

GCSE (9-1)

Examiners' report

DRAMA

J316

For first teaching in 2016

J316/03 Summer 2023 series

Contents

Contents	1
Introduction.....	2
General overview.....	3
Introduction	3
General	4
Administration	4
Concept Proforma.....	5
What did candidates do well?	5
What did candidates find a challenge?	7
Texts	8
Performance - Acting	9
What did candidates do well?	9
What did candidates find a challenge?	10
Performance - Design	10
Most common causes of candidates not passing	16
Avoiding potential malpractice	16
Helpful resources	16

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates. The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the concept proforma and performances, highlight good practice and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

General overview

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the concept proforma and performances, highlight good practice and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

This was a very unusual and challenging year in the context of covid amendments and illness of candidates, sometimes at the very last minute before a performance.

General

This year saw the return of an examiner visiting to watch performances for component 03, Presenting and Performing Texts, and assess since 2019. All examiners said this was welcomed by centres. Overall, the examinations ran very smoothly. Examiners reported seeing some very exciting and engaging performances. There was evidence that previous reports had been helpful and acted on, leading to some improvements. There was also evidence from examiners that some centres had forgotten how to conduct the visiting examination and needed reminders and advice. This did not affect the assessment of candidates but became an administrative challenge in some cases. The return to a showcase of two extracts increased the demand on candidates compared with 2022.

It is important that the online Visit Booking Form (VAF) is completed in plenty of time to make sure an examiner is allocated. Please note that concept proforma must not be sent digitally but must be sent as a hard copy to the examiner at least seven days before the visit to mark performances.

Administration

Most centres met the deadline of seven days for sending the examiner the required documentation.

Examiners reported that most centres provided smooth and efficient administrative arrangements and were pleased to meet any requests by examiners. For example, sometimes it was more appropriate for the examiner to sit behind an audience so some adjustment to location was requested and arranged without problem.

The time-sensitive paperwork required is important and although most centres met the deadline of seven days for sending the examiner the required documentation, a small number missed deadlines and the concept proforma and running order and associated documentation was received very late. The seven-day deadline for documentation and concept proforma is in place to make sure parity for candidates and to give examiners sufficient time to mark the concept proformas in advance and to prepare their paperwork for the marking of the performances. It is important for examiners to have an idea of the intention of candidates in their performances, and this aids examiners' understanding of what candidates are doing. In addition, non-receipt by the seven-day deadline puts candidates at risk of receiving zero for that element of the examination.

The items required are as follows:

- The concept proforma for each candidate as a hard copy. Electronic versions are not acceptable. The proforma must be signed by the candidate with the centre confirming that the work is that of the individual candidate alone. There was an increase in the number of texts to be performed from one up to a full showcase of two.
- The running order of showcase performances. This must have candidate names and candidate numbers and be organised in order of performances.
- Details of the centre such as location, availability of parking, and any ID required.
- The time the centre wishes the examination to start.
- Although the specification refers to photographs being sent in advance, this is not necessarily very helpful, and most examiners prefer photos of the candidates in costume to be available on the day. Most centres provided photographs of candidates on the day in costume. Photographs of the candidates when they were in year seven or eight was not helpful when watching performances and identifying them.

A requirement of the specification is for the performances to be filmed and then chaptered and placed on a DVD or memory stick. Candidates must introduce themselves before each extract. When candidates are in a group of four or more it is important that their costume makes them easily identifiable by the

examiner. Some centres were imaginative about this providing sashes, arm or wrist bands and case headbands, all in bright different colours. Examiners appreciated this assistance

It is a requirement of the specification that the centre provide an audience for performances. The specification gives details of the nature of audiences permitted. Many centres did so with the majority of centres having audiences that were made up of the actual examination class, taking it in turns to perform and to watch their peers. Some centres also had other classes watching from younger years or future GCSE candidates. Several centres had invited candidates' parents and friends to watch with some of these taking place in the evening, making it into an event, and which worked well. A very small number performed on a Saturday in front of an audience of family and friends.

There were some issues with dates initially as the VAF form had dates that spanned weekends and did not fit a normal centre week. Most centres worked with examiners to make sure a visit was arranged that was suitable for both.

Concept Proforma

This section of the examination requires candidates to have good knowledge of the whole of the play, not just the extract that they have used for their showcase. Candidates need to

- know and understand the original intention of the playwright
- research the context of when the text was written
- identify the challenges the text provides for a performer and/or designer and how they might be met
- decide on their own intention and how they want an audience to respond
- plan how to develop their role using drama techniques learnt during the course
- have examples of how they have prepared as an individual in a role, not the group as a whole.

The concept proforma guides candidates into preparing thoroughly for their showcase.

What did candidates do well?

Examiners reported many candidates wrote in good detail, the most successful focusing on and addressing the elements asked for by each question. It isn't necessary to write in great length, and there were good responses that were succinct in their writing yet covered all the essential information, without repeating themselves in later questions.

The best candidates were able to provide information about the origins of the play in their responses to Question 1, explaining why the playwright had written it, and setting the text in the social and/or political context of that time. They were able to do this without going into unnecessary detail and swamping the answer with a biography of the playwright. In the best responses, candidates' research had uncovered previous performances and they were able to compare the original to subsequent interpretations, and then compare it to their own intentions, sometimes taking the best ideas and building on them; sometimes commenting on the weaknesses and suggesting ways they could avoid them.

Well-focused responses kept to the brief. For example, Question 1 is asking about the challenges and refers to structures. The best candidates were able to reference the whole play and avoid just describing the plot. The key word is *demands* and while there will be challenges linked with character, the most successful candidates avoided going into detail about their role and avoided discussing general issues

about the plot and were able to pick out challenging moments in the text and relate them to their significance in performance.

There were some very detailed accounts of the way that – sometimes at least – the challenges had emerged through the process rather than being clear at the outset.

In Question 2 the focus is on artistic vision. In the most successful responses candidates understood what 'vision' meant and were able to link their own vision for their extracts with the original intention and how they had interpreted it. Where there had been subsequent productions of the play, research had enabled some candidates to discuss their own interpretation in the context of how others had interpreted the text. Another aspect some successful candidates used was to apply knowledge of practitioners and/or workshops to inform how they wanted to present their extracts. Some discussion of design and how it might support their vision was evident in well-rounded responses. Examiners reported that more candidates were able to reference the style they would choose in the context of intention and what they had written in their responses to Question 1. The most thorough responses went on to describe and explain design elements that would support their personal vision in practice, providing even more context for what they wanted to happen.

The question answered most successfully was Question 3. Most candidates understood their role, and that they needed to carry out preparation if their performance was to be successful. Some linked this with the demands of their vision, so they were not considering their preparation in isolation. The strongest candidates offering acting considered the drama techniques they had used and how that linked with the demands of their own role. Higher achieving candidates avoided the trap of writing about all of the roles instead of focusing on their own. There is a good opportunity here to link the demands of the text (explained in Question 1), their vision (described in Question 2) and how they need to develop their role for the demands to be met and their vision achieved.

Another element that helped contribute to the achievement of high marks was explanation of how the role itself developed from first beginnings, how perhaps peers had commented on the success of their character interpretation, and how they changed their presentation of role to overcome challenges – a recognition of when something wasn't working and attempts to modify their character.

Most higher achieving candidates were clear about the demands of their own role and the relationships with other characters, and such candidates provided some good comments on specific vocal and movement ideas, semiotics and emotional expression.

There were more examples of the use of drama technical language and fewer examples of generic reference to Brecht and Stanislavski, candidates instead focusing on a particular technique, naming it correctly and then explaining how its use had an impact on how they prepared their role. References to workshops using current practitioners were well-documented and underpinned technique they wanted to incorporate into their performances. Examiners reported that a strong feature this series was the way high-achieving candidates used the rehearsal process as a scaffold to build their response to Question 3.

Answers to Question 4 were usually very clear on the kind of audience reaction that they wanted and might get. This question is underpinned by the previous three and the most successful responses managed to blend in the intentions, challenges and vision with their own character interpretation into an intended and expected audience response. Cross-referencing rather than repeating information given in the other three responses is the key to a sound response to Question 4.

Those responses where good marks were not achieved often gave a description of what happens in the play for Question 1 and Question 2, a vague commentary on what all the character were for Question 3, and a bland comment on audience reaction without any consideration of what the candidate might have

written in the earlier responses. The most successful candidates were those who stuck rigidly to the elements of each question and avoided repetition.

It is important to note that the space provided for the responses is considered sufficient for an answer that could be given full marks, and although there is no penalty for exceeding the suggested length, some of those candidates who did have long responses took the risk of being self-penalising through generalisations and repetition. Candidates are requested not to use very small font size to fit more onto a page. Some examples went as low as font size 9, which was difficult for examiners to read comfortably.

What did candidates find a challenge?

The temptation to describe the plot is often too much for some candidates. Some candidates went into detail describing the plot, and giving a potted history of the playwright, ignoring completely the requirements of the question. Consideration of structure was absent for many candidates except the highest-achieving, and this is an area that is clearly important when considering how to interpret their extracts. Some candidates placed too much emphasis on the playwright's background, and a literary analysis of the play, rather than focusing on the demands of bringing the play to life and the staging of the play for live theatre.

Although the majority identified the playwright and when the play was written, some candidates did not go on to explain succinctly the social and/or political context. There were again few examples where candidates referred to subsequent productions where there may have been interpretations that could have influenced the candidates' own thinking.

Some candidates did not seem to understand what was meant by *vision* in Question 2 and ended up repeating much of what had been written as an response for Question 1.

Question 1 is about the whole play, relevant aspects of the context, the challenges it presents and considering the way the extract(s) fit into that whole. There need be no mention of roles played or group/individual intention here. It is better that there is some consideration of previous presentations of the play that may inform what they are going to do. The structure of the play as a whole and the relevance of the extract chosen is an important consideration.

In relation to this question, one examiner reported last series that *'...in many cases it felt like reading an English essay and there was no sense that candidates were exploring the text with the intention of performing it.'* Another examiner reported, *'Answers that offered a balanced view of the whole performance were rare. Candidates were often focused on the issues of the text rather than its performance demands; these were frequently concerned with social or cultural matters, often with the assumption that a contemporary audience would be unable to understand what life was like in a previous generation when the play was written. In other case candidates appeared to be answering the question, 'what are the demands of the role you are playing?'* This comment is just as relevant for this series.

Another examiner wrote, *'Some candidates did not even mention demands. They tended to write in detail about the background to the text, the plot, the characters. 'Learning my lines' was given several times as a demand!'*

Question 2 then expands on what they are going to do with the extract and why – their own artistic intention. Here the discussion often seemed to be about how all the characters are to be played rather than discussing the individual's approach, the overall vision of the candidate, with references to genre and style of performing the whole extract. Where appropriate, candidates could support their vision and intention with decisions on design elements. Many less successful responses just did not understand what vision meant and provided another narrative response

Many candidates struggled to identify an artistic vision for their work, especially when one of the extracts was short. In such instances there was an abiding impression that the vision being offered was confined entirely to the extract they had performed, rather than providing this in the broad framework of the whole play.

Question 3 is about the role(s) the candidate is taking on, how they worked on them, indicating understanding of what happens to that character and their relations with others both before and after the extract that makes this selected section significant for that role. Weak responses here make little or no reference to drama techniques nor do they use appropriate drama vocabulary. Rehearsals and character development is missed as an important element for discussion. A few candidates approached the question not as a process but as a simple outcome. In such responses, there was little acknowledgement that this question asked them to discuss the development of their own role. In such responses by less successful candidates, at best there were specific examples of choices they had made; at worst, it was an analysis of character as it appeared on paper. Asking candidates to discuss rehearsal techniques would really help them to focus on development.

Question 4 is about the anticipated reception of their work and how they plan to manipulate that as performers or designers. Good responses here will often cross reference to their vision and intention, and the playwright's original intention where relevant.

Design candidates sometimes struggled to interpret the questions to make them relevant to design. While it is important in Q1 to provide the same information as candidates offering acting as their skill, the later questions need to be focused on design while still being specific as described above.

In summary,

- address each question as precisely as possible focusing on the elements of each question
- avoid repetition
- provide supporting and specific examples
- reference both extracts not just one of them
- identify the different challenges of each extract and how it might impact on the candidate's development of the role being played
- ask candidates to discuss rehearsal techniques to help them to focus on development.

It is important for centres and candidates to remember that the concept proforma provides a third of the marks for this component.

Texts

The range of texts continues to be more imaginative and wide-ranging. The trend from last year when there was evidence of more examples of classical texts, continued this series, there were some very imaginative approaches to frequently performed texts such as *DNA* and *Girls like That*. This was not the case with the plays of John Godber. While there were some examples that were exceptional, there were others that were weak, lacked momentum and missed opportunities for the comedy to be brought out.

Requests to use a text must be made to the OCR Text Management Service each year as there is no guarantee that a text will remain on the approved list. Some texts were approved this series in error. Despite the warning in the last report (2022), several examiners saw some examples where the extracts chosen were full of expletives or dealt extensively with incidents of violence, abuse or suicide. The starting point for this is that it is not appropriate; other examiners saw very sensitively chosen extracts that had just the occasional expletive, where candidates had been able to bring out the full power of the

text. There are plenty of suitable texts that will allow candidates to demonstrate a broad range of skills and be engaged.

The specification gives clear guidance regarding the suitability of content. Care should be taken that centres do not confuse this with the guidance for texts to be studied, as what is allowed is different from what can be performed.

*Candidates' performances **may not** contain:*

- *strong violence acted out against another character which dwells on the infliction of pain or injury*
- *sadistic violence*
- *frequent use of very strong language*
- *detailed or extended portrayals of sexual activity*
- *scenes of sexual violence*
- *nudity*
- *scenes explicitly demonstrating drug taking*

The text management service does not check a text regarding the suitability listed above – that is the responsibility of the centre - but ensures it does not clash with texts being used in another part of the examination, or that has been considered previously as being inappropriate. There was an increase this year of plays being chosen that did not meet these requirements, especially regarding 'frequent use of very strong language'. While this did not affect the awarding of marks, centres should make sure they meet the requirements listed above.

Performance - Acting

The move back to a full showcase proved to be a challenge for some candidates. The impact of covid seemed to have reduced opportunities for acting especially, and this series provided the most lines forgotten, freezing on stage, or even in some cases a refusal at the last minute to perform, since the specification began. There were also examples of some very short extracts, and in a few cases, they were so short that they did not meet the minimum demands as described in the specification. Extracts do need to provide sufficient opportunity for a candidate to present a range of skills and to interact with other characters. Most centres have recognised that smaller groups usually provide the best result and opportunities for their candidates. Monologues and duologues were used effectively when matched to the needs of a candidate, to demonstrate a range of skills.

What did candidates do well?

Once more this series, some group performances took well-known plays but prepared them so well and so imaginatively that they appeared as fresh and thoughtful pieces.

More centres had the faith to let the script and actor do their work without thinking they had to add lots of stylistic extras. Transitions were also much more effective without the frequent tedious blackouts that have been present in the past.

Most candidates delivered scripts as the characters they were meant to be playing. There was some very effective use of dramatic conventions. Semiotics were used in many performances as an aid to enhance the extract.

Brought out the context through the use of acting and well-chosen semiotics and grasping the style of the plays with success. Demonstrating performance discipline and crafting characters with both vocal and physical skills. Crafting transitions to make sure momentum was not lost and pace maintained.

There were examples of candidates taking on roles that allowed them to become someone completely different, stretching their emotional and physical capabilities.

Examiners reported a strong commitment to the role being played and that there were some good examples of creative and thoughtful staging. When used, physicality was appropriate, well-planned, and effective. Higher achieving candidates provided good evidence of emotionally connecting with their characters. Some ensemble work was accomplished.

What did candidates find a challenge?

A surprisingly large number of candidates read from the script, in some cases making use of mobile 'phones'. Some of these candidates delivered quite animated readings with strong characterisation, hence, the potential for much higher marks was clearly evident

With some candidates there was a lack of variation in vocal pitch, pacing and/or intensity. Vocal delivery not always matched by physical agility and/or good use of stage-space. There were examples of a variable sense of ensemble, especially where one or two group members were dominant. Poor articulation – often more noticeable in boys' performance – impeded effective delivery.

Although overall performance memory was very good, a few candidates did not know their lines and froze up on stage. It should be noted that if a prompt is used this does not automatically lead to lower marks. Even well-known actors sometimes freeze, and it is clear to an examiner when the 'freeze' is unexpected and the candidate is well prepared, as opposed to forgetting lines through poor rehearsal and lack of preparation.

Where there were examples of weak characterisation it was often through a lack of planning and preparation.

Male candidates playing female roles were often unconvincing.

Performance - Design

The number of design candidates has increased significantly, as has the standard of presentation, but remains small compared with acting. Most design candidates took the opportunity to provide an oral explanation of what they had done and why, signposting and in some cases demonstrating relevant areas to the examiner.

In the 2019 report, the following was indicated, which is just as relevant for this most recent series and for the future.

'Before anything else, the candidate must recognise that when selecting a design option, it must be the equivalent of the acting option. There is a heavy demand in, for example, learning lines, blocking, choosing and applying a style, and spending considerable time rehearsing. The design element chosen must be of similar demand. Choosing to light an extract with very simplistic lighting changes cannot be said to be the equivalent of an acting role. In the same way, choosing to do costume and make-up when the play is about school children so that the only costume is school uniform that is easily sourced is unlikely to place much demand in terms of research, design, sourcing and realising and so cannot be said to be equal in demand and will not attract marks because it is not possible to show a range of skills in the area of design chosen.'

Page 29 in the specification gives a clear description of the demands and the supporting material required for each of the design options. The best set designers this series provided photographs of model-to-scale sets, with scene changes indicated clearly, and photos of how it was replicated in the performance. The best costume and make-up design candidates gave supporting material detailing their research into colours and fabrics, issue about designing and making, and photographs of the final product, including issues about wearability. Lighting and sound included rigging, selecting appropriate technology, proof of operation of equipment and details of different options to support the vision of the text. All design options need to provide evidence as to how their design supports the vision and intention of the extract to be performed, and any trials they conducted along the way.

The following provides detailed guidance:

Probably the most important thing to keep in mind is that there should be parity in demand between candidates selecting design and those selecting acting as their performance skill.

The concept proforma can be very helpful by providing evidence of the thought processes of the candidate. Other supporting evidence – as described below - can be very helpful. The concept proforma should signpost and provide details of the decision-making process in preparation for designs the examiner will see.

Fewer candidates now fall into the category of doing design because their attendance is poor or they have difficulty working in a group, although there may still be a few. Therefore, more candidates are choosing design options and need to access the appropriate resources material.

Health and safety

People often groan when they hear these words spoken, but it is an important and essential element for consideration in design work. Whether it is the use of scissors and sewing machines, potential trips and falls in costume design, the danger of heights with rigging or electrocution and overheating with lighting, the level of decibels in sound, or the safe use of tools and weight of materials in manufacturing and the security of sets; all areas of design have their own health and safety challenges and should be considered. It might not be stated explicitly in the specification but is an important element of learning in the different design options.

Costume

It is important that candidates provide evidence that they have, themselves, had the ideas and have knowledge and understanding of how to make them work.

Evidence may include:

- A presentation to explain their ideas (but the examiner will not ask questions)
- Design board of ideas
- Photographs
- Diagrams
- Research
- Swatches of fabric
- Development/progression leading to final design including reasons for choices

- *the highest performing candidates will include many of these*

The presentation should provide a clear explanation of the physical evidence or artefacts; this will clarify what is seen, which may not otherwise always be made clear. How the explanation is presented will not be marked.

There should be evidence of understanding of genre, the period in which the play is set, and the social/historical context. Has the candidate considered alternative means of meeting the design? Good candidates will cover this in their concept proforma as well as in the physical evidence presented.

The realisation should match with the ideas presented – changes are acceptable and part of the artistic process but should be explained. The best results show progression and development of ideas from first ideas to the final design.

It is not necessary for candidates to make the costume; how the costume was sourced does not affect marking, but the relevance and the manner of, and reasons for outsourcing are important.

Costume can be adapted from charity shop stock, but how and why this is done is needs explaining.

There may be some repetition of points made in the concept proforma which is acceptable if it serves to enhance the original explanation and illustrates original ideas.

The final design should illustrate character, personality, mood, relevance to text and its context.

It should be appropriate for the character in the performance at the specific point in the script/the situation at the time.

It is essential that designs take into account the practicalities for the actor wearing it – ease of movement, comfort, and that it will not fall apart. Masks will need particular attention.

Set Design

- Understand the space available, (studio, pros arch stage, round etc.) where located?
- Where is the audience?
- Dimensions available (leads to scale drawing of ground plan) including height, for access
- Equipment available, boxes, furniture, flats, drapes, etc.
- Ground plan, to scale, indicating entrances and exits, furniture, flats, etc.
- Number of scenes required? Any changes of scene? Who? How?
- Interior or exterior?
- What does the script ask for in terms of setting? Anything?
- How many actors on stage and what are their requirements for furniture and props
- Set box with video 'tour' around it and voice-over rationale
- Explanation of what they are trying to represent, is it naturalistic, symbolic or something else?
- What has been the work needed to create the set? What has been made, painted, found or outsourced?

Relevant Websites

[A step-by-step guide to set design from Dramatics, International Thespian Society](#)

[Set Design 101 by Specialty Theatre](#)

Lighting (LX)

- Candidates should know what they've got to use and know how to use it to get what they want
- Understand the equipment available – How many channels available? Possible limitations on power available?
- Types of lanterns available/to be used – profile -flood-fresnel- moving heads, parcans and LED varieties
- Rig plan indicating basic cover and specials
- What does the script ask for in terms of lighting? Anything?
- How many states? Are they interior or exterior?
- Process of building the lighting states in discussion with actors
- Annotated script with cues
- Cue sheet for operation levels, timing, fades
- Special effects – e.g gobo (**g**oes-**b**efore-**o**ptics) How made? What used? Effect desired?
- Easily readable blog intro about basic lighting principles and tech language and the Stanley McCandless' method for example.

Relevant Websites

[Stage Lighting by Illuminated Integration](#)

Sound (SFX)

- Understand the equipment available – sound desk, any other effects?
- Remember that sound can be collected on a phone!
- Speaker plan- where are they located in relation to the performance space, and can they be moved to locate a sound coming from a specific place/direction?
- What does the script ask for in terms of sound? Anything?
- Process of introducing sounds in discussion with actors
- Sourcing of sounds. – internet, CD/LP, live recording
- Annotated script with cues
- Cue sheet for operation to include Levels, timing, fades
- Special effects – how made? What used? The 'Foley Engineer', etc.
- Voice overs – who? Why? How executed?

- Achieving balance for audience with actors
- Is there extraneous noise needing covering?
- Again, useful blog post from same source as lighting looking at basics

Relevant Websites

[Sound Design for theatre by Illuminated Integration](#)

The list of the plays that follows gives an indication of the range of texts performed in recent series. It is not exhaustive and is just a representative sample. Remember to submit your choice to the OCR Text Management Service.

Name of text	Playwright
<i>Blackout</i>	<i>Davey Anderson</i>
<i>Waiting for Godot</i>	<i>Samuel Beckett</i>
<i>Metamorphosis</i>	<i>Steven Berkoff</i>
<i>Things I Know To Be True</i>	<i>Andrew Bovell</i>
<i>The Caucasian Chalk Circle</i>	<i>Bertolt Brecht</i>
<i>Two</i>	<i>Jim Cartwright</i>
<i>Road</i>	<i>Jim Cartwright</i>
<i>Top Girls</i>	<i>Caryl Churchill</i>
<i>The Insect Play</i>	<i>The Brothers Copek</i>
<i>Private Lives</i>	<i>Noel Coward</i>
<i>Daisy Pulls it Off</i>	<i>Denise Deegan</i>
<i>A Taste of Honey</i>	<i>Shelagh Delaney</i>
<i>Gut Girls</i>	<i>Sarah Daniels</i>
<i>Mudlarks</i>	<i>Vickie Donaghue</i>
<i>Grimm Tales</i>	<i>Carol Anne Duffy/Tim Supple</i>
<i>Hansel and Gretel</i>	<i>Carol Anne Duffy</i>
<i>Mind Games</i>	<i>Paul Elliott</i>
<i>Medea</i>	<i>Euripides</i>
<i>Neville's Island</i>	<i>Tim Firth</i>
<i>Dancing At Lughnasa</i>	<i>Brian Friel</i>
<i>Parliament Square</i>	<i>Jim Fritz</i>
<i>Bouncers</i>	<i>John Godber</i>
<i>Shakers</i>	<i>John Godber</i>
<i>Government Inspector</i>	<i>Nikolai Gogol</i>
<i>The Magdalen Whitewash</i>	<i>Valerie Goodwin</i>

<i>Fathers For Justice</i>	<i>David Hughes</i>
<i>Chalk Farm</i>	<i>Keiran Hurley</i>
<i>The Woman Who Cooked Her Husband</i>	<i>Debbie Isitt</i>
<i>My Mother Said I Never Should</i>	<i>Charlotte Keatley</i>
<i>DNA</i>	<i>Dennis Kelly</i>
<i>Orphans</i>	<i>Dennis Kelly</i>
<i>Blood Wedding</i>	<i>Frederico Lorca</i>
<i>Yerma</i>	<i>Frederico Lorca</i>
<i>People Places and Things</i>	<i>Duncan MacMillen</i>
<i>The Wasp</i>	<i>Morgan Lloyd Malcolm</i>
<i>The Woman in Black</i>	<i>Stephen Mallatratt/Susan Hill</i>
<i>Child's Play</i>	<i>Don Mancini</i>
<i>Beauty Queen of Leenane</i>	<i>Martin McDonagh</i>
<i>Someone Who'll Watch Over Me</i>	<i>Frank McGuinness</i>
<i>Welcome Home</i>	<i>Tony Merchant</i>
<i>The Crucible</i>	<i>Arthur Miller</i>
<i>Alice in Wonderland</i>	<i>Adrian Mitchell</i>
<i>100</i>	<i>Kass Morgan</i>
<i>The Secret Garden</i>	<i>Marsha Norman/Lucy Simon</i>
<i>Mugged</i>	<i>Andrew Payne</i>
<i>Agnes of God</i>	<i>John Pelmeier</i>
<i>The Dumb Waiter</i>	<i>Harold Pinter</i>
<i>Girls Like That</i>	<i>Evan Placey</i>
<i>Blue Remembered Hills</i>	<i>Dennis Potter</i>
<i>An Inspector Calls</i>	<i>JB Priestley</i>
<i>Art</i>	<i>Yasmina Reza</i>
<i>Mary Stuart</i>	<i>Friedrich Schiller</i>
<i>Equus</i>	<i>Peter Shaffer</i>
<i>Macbeth</i>	<i>Shakespeare</i>
<i>Midsummer's Night Dream</i>	<i>Shakespeare</i>
<i>Othello</i>	<i>Shakespeare</i>
<i>The Tempest</i>	<i>William Shakespeare</i>
<i>Journey's End</i>	<i>R C Sherriff</i>
<i>Antigone</i>	<i>Sophocles</i>
<i>Oedipus</i>	<i>Sophocles</i>
<i>The Curious Incident of the Dog.....</i>	<i>Simon Stephens</i>
<i>Five Kinds of Silence</i>	<i>Shelagh Stevenson</i>
<i>Real Inspector Hound</i>	<i>Tom Stoppard</i>

<i>Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead</i>	<i>Tom Stoppard</i>
<i>Bronte</i>	<i>Polly Teale</i>
<i>Chatroom</i>	<i>Enda Walsh</i>
<i>Too Much Punch For Judy</i>	<i>Mark Wheeler</i>
<i>Lord of the Flies</i>	<i>Williams/Golding</i>
<i>A Streetcar Named Desire</i>	<i>Tennessee Williams</i>
<i>Be My Baby</i>	<i>Amanda Whittington</i>

Most common causes of candidates not passing

Poor concept proforma

Not meeting the minimum time requirements for extracts in the showcase

Avoiding potential malpractice

Make sure concept proforma is the candidates' own work, not sections copied from centre handouts, common sections with another candidate or taken from resource material such as theatre reviews.

Helpful resources

There is a list of drama technical terms within the [specification](#).

The specification has guidance on the demands for design candidates..

[Candidate exemplars | Teach Cambridge](#)

[Concept Proforma](#)

Practitioner theory texts or web resources

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Access to Scripts

For the June 2023 series, Exams Officers will be able to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts' for all of our General Qualifications including Entry Level, GCSE and AS/A Level. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

[Find out more](#).

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.