analysis of sound design—including music, sound effects, and dialogue—with nuanced discussion of performance, capturing how actors' delivery and physicality can be employed to embody ideological messages. The best essays were characterised by precise use of film terminology and close reference to key sequences, showing clear connections between technical choices and thematic impact. For example, extraordinarily detailed scene analyses from *Trainspotting*, *Under the Skin* or *Mogul Moggli* revealed candidates' abilities and preparedness to explore how soundscapes and performative subtleties convey complex meanings.

In contrast, weaker responses often lacked depth and focus, tending towards vague description or even ignoring the question completely, rather than rigorous formal analysis of sound and performance. Many candidates struggled with defining what constitutes film performance, resulting in superficial or generic observations that missed opportunities for critical insight. While sound was generally handled more confidently—with some attention to effects and music—there was still a significant number of essays where sound and performance were discussed in isolation rather than as interconnected elements shaping meaning which would have made responses more complex and sophisticated. Films like *We Need to Talk About Kevin*, *Trainspotting*, *Shaun of the Dead* and *Belfast* sometimes proved particularly challenging, with weaker answers failing to convincingly link sound or performance choices to the films' ideological meanings. These limitations highlight the ongoing need to develop candidates' technical vocabulary, and their understanding of how audio-visual components work separately and together to communicate ideological messages and values.

FILM STUDIES

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 2

Overview of the Component

Candidates approached this year's examination with assurance and maturity. It was encouraging to see that many responses demonstrated a secure understanding of the set films, along with a genuine engagement with the subject. Responses were generally well-structured and purposeful, reflecting the efforts of centres in reinforcing the importance of focused answers. It was particularly clear that candidates had been reminded to avoid unnecessary narrative description when not required by the question. Rubric breaches were rare, suggesting careful preparation and strong exam literacy.

The introduction of new films has brought a welcome freshness to the paper. When well taught, these texts provided rich opportunities for candidates to address both AO1 and AO2 with confidence, insight, and enthusiasm. Teachers are encouraged to revisit the newly introduced films across all three sections and consider how CPD resources and case studies might support planning for future exam series.

Contextual understanding was a notable strength across many responses. Candidates displayed an informed grasp of the historical, industrial, and socio-economic factors surrounding film production, reflecting effective classroom teaching and a strong understanding of how context shapes meaning. This aspect continues to be a positive feature of candidate performance.

However, a key area for development lies in the teaching of core film elements. Some responses lacked the specialist vocabulary and precision required to analyse sequences effectively. Generalised descriptions often replaced detailed discussion of cinematography, *mise-en-scène*, sound, and aesthetics. A more deliberate emphasis on these foundational concepts will help students deepen their analytical skills and produce more sophisticated, critically engaged responses.

It is recommended that future teaching continues to integrate theoretical concepts with close textual analysis. Candidates who can effectively connect aesthetic elements—such as editing, framing, colour, and *mise-en-scène*—to the wider values and innovations of the relevant film movement produce effective answers to any set question. This approach not only deepens their analytical insight but also demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the films in context. Embedding this practice into classroom teaching and assessment preparation will support the development of more nuanced and critically engaged responses, serving as a valuable model for future cohorts.

Centres may want to remind candidates to manage their time efficiently during the examination, allocating approximately 60 minutes to Section A and 30 minutes each to Sections B, C, and D. Adhering to these recommended time limits is essential to ensure well-balanced responses across all sections. It should be noted that Section A does not necessitate additional time, as it does not involve any comparative analysis of films.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Section A: Global Film

Candidates generally responded well to the question on representation, with gender being the overwhelmingly more popular option. Almost all candidates chose to explore representations of gender, with only a tiny number engaging with ethnicity. The representation of gender or ethnicity provided a relatively straightforward analytical task, although it was tackled with varying degrees of detail, accuracy, and application of subject-specific language. The most challenging component of the question was the requirement for insight, which, when addressed successfully, resulted in stronger and more nuanced responses.

At the top band, candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to link representation to context, often showing how representations are constructed to critique the societies in which the films are set. The best answers reflected a nuanced understanding of how gender or ethnicity is depicted and why, offering well-rounded, developed interpretations. In contrast, responses at the lower end lacked meaningful connections between representation and context, and sometimes sacrificed depth for breadth, particularly where candidates attempted to discuss both gender and ethnicity or applied different focuses across their chosen films.

While the wording of the question suggests a focus on either gender or ethnicity, some candidates chose to address both or selected a different concept per film. Although this approach is acceptable, it often resulted in shallower analysis, due to breadth being prioritised over depth.

Popular Film Texts and Their Effectiveness:

- *Pan's Labyrinth* and *City of God* remain central to many centres' teaching and were frequently chosen by candidates. These texts continue to lend themselves well to discussion around representation, though the effectiveness of responses varied.
- *Parasite* emerged as the most popular of the newer texts, often paired with one of the older, established films. It proved to be a productive choice, with many candidates successfully linking gender to class and social structure. A common analytical thread was the contrast between male and female characters across the two central families, which supported strong insights into both characterisation and wider societal critique.
- *Portrait of a Lady on Fire* was also handled particularly well, with candidates demonstrating a solid grasp of how gender is constructed through the gaze. These responses showed clear evidence of thorough preparation and this maybe a film that centres may want to consider for future teaching.
- *Mustang* was another film that appeared in a fair number of responses. While these were often strong in contextual understanding, they were sometimes lighter on detailed textual analysis, suggesting an imbalance in the approach.
- *Life Is Beautiful*, in contrast, was less successfully explored in response to this question, possibly due to challenges in aligning its narrative style and tone with a focused discussion on representation.
- Other films appeared infrequently, but centres may want to consider selecting one of the new films to 'freshen up' this section and open debates.

In summary, this question was very popular among candidates, especially due to its relevance and accessibility. Well-prepared, candidates produced insightful and contextually rich responses, particularly with texts like *Parasite* and *Portrait of a Lady on Fire*. The challenge remains in encouraging all candidates to develop deeper insights and to strike the right balance between textual analysis and contextual understanding. Candidates do need use relevant subject specific terminology surrounding film form in whichever question they choose.

1.2

This question was broadly accessible and generated a wide range of responses from candidates. While not as widely chosen as Question 1.1, it remained popular and allowed students to explore two fundamental aspects of film form: editing and sound. The most successful candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of these elements and were able to articulate how they contributed to the communication of key messages in their chosen films. However, the complexity of the question—requiring consideration of both editing and sound across two films—meant that only the strongest candidates provided consistently well-balanced and insightful responses.

Overall, this question allowed candidates to demonstrate analytical insight into how editing and sound shape the meaning of film. While many responded with confidence and clarity, particularly when working with films rich in formal complexity, others showed gaps in their understanding or struggled with the technical distinctions required. With targeted support and a renewed focus on formal analysis, particularly of editing, future responses to similar questions can show further improvement.

Common Strengths:

- Candidates who selected well-chosen sequences where both editing and sound were integral to meaning were often able to produce perceptive and focused analyses.
- Stronger responses answered the question directly, showing an explicit understanding of *how important* editing and sound were in conveying messages. These answers were typically well-structured and employed appropriate critical terminology.
- Some films, such as *Portrait of a Lady on Fire*, lent themselves particularly well to this question. Candidates analysing this film often produced highly skilled discussions of soundscapes and editing, making clear links to thematic and narrative meaning.
- The most effective responses treated the two films with relative balance and explored the significance of either editing, sound, or both, depending on the demands of the films and the chosen sequences.

Common Challenges:

- A notable proportion of candidates struggled to address both editing and sound equally. In some cases, one of the elements—typically editing—was underexplored or confused with cinematography.
- Some responses appeared to rely on pre-prepared material, occasionally shifting focus away from editing and sound entirely in favour of discussing other elements of film language. This approach often resulted in responses that did not fully meet the demands of the question. Please remind your candidates to answer the set question rather than shaping the question to fit their prepared answer.
- There was frequent confusion between the formal elements of cinematography and editing, with some candidates referencing visual composition and claiming it as evidence of editing in their conclusions. This indicates a need for further emphasis on the distinction and analysis of editing.
- In a few cases, candidates failed to reference detailed sequences or neglected to tie their analysis back to the central theme of conveying key messages.

Film Choices and Popular Sequences:

- The combination of *City of God* and *Pan's Labyrinth* was particularly popular among candidates. The opening of *City of God* was a frequently selected sequence, as was the ending of *Another Round*.
- *Portrait of a Lady on Fire* provided especially strong opportunities for analysis, with its nuanced use of both sound and editing being recognised and well-explored in some responses.

Section B: Documentary Film.**2.1**

This question offered candidates the opportunity to explore how theoretical frameworks influence their understanding and appreciation of creative decision-making in documentary or non-fiction filmmaking. While many candidates engaged with the task effectively, this question proved to be one of the more problematic in terms of interpretation and execution. Several candidates misunderstood key requirements, leading to partial or unfocused responses that limited their overall achievement.

Centres should reinforce the requirement to refer to one of the four prescribed filmmaker-theorists when answering this question and avoid substituting this with general documentary theory or the director's own approach.

Key Strengths:

- The strongest responses demonstrated a clear understanding of one of the four prescribed filmmaker-theorists and applied the theory meaningfully to the film studied.
- These answers often integrated theoretical ideas with textual analysis throughout the answer, showing how the application of theory deepened their appreciation of creative decisions such as structure, voice, framing, and narrative construction.
- Candidates who engaged critically with the theory—questioning, contrasting, or exploring its limitations in relation to their chosen film—often produced nuanced and insightful work. Some candidates successfully argued that diverging from the chosen filmmaker's theoretical principles enhanced their appreciation of the film's creative approach.
- Effective responses tended to limit their focus to a few well-developed points, offering depth of analysis rather than a broad overview.

Areas for Improvement:

- 1. Misinterpretation of “Filmmaker’s Theory”:**

A recurring issue was confusion over what constitutes a filmmaker’s theory. A number of candidates incorrectly used Bill Nichols’ modes of documentary or a director’s individual approach (e.g., Asif Kapadia’s notion of "true fiction") in place of one of the four specified theorists. Although some managed to make meaningful points, these responses could not be rewarded fully, as they did not meet the criteria of the question.
- 2. Structural Issues in forming an answer:**

Many candidates struggled with structure, often presenting fragmented or overly general arguments. There is a clear need for more classroom emphasis on structuring answers around theoretical ideas and clearly connecting these to textual analysis. As candidates have limited time for each response it is important to practice planning an answer that deals with specific questions.
- 3. Limited Reference to Specific Scenes:**

Some responses lacked focus on specific sequences or creative decisions, instead offering broad, generalised commentary on the film as a whole. Stronger answers were those that grounded their discussion in particular moments or techniques, making the analysis more concrete and precise.
- 4. Integration of Theory and Text:**

Weaker responses tended to mention the filmmaker’s theory briefly—often at the beginning or end of the essay—without integrating it into the analysis. The most effective answers wove the theory throughout the response, using it as a lens through which to interpret the film’s creative choices.
- 5. Understanding of “Creative Choices”:**

While the term “creative choices” was interpreted in various ways, the more successful responses made this a central and explicit focus. These responses often discussed elements such as editing, use of archive footage, narrative voice, re-enactments, and visual style in relation to the chosen theory.
- 6. Appreciation and Evaluation:**

The question’s focus on “increased appreciation” was addressed most successfully by those who reflected critically on their learning process. Stronger answers recognised that both alignment with and divergence from the filmmaker’s theory could enhance their understanding and appreciation of the film’s construction.
- 7. Depth vs. Breadth:**

Candidates who attempted to cover too many points often produced shallow, checklist-style responses. By contrast, those who selected a smaller number of ideas and explored them in depth were more likely to achieve higher marks.

Recommendations:

- Centres should reinforce the requirement to refer to one of the four prescribed filmmaker-theorists when answering this question and avoid substituting this with general documentary theory or the director's own approach.
- Essay planning and structural development should be a key area of focus in teaching, ensuring candidates know how to balance theory and textual evidence effectively.
- Students should be encouraged to analyse specific scenes or moments and make the "creative choices" at the heart of the question a clear focal point.

2.2

This question offered candidates considerable freedom to engage creatively and analytically with their chosen documentary film. It invited students to explore the formal overlap between documentary and fiction filmmaking, particularly in terms of how narrative, characterisation, and stylistic choices can be employed to heighten dramatic effect. While the question proved popular and elicited some strong responses, a significant proportion of candidates found aspects of it challenging, particularly the requirement to focus on *fiction film techniques* and to anchor their analysis in a *singular key sequence*.

Key Strengths:

- Stronger answers clearly identified techniques associated with fiction films—such as characterisation, narrative arcs, music, dramatic irony, and montage editing—and examined how these were employed within a specific sequence to enhance emotional or narrative impact.
- Films such as *Amy* proved particularly well-suited to the demands of the question. Several candidates demonstrated perceptive insight into how figures such as Blake Fielder-Civil and Mitch Winehouse were constructed with traits often associated with fictional antagonists. Where this was linked clearly to increased dramatic effect, responses were notably effective.
- The best responses maintained a clear focus on a specific sequence, using it as a basis for sustained analysis rather than generalised commentary. These answers often benefited from a strong structure and well-integrated textual references.

Areas for Improvement:

1. **Misunderstanding of "Fiction Film Techniques":**
A recurring issue was the misinterpretation of the phrase "techniques commonly associated with fiction films." Many candidates instead focused on documentary conventions, thereby drifting away from the central premise of the question. This significantly limited the analytical depth and relevance of their responses.
2. **Neglect of the "Key Sequence" Requirement:**
Although the question specifically called for analysis of a *key sequence*, many responses lacked this focus. Instead, they offered broad, film-wide commentary. While contextualising the sequence within the wider film is appropriate, the absence of a defined, detailed sequence often led to superficial analysis.
3. **Depth vs. Breadth:**
Weaker responses tended to prioritise breadth over depth, offering multiple brief points without developing any in sufficient detail. Stronger candidates made fewer points but explored them thoroughly, drawing clear links between specific techniques, their fictional film parallels, and their impact on the audience.

Film Choices and Suitability:

- *Amy* was the most frequently selected film and generally worked well in response to this question. However, some candidates struggled to move beyond surface-level analysis of its style or to clearly identify fiction techniques in a focused sequence.
- *For Sama* also proved effective, with several thoughtful responses analysing scenes that blended personal narrative with dramatic tension. Centres may want to consider this film in the future and use the CPD case study provided by Eduqas as a starting point in textual analysis.
- *Sisters in Law* posed more of a challenge due to its observational style, making it more difficult for some candidates to identify fiction-related techniques.
- *Exit Through the Gift Shop* was less commonly chosen but produced some interesting responses when candidates focused on the 'Disneyland' sequence, which allowed for discussion of narrative manipulation and performative elements.

Section C Film movements- Silent Cinema

3.1

This question was popular and generally well understood, offering candidates the opportunity to explore the relationship between film form and character construction. The focus on either cinematography or mise-en-scène (or both) provided flexibility, while the requirement to analyse a specific key sequence helped to promote focused and structured responses. Overall, responses demonstrated a solid understanding of key film language, though there were some recurring limitations in depth of analysis and conceptual clarity, particularly among weaker responses.

Key Strengths:

- Most candidates responded effectively to the question, with the majority clearly referencing either cinematography, mise-en-scène, or both in relation to character construction.
- Stronger answers maintained a sharp focus on one key sequence and analysed how specific formal choices contributed to the audience's understanding of a character's traits, emotions, role, or symbolic meaning within the film.
- *Sunrise* emerged as a particularly strong choice, with candidates often linking formal elements to themes such as gender representation and moral transformation, supported by relevant contextual knowledge. Although the question was more challenging for those studying *Man with a Movie Camera*, some candidates offered commendably original interpretations. These included analyses of the cameraman, the editor, the Soviet citizenry, or even the ideological 'character' of the Soviet Union.
- Many responses demonstrated a sound grasp of technical terminology, with students able to apply it appropriately to support their arguments, centres should be applauded for their teaching of this section.

Areas for Improvement:

- 1. Descriptive vs Analytical Responses:**
Weaker answers tended to be overly descriptive, outlining what happens in the sequence without analysing how film form constructs meaning. A more analytical approach—linking technique to effect—is necessary for higher achievement.
- 2. Neglect of the ‘Key Character’ Element:**
Some candidates lost sight of the central focus on a *key character*. While technical analysis was often sound, it was occasionally disconnected from any clear discussion of characterisation, limiting the effectiveness of the response.
- 3. Overuse of Multiple Sequences:**
While the question encourages focus on *one* key sequence, references to more than one was acceptable where they added depth or contrast. However, some candidates included multiple sequences without clear justification or development, which diluted the analytical depth of the response.
- 4. Mise-en-Scène and Performance:**
A few candidates attempted to incorporate performance into their discussion of mise-en-scène. While performance is not strictly a component of mise-en-scène, such overlaps were evaluated on their merit, provided they contributed meaningfully to the discussion of character construction.

3.2

This question was well received and generally produced thoughtful and well-developed responses. It enabled candidates to engage with a critical debate central to silent cinema, offering opportunities to explore how expressive and realist elements interact to generate meaning. Most candidates recognised the conceptual dualism inherent in the question and attempted to analyse their chosen film accordingly. However, there were some recurrent issues that prevented some responses from reaching the higher levels of the mark scheme.

Strengths:

- Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the distinction between expressive and realist film modes and could identify features of each within their chosen film.
- Stronger responses focused not only on identifying such features but also explored how these modes *interacted* or *merged*, particularly within a specific scene or sequence. This synthesis was key to achieving a sophisticated analysis.
- Films such as *Strike* and *Spies* produced particularly successful responses. Candidates often selected powerful sequences—such as the slaughter montage in *Strike* or Matsumoto’s suicide in *Spies*—to exemplify the effective blending of realism and expressionism.
- Several candidates studying *Sunrise* were able to integrate contextual discussion, including representations of gender and morality, into their analysis of cinematic style, which added complexity and depth to their arguments.
- Although not required by the question, many stronger candidates chose to anchor their analysis in one or two well-chosen sequences. This approach allowed for close textual analysis and supported more coherent arguments.

Areas for Development:

- 1. Integration of the specialist area:**
A key expectation of this question is engagement with realism vs expressionism. Consider André Bazin's writings on realism which are directly relevant. Candidates should be encouraged to engage meaningfully with relevant academic perspectives.
- 2. Understanding of 'Merge':**
Some candidates approached 'merge' as referring to the combination of modes across the film as a whole, while others considered it within individual sequences. Both interpretations were valid; however, stronger responses made this understanding explicit and used it to structure their analysis.
- 3. Focus on Meaning Creation:**
While many candidates successfully identified expressive or realist techniques, some failed to articulate how these elements *create meaning*. High-level responses linked technique directly to thematic, emotional, or ideological meanings, whereas weaker responses remained on a technical or descriptive level.
- 4. 'How Far' Framing:**
The evaluative element— 'how far'—was inconsistently addressed. The best responses revisited this phrase throughout and structured their argument as a measured assessment, rather than treating it as a rhetorical opening device.

Section D: Film movements- Experimental film (1960-2001)

4.1

This question, while conceptually rich and academically valuable, proved to be one of the most challenging for candidates across the paper. Although a small number of students attempted it, responses were often hindered by misinterpretations of key terms, particularly the concept of "film movement." As a result, many answers lacked the depth and accuracy required to reach the higher levels of the mark scheme.

Common Strengths:

- In general, the first part of the question—exploration of *aesthetic elements*—was handled more successfully. Many candidates were able to identify and describe key visual or stylistic features in their chosen film, with varying levels of analytical depth.
- Responses on *Daisies* and *Cléo from 5 to 7* demonstrated a strong grasp of the relationship between visual aesthetics and their respective movements—Czech New Wave and French New Wave. In these cases, candidates not only described the aesthetic elements effectively but also contextualised them within the broader socio-political and cultural frameworks of the movements.
- Several candidates studying *Fallen Angels* showed a confident understanding of Wong Kar-wai's visual style. Where students also successfully linked his aesthetics to the characteristics of the Hong Kong Second Wave or other relevant cinematic movements, responses were sophisticated and well argued.

Areas for Development:

1. Misidentification or Omission of Film Movement:

The most common issue was the failure to correctly identify a film movement—or the complete omission of one. In numerous cases, candidates referred to “experimental film” or “experimental movement” as a catch-all category, which lacks the specificity expected at this level. Additionally, some candidates discussed films such as *Memento* without situating them within an appropriate movement, such as postmodern cinema. This significantly limited the extent to which candidates could address the question in full.

2. Over-Reliance on Auteur Theory:

In responses on *Fallen Angels* and *Memento*, candidates frequently focused on auteurist interpretations, particularly the distinctive style of Wong Kar-wai and Christopher Nolan. While this often led to insightful commentary on aesthetic features, it diverted attention away from the intended focus on *film movements*, thereby weakening the overall coherence and relevance of the response.

3. Neglect of the ‘Reflect’ Element:

While many responses described aesthetic elements effectively, fewer explored how these elements *reflect* the ideologies, contexts, or stylistic principles of a specific film movement. This evaluative component—linking form to context and movement—was crucial for achieving higher-level analysis but was often underdeveloped or absent.

4. Conceptual Confusion and Lack of Clarity:

A small number of responses lacked a coherent structure, presenting a disjointed collection of ideas without clearly linking aesthetic analysis to a defined movement.

4.2

This was the most popular question in this section and the new film choices were effectively used. Most candidates engaged well with the question, demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of experimental narrative. Stronger responses showed a sophisticated grasp of how narrative structure is manipulated in experimental cinema, while weaker responses tended to struggle with deeper analysis of narrative techniques, often defaulting to more general observations.

Memento emerged as the most frequently discussed film, followed closely by *Mulholland Drive*. Candidates who chose *Memento* generally found it easier to address the question due to its clearly unconventional narrative structure. Many were able to articulate how the film's reverse chronology and fragmented sequencing subvert traditional storytelling. Responses on *Mulholland Drive* varied, with more capable candidates successfully navigating the film's complex and ambiguous narrative structure, though some found its nonlinear elements challenging to analyse in depth.

A smaller group of candidates focused on *Cléo from 5 to 7*. While the film's use of episodic, fragmented structure was frequently noted, many responses failed to fully explore how these features constituted alternative storytelling, often stopping at surface-level commentary. The idea of time is prominent in the film and drives the narrative with a playful, ambiguous approach to real time and this could have been further addressed.

Some candidates who studied *Fallen Angels* often veered towards discussing stylistic elements like cinematography and editing, rather than engaging directly with its narrative experimentation. Overall, this question allowed many candidates to demonstrate their understanding of how experimental films challenge conventional narrative forms. However, the strongest responses came from those who could critically analyse the film's storytelling techniques in depth, rather than simply identifying surface-level features.

Areas for development:

1. Reinforce the **importance of analysing how techniques generate meaning**, not just identifying them.
2. Teachers should help candidates understand how to make **effective use of one or more sequences**, ensuring each sequence contributes meaningfully to the argument rather than being included for coverage
3. Candidates are encouraged to **engage critically with the filmmaker's theories** for Documentary, not only as a framework to support analysis, but also to reflect on how theory enhances or challenges their understanding of filmmaking practices.
4. Teachers are encouraged to **revisit the teaching of editing as a formal element** or any element of film form, they are less confident in delivering with tailored CPD opportunities.
5. **Align film choices with recognised movements as outlined in the specification.**
Where possible, centres should guide candidates to contextualise their experimental film within a recognised cinematic movement, and teach the historical, political, and aesthetic context of that movement. Please use the Eduqas fact sheets as a starting point for key sequences and debates.

FILM STUDIES

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 3

Overview of the Component

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 label the work clearly; some short films in particular were not labelled with the candidates' names and candidate numbers, just film or final film which was not helpful when downloading multiple files. Centres should record on coversheets where the assessment procedures (page 40 of the specification) have been applied. There were 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.

Some written work did not have word counts added, it is helpful for both moderation and centre assessment when candidates include this. It is also helpful for candidates who have chosen the brief of distinct genre codes to name the genre on the coversheet.

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

Short films were in general assessed more accurately than the screenplay and storyboard option. There were some interesting and creative responses to all the briefs on offer. As in previous years the distinct genre brief was the most popular choice with an interesting range of genres being chosen although thriller and horror remain the favourites. A few candidates cited 'drama' as a genre, for academic study and fulfilling the brief, 'drama' is too wide a category, lacking clear conventions which can be analysed in the evaluative analysis and candidates should be more specific in their choices. There was some good work on that narrator brief, with some excellent consideration of the purpose of the interior monologue which was the most common type of narration used. There was also some excellent work with the non-linear brief being used to reveal previous misdeeds carried out by characters. The parallel stories brief was the least popular narrative brief, and very few of these were assessed, but they tended to be done well where they were chosen. It was pleasing to see that virtually all centres were using the correct briefs.

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. There is still a need for candidates to be more careful in their music choices: some film extracts used music tracks that seemed to be chosen based on their lyrics rather than tone to match the mood and atmosphere of that moment in the sequence.

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

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 clear that candidates had carefully considered narrative structure and characterisation. Candidates mostly described the mise-en-scene, characters and action in ways that were easy to visualise, there were however still too many examples of prose writing which was not visual. Candidates need to ensure that they do not describe a character's thoughts or feelings. 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-scene, character and action, were over-rewarded in some cases.

Storyboards are still a problematic part of this option 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. Some candidates, but not enough, considered non-diegetic sound and had some appropriate and specific music choices. This is an area 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, or from behind the characters and this limited the effectiveness of the storyboard.

The evaluative analysis is also a piece that tends to be assessed with some generosity, particularly for screenwriters as they also need to write about their work in relation to professionally produced screenplays, including those for short films and consider the art of screenwriting. More candidates were discussing screenwriting this year which is pleasing to see. 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 brief analysis of how the work meets the chosen brief. The focus should be on the analysis of the meaning and response created by the specific use of key elements in the candidate's own work with cinematic influences (their own choices and the short films) woven into that analysis; the cinematic influences should not be discussed separately. Some candidates described the short films in isolation wasting valuable words needed for the analysis of their own work. 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. There is a suggestion of an effective structure in the updated Guidance for Teaching document on the Eduqas website.

When considering the set short films, a misunderstanding seems to persist that only three films need to be considered; please see page 43 of the specification where it is clear that the total running time of the films selected must be at least 80 minutes, with a minimum of three being considered. For some centres there was a tendency to list all films studied or watched on the coversheet and again in the work, but then only discuss three of them; all 80 minutes should be referred to as influential in some way, with some being discussed in more detail than others. Please see the assessment procedures in the specification which state on page 40: *if work references 40 minutes or less, cap marks at lower band 3. If work references between 41 minutes and 79 minutes cap at upper band 3*. These assessment procedures had been overlooked by some assessors.

Meaningful comments should deal with an aspect of the short film which could be key elements and/or structural elements making a clear link with a specific influence on the candidate's own work. Generalisations about single short films or short films paired or grouped together cannot be considered sufficiently meaningful.

In summary, the short films and screenplays were of a high standard and moderators saw some excellent, creative work. There were many recommendations that work should be entered for The Moving Image Awards where their hard work and achievements can be celebrated.

Comments on approaches to tasks and areas for improvement:

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.
- Don't 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 where possible rather than inanimate objects as substitutes.
- Very few marks are available for key elements if a storyboard is not submitted.

Evaluative Analyses:

- This needs to be annotated by the assessor.
- Include a word count.
- Refer to assessment procedures on page 40 of the specification when assessing work which is too short or too long, or which doesn't meaningfully discuss 80 minutes of the short films detailed on page 43 of the specification.
- Cinematic influences must be films.
- Screenshot of the influences alongside the work of the candidate are useful.
- Don't 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 in the candidate's own work with cinematic influences woven into that analysis; do not discuss the influences separately.
- No need to describe narrative theory.
- 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. Screenshot 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.
- Follow assessment procedures if the candidate has not meaningfully commented on 80 minutes of the short films and record this on the coversheet.
- Use the correct running times on the short film log on the second page of the coversheet, see Appendix A on page 43 of the specification.
- The short films detailed on the short film log must be covered in the evaluative analysis, it should not be a record of all films watched or studied.

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: [AS and A Level 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