GCE

Film Studies

Advanced GCE **A2 H467**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H067**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Film Studies (H467)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Film Studies (H067)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

F631 Film Text and Context

General Comments:

The quality of candidates' responses, the range of questions attempted and the range of films studied has grown considerably from the first sitting of this unit in summer 2013 and is on a par with that seen in the previous session generally. There was very considerable diversity of films studied as the basis for responses to the questions in Section A, demonstrating that centres and candidates are using the flexibility that the specification affords. As was mentioned in previous reports, this again shows a very pleasing engagement with the letter and the spirit of the specification. Texts used for discussion included *Children of Men, 2012, Fish Tank, My Brother The Devil, Inception, Looper, Animal Kingdom, Super 8, Skyfall, Tinker Tailor Soldier Spy, Hanna, Spectre, Submarine, The Great Gatsby, There Will Be Blood,, The Dark Knight, The King's Speech, The Woman In Black, Don't Be Afraid Of The Dark, Nightcrawler, Kick Ass, Time Travellers Wife, Never Let Me Go, Divergent*, *Twelve Years A Slave.*

This list shows again the considerable diversity of genres, and film-making styles which centres have embraced with this unit. This diversity – across the range of the whole cohort and centre level - has enabled candidates to answer the questions in Section A with conviction and knowledge, as will be discussed further below. While the diversity of films studied is to be applauded; due care should be exercised in determining what combinations of films are taken forward as the basis for examination responses. Some of the more effective combinations of films in this session included Inception and Looper; Fish Tank and My Brother The Devil and The Great Gatsby and There Will Be Blood. Centres and candidates are advised to be clear about the rationale they employ for choosing the films they study. With the combinations named immediately above, there are clear areas in common between the chosen films – with some it is genre, with others it is character types and others it is setting and social context. This demonstrates that there are a variety of possible approaches to selecting films for study for this topic. This advice is repeated from previous reports from prior sessions.

In Section A, there was a general preference for Q2 over Q1. Regardless of choice here, when candidates firmly addressed the terms of the question and directly used evidence from the films they had studied, high quality work emerged. This is a point of examination housekeeping which centres and candidates should fully bear in mind as they prepare for future examination sessions. With regard to Section B, once again, the most popular topics were the rise of the blockbuster, format wars and multiplexes and developments in 21st Century cinema and film. However, it is very pleasing to report that both of the other two topics available - Early Cinema and The Impact of World War II on British cinema have both increased again their popularity that was evident from last year's examination session. The strengths and weaknesses of different approaches taken to the different questions and topics are discussed below.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A
Question 1

The question addressed one of the seven Frameworks For Analysis described in the specification, namely authorship. On the whole, the question was proficiently handled by candidates – the majority of candidates who responded to this question were able to engage with a debate about the authorship and offer competing claims for a film's author in the films they had studied. Better responses were able to offer a range of potential authors – such as director, actor, and producer and in some cases reflection on the audience ability to drive the direction of a franchise over time. As has been mentioned in previous reports and is evident in the mark

schemes, the ability to offer precise textual evidence supported by accurate use of terminology is vital. Centres and candidates are urged to remember that this skill is vital in determining the level of success in the examination. Where candidates could discuss a range of technical terms and sustain such an approach across their response they were appropriately rewarded for this essential element of a film studies response.

An area for development with some candidates is the spread of their analysis across the films – seeking to focus on two or three key sequences within each film in the examination, and seeking to move away from descriptive writing and / or focussing on one part of the chosen films.

Question 2

The question addressed one of the seven Frameworks For Analysis described in the specification, namely 'messages and values'. With this question, the critical factor in determining the success of candidates responses here rested upon the degree to which candidates engaged could discuss the messages of the film and not conflate with themes – which while linked are not necessarily exactly the same. Better responses were characterised by the ability to communicate what the messages of the films were and do so directly, whilst less successful responses would offer discussion around phrases such as 'there is a message about family'. Vagueness at the top level conceptual thinking and writing will normally inhibit a candidate's ability to offer direct and relevant textual evidence.

As always, where candidates could discuss a range of technical terms and sustain such an approach across their response they were appropriately rewarded for this essential element of a film studies response.

Section B
Early Cinema (1895 – 1915)

For those centres whose candidates offered responses to this topic, Q3 and Q4 proved to be equally popular. Many candidates had a good level of knowledge which enabled them to respond effectively with a range of relevant points with respect of both questions. With regard specifically to Q3, better answers could address a range of factors – working through a range of film pioneers – such as the Lumiére brothers, Melies, Porter and Griffith. Alternatively some candidates found ways to query the question with discussion of economic and sociological factors as drivers of change also. Opinions supported by relevant evidence are needed to be successful in this regard.

With regards to Q4, candidates were on the whole able to offer a detailed knowledge of the specific conditions which pushed the American film industry to relocating in California and then to flourish there. The checking of key factors such as avoiding the Edison Trust on the east coast, the better climate, the availability of a range of relatively cheap land and easy access to more locations were all key to developing an effective answer. Furthermore, better responses were able to offer some details and examples of these processes in action with reference to the practices of some the Hollywood film industry pioneers.

The impact of World War II on British cinema (1939-45)

A generally pleasing feature of many responses to both questions was the accuracy of relevant historical knowledge and the ability of candidates to use this knowledge to make an argument which firmly addressed the terms of the question. Q5 asked for a discussion on number and type of films being produced – this was a key issue in determining the level of success enjoyed by the candidates who responded to this question. Q6 was the more popular option in this topic. Better answers could reflect on the intent of the films, using concise details from the films to help support the overall argument. Weaker responses were characterised by an over-reliance on textual description – re-telling the story of the film. As was mentioned above, Section B requires different types of responses than Section A which is geared towards textual analysis.

The rise of the blockbuster, format wars and multiplexes (1972 -84)

As was the case in the previous session, this was one of the more popular topics in this section. With regard to Q7, many candidates were suitably well briefed on the format war – there were some very detailed workings through of the nature of the format and their differences. Where candidates anchored their responses to the video format war and were able to support with relevant detail about the formats, and in some cases with personal anecdotal evidence on how parents and grandparents remember the period. Many candidates broadened out to debate the 'video nasties' – where discussion kept focus with format war, and the rise to prevalence of VHS this worked well. Where such discussions slipped into a debate on censorship, then these responses fell outside of the remit of the mark scheme. Q8 was extremely popular, with the majority of candidates able to offer detailed responses that referenced some of the key blockbuster films from the 1970s, explaining how their success revitalised the cinema market and how such films drove technological innovations requiring better auditoria. Q8 was the more popular of the two in this section, and on the whole, elicited many strong responses.

Developments in 21ˢᵗ Century cinema and film (2000 – present)

As with previous sessions, this proved to be a very popular topic area. Q10 was more popular than Q9. A common feature of many responses was to focus on audiences rather than filmmakers, and thus this greatly inhibited the ability of candidates to achieve high marks with regard to answers in this style. Where candidates did engage directly with the question and offer examples of technological innovation with regard to production and distribution factual level, then these responses were appropriately rewarded. The final question was the more popular option and in general, this was well handled by the majority of candidates. The majority of responses were well informed about the publicly funded Digital Screen Network – number of screens and in general terms what those screen are used for. The rise of 'Thinema' – the broadcast of theatrical and operatic performances in cinema screens was well recognised and an issue which was in main effectively addressed by many candidates. The better responses were ones that could be precise and particular – looking at the exhibition practices in cinemas local to the candidates and using this as an evidential basis to discuss to what extent audience choice has been broadened out. Additionally, many responses engaged with the methods of access to films which was characterised by the ability to engage with some specific examples – of platforms (Netflix / Amazon Video / iTunes) and / or specific products – (*Beasts Of No Nation; A Field In England)* and discuss the emerging re-formation of the film exhibition market as with all of the questions of this unit, this question was looking to elicit a sense of debate from candidates, and the ability to enter into a debate supported by evidence was key in determining the level of success of responses.

Sociological / Economic / Technological contexts

The advice below is a re-iteration of the same advice as from the previous report; centres and candidates who have responded to this advice have improved the quality of the responses offered in this session.

The better answers across all of the Section B responses explicitly addressed one or more of these contexts, as candidates determined what was most relevant from their learning and adapted to answer the questions set.

Centres are advised to use these contexts to help frame tasks inside and outside of the classroom and in so doing, candidates will then begin to generate material from their research which can help them better contextualise issues and perhaps personalise their learning more. Some practical ways that this aspiration can be put into practice is signposted in the scheme of work available on the OCR website.

General Advice to Centres

Section A – develop the candidates' technical knowledge and understanding alongside their understanding of the films and the seven Frameworks For Analysis. Technical prowess is integral to high performance in the exam. Also ensure that candidates are able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the films studied through being able to write about different aspects of those films. One tool in achieving this is through regular use of timed responses.

Section B – enable candidates to personalise and make concrete the work of the topics – regardless of which of the four topics they study. Candidates need to be able to construct arguments in the exam, and to enable them to do so fully, they need greater personal / local evidence to help over and above to what may be learned from reading books and websites. Whilst watching films or extracts from film from the periods being studied will help to consolidate candidates knowledge and understanding, it needs to be remembered that such work is a dimension of study for this topic, but detailed textual analysis is not required for questions to this topic and the mark scheme offers no facility for rewarding textual analysis in this section.

Centres and candidates are advised to make use of the support materials (study guides and exemplar materials) which are published on the OCR website in order to learn from best practice and scaffold ways to improve.

F632 Foundation Portfolio in Film

Administration

As the qualification enters its penultimate session it is clear that most Centres are very good at the administration of this component, with marks and work being submitted on time. All centres completed coursework cover sheets thoroughly, often with detailed comments outlining how and why the marks were allocated. A number of centres would still benefit from being more explicit in justifying why certain marks were awarded. The majority of centres submitted work as physical folders which were suitably presented; the centres which submitted work online had minor issues with moderators needing to access all material but this was quickly resolved.

Centres were often very clear about how and why marks had been awarded and avoided using subjective comments or just statements copied and pasted straight from the assessment criteria. Comments should clearly indicate how the individual candidates work meets the assessment criteria as this makes it clear as to how the centres have applied the criteria.

The video work was often submitted as individual discs which can make the moderation process more challenging as moderators are constantly switching between discs. It would be ideal if the complete work of a centre could be put onto a single disc. Please continue to make sure that video work is submitted in suitable universal formats.

Quality of marking

Application of the criteria was close to the agreed standard, though a minority of centres tended to be over-generous this was often with specific elements rather than the portfolio as a whole. Harsh marking was very rare. In terms of the textual analysis most centres are assessing candidates in the right levels, centres now appear confident in marking the planning. It was clear that if candidates had completed set tasks then this alongside the actual quality of the work allowed them to access the higher level marks.

The continued variety of creative artefacts produced was pleasing and the majority of centres were accurately rewarding the highest quality work. The centres producing the script and key frames still need to make sure that candidates demonstrate consistently high levels of appropriate production skills to justify awarding level 4 marks. Surprisingly there are still issues around candidates demonstrating the ability to frame and focus still images as well as using appropriate landscape formatting. The video work produced was mixed but was often accurately awarded the correct level.

Evaluations varied in approach with the majority of candidates submitting an essay style write up of their work and progress. Centres need to make sure that candidates address all the set questions.

Candidates' work

Given that this is the fifth year for the specification moderators were pleased that there is still a diversity of work produced particularly in the choice of films used in the textual analysis work. The diverse choice of films being selected is in keeping with the spirit of the specification. Candidates would all benefit from clear guidance being given on the correct ways to format planning and the importance of this being carried out prior to the production of the creative artefact as opposed to after the production.

Textual analysis

Candidates chose a wide range of films to analyse; these were often carefully chosen and facilitated the textual analysis. The most successful work demonstrated a clear sense of engagement with the texts and made insightful links between the micro-technical elements and the contextual macro elements. This was supported by the use of screen grabs to help illustrate the point being made and this visual stimulus proved to be useful in allowing candidates to make direct links between the two films.

The candidates whose textual analysis focused on small extracts from the whole film were able to gain appropriate marks for terminology due to the close analysis of micro-technical elements. As with the close focus on an extract the candidates who used a single framework of analysis tended to produce more coherent and focused pieces of writing. This approach should be encouraged.

A number of candidates had tried to shoehorn in specific film theory, often rather clumsily. It is better if candidates are aware of the broader concepts of film theory and apply this to their film choices as opposed to trying to fit in theory.
It was clear that where centres and candidates had considered the whole portfolio from the start the choice of films for the textual analysis provided a clear and constant thread which linked all the elements together and allowed a cohesive portfolio of work to be produced. Both centres and candidates should be aware of the need for one film to be non-Hollywood and make this choice very clear.

Planning

The range and quality of planning was varied with some candidates producing lots of focused and detailed material whilst others had obviously produced much more limited planning material. The better work made explicit links to the impact of the textual analysis and how the candidates work had been influenced by the films analysed. Candidates producing a location report often seemed to ignore them when making the creative artefact or chose to include badly focused and framed images. It is vital that candidates realise the importance of planning and the need for it to be presented in a suitable format.

Creative artefact

More Centres appeared to be submitting script and key frames as opposed to filmed sequences. The quality of work produced in both areas was mixed.
The stronger filmed sequences had clearly benefitted from good planning and an understanding of technical conventions linked to the textual analysis. Where this was evident candidates had produced excellent work that was both sophisticated and demonstrated excellent application of production skills. The film sequences that were less successful did not demonstrate the same technical excellence. If centres choose to offer the filmed sequence they would benefit from highlighting the need for basic technical competence.
As with the filmed sequences there was excellent work produced in the script and key frame approach. Again as with the filmed sequence candidates who used the appropriate formatting for the script tended to produce work of a higher standard. These candidates also managed to relate their key frames clearly to the prior planning. An area for improvement in both the filmed and non-filmed work is the use of mise-en-scene which can let down otherwise well planned and constructed creative artefacts.

Evaluation

The evaluations are an element that have benefitted from more focus, it is important that candidates do more than just describe what they have done without much sense of evaluating its success or otherwise. A significant number of candidates now include screen grabs of their own

work and compare this directly to the work from the textual analysis, this approach should be actively encouraged. The better candidates were able to make clear and insightful points about how all elements of their portfolio linked together.

All submitted evaluations were written and often presented as a continuous piece of writing. The specification does not state the format that the evaluation should be presented in so it may be beneficial for centres to consider the way this is presented in future sessions; evaluations could be presented as an audio commentary, a video presentation or through a mix of approaches. Centres would benefit from considering how the evaluation is delivered and structured in order to access the full range of levels. It is vital that all candidates answer all four questions in order to access the full range of marks.

Centres are reminded that all the elements are meant to interlink and inform each part of the process. It is also expected that differentiation takes place within centres particularly in the marking of the individual elements.

F633 Global Cinema and Critical Perspectives

General Comments:

As the fourth sitting of the A2 paper for this specification it was pleasing to see continuing improvements in candidates' responses and a clear sense of confidence growing in both candidates and centres. There were examples of excellent practice by some centres and clear engagement with the spirit of the specification.

A range of texts, case studies and approaches were undertaken. For Section A the variety of texts from differing contexts included La Haine, A Prophet, City of God, Tsotsi, Elite Squad, The Tin Drum, Goodbye Lenin, Metropolis, À bout de soufflé, Pan's Labyrinth and Caramel. In Section B, all sections were covered but Authorship was again the most popular, with fewer candidates attempting the topic area of Film Regulation this session.

Overall the quality of responses for Section A was again higher than those for Section B. Centres are reminded to take note of the case study approach to the topics in a contemporary framework. Many weaker candidates focused too heavily on theory without application and/or out-dated texts which made it difficult to address fully the question set. There was also evidence of gaps in teaching/learning in some areas where candidates seemed unprepared to deal with the focus of the question. It is important to remind centres that in order to develop students' skills from AS, they should be engaging with wider contextual issues in Section A and debating contemporary issues underpinned by critical approaches in Section B.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

The question focused on the macro framework of themes and the role this played in conveying messages and values. Successful candidates were able to identify several key themes and discuss with confidence how these were communicated in the texts supported by micro evidence. This was consistent in high-end responses also using technical terminology with confidence and accuracy. Where candidates had clearly engaged with a range of contextual issues, social, political and historical, they were able to confidently make links between these and often achieved marks in level 4.The majority of candidates really engaged with the question and were able to discuss with confidence the contribution of themes to understanding the messages and value of their chosen films. Those at the higher end were able to offer clear balance in the discussion of their two texts and draw interesting comparisons between them. Weaker responses often did not sufficiently address the set question and/or support points with examples and evidence. Several candidates made no reference to wider contexts or discussed context to the detriment of engaging with the films themselves. The weakest responses were often characterised by the failure to understand and appropriately identify themes and/ or messages and values in their texts. A few candidates demonstrated no understanding of the macro area of themes and instead offered simple descriptive accounts of their texts. In a very small minority of cases only one text was discussed. It is reminded two texts should be studied for this question. These must be studied in their entirety and explored with reference to their wider historical, social and political contexts.

Centres are also reminded, as stated in the specification, that the texts chosen for study should be from two different countries or the same country, but different periods of time.

Section B

Question 2

Only a few candidates answered this question.
Successful responses were able to discuss how wider social and often cultural/political context impacted on the role of regulation in the countries studied. Several made reference to the BBFC in the UK with discussion on the growth of online film access and the challenges this poses to effective regulation. Sadly few candidates fully engaged with countries such as Iran, China and Saudi Arabia for this question that would have provided rich case studies that would have broadened candidate's experience of film.
Weaker candidates failed to engage with the question and discussed regulation in much broader terms and gave out-dated examples, which had limited relevance to contemporary issues. Centres are reminded to be careful with the use of out-dated case studies such as the Jamie Bulger case, which has limited relevance to the question set, and highly disputable evidence about the impact of films in the case. This sadly was still seen by some centres despite strong warning in the previous session.

Question 3

This question asked candidates to consider the impact of regulation on filmmakers' creativity. The higher level responses carefully considered the debate in the question and explored how this could have a positive and negative effect. They also explored regulatory practices in several filmmaking contexts and could confidently compare and contrast case studies. Some discussed heavy censorship in Iran and a good case is still Jafar Panhi and his house arrest whilst making 'This is not a film'. Many candidates also discussed how filmmakers would compromise creativity and take cuts to their work to secure ratings and in turn box office takings. A range of countries were made reference to including the UK, US, China, North Korea, Iran and Saudi Arabia. Weaker candidates failed to engage with the question and discussed regulation in much broader terms and gave out-dated examples, which had limited relevance to contemporary issues.

Question 4

This was a very popular question with a wide range of answers offered with varying success. Responses at the higher end were able to really engage with the question in a contemporary context. The Marvel Franchise was a popular example as well as Star Wars along with the superhero genre. Strong responses supported their case studies with box office takings and figures to fully exemplify how these films can dominate the box office and are financially very successful. Level 4 responses offered clear case studies, a sense of debate and an ability to underpin their relevant points with critical approaches. Weaker responses to the question either lacked a contemporary focus or offered merely anecdotal evidence rather than the consistent and detailed evidence of the higher end.

Question 5

This was another popular question in Section B but proved challenging for some candidates. The key focus of this question was independent directors in a contemporary framework. There were some examples of excellent practice here where candidates had really engaged with a range of appropriate case studies. Jim Jarmusch was a good example with discussion of his recent film Paterson as well as Alejandro González Iñárritu and his success with Babel and more recently Birdman and The Revenant. Wes Anderson was again a popular example with some well-focused discussion comparing the success of his early work such as Bottle Rocket with more recent films such as The Grand Budapest hotel. Responses at the higher end underpinned this discussion with relevant critical approaches such as auteur and star theory. They also considered how success for independent films is not merely financial and the role of awards and critics.

In weaker responses several candidates sadly failed to engage with the 'independent' aspect of the question and merely debated the importance of the director. Centres are reminded that they should cover both independent and mainstream case studies as outlined in the specification for this unit. They also must consider this in a contemporary framework, as there were several candidates who discussed Hitchcock working as an independent early in his career but did not support this with any contemporary context. Sadly this meant these candidates were unlikely to reach beyond Level 3 at best.

Film and Audience Experience

Question 6

Only a relatively small number of candidates responded to this question. Responses were generally able to discuss how gender creates variety in spectator response. Wonder Woman was a recent example used here with some reference to feminist readings of the text. Weaker responses lacked critical engagement and used a limited range of examples to discuss the question set. Centres are also reminded that candidates must understand how particular audiences have responded to texts and have specific examples of which to refer, rather than rely solely on their own readings.

Question 7

There were some successful examples of responses to this question. These were able to link their points and examples to critical approaches and confidently discuss the issues in the question. The use of 4k, HD and 3D/4D were all relevant examples as well as the discussion of the potential of VR in filmmaking and 360 degree views. Some considered the role of online exhibition and in particular how Netflix and home viewing has changed film exhibition. Clear case studies and 'evidence' is still lacking in this area and it is important that candidates are equipped with examples to support their points to be able to access beyond L2.

General Advice to Centres:

Section A - Ensure that candidates are fully prepared to discuss the wider contexts, which influence the message and values in the films studied. Historical, social and political issues in the country at the time of production are fundamental to candidates' understanding of the texts and how they operate.

Ensure that candidates understand the key messages of their films and are able to link these to wider context and the macro areas.

In class, candidates should cover all macro areas so they are able to link messages and values to each of the potential question areas.

Comparison is key, and film texts should be selected with this in mind.

Section B - Exploring the key issues detailed in the bullet points of the specification for each area and ensuring that candidates have relevant, detailed and up to date knowledge is essential. Critical approaches must be applied to contemporary examples and not just regurgitated. Long paragraphs of theory are difficult to credit as the relevance to the question together with application is not clear.

F634 Creative Investigation in Film

General Comments:

There continues to be a wide range of research topics explored and work was very well presented. There were more filmed extracts produced in this session which was pleasing to see. Marking was mostly in line with the national standard set for this unit but there were still a few centres overmarking the creative artefacts and the research projects.

Administration

In most cases the portfolios were well presented and arrived on time. All candidates required for the sample were sent to the moderators. Most candidates presented their work on paper with a few centres deciding to use online blogs or websites. Both worked equally well. Most filmed tasks were submitted on DVD or featured links to a blog or website, and in all cases, these were problem-free. There were, however, a few centres that submitted their filmed work on a USB stick which is not acceptable. Please refer to the guidance on page 52 of the specification for suitable formats. The comments on the cover sheets were especially helpful in this year's session with many centres offering clear and detailed justifications for the marks submitted. Most centres used the interactive cover sheets which meant comments were much easier to read than with hand written sheets. Comments referred to both the strengths and weaknesses of a candidate's work, with focused reference to the work submitted. Internal standardisation was clear in many centres through annotations on the work.

Research

There were some very interesting research topics in this year's session. As with last year's session, the most successful research tasks were those that embedded their secondary source material seamlessly into their findings, using them to influence their own analysis of the primary texts. Candidates continue to enjoy their research topics and demonstrate a wide range of interests in their choices. Some of the research topics investigated included: Artificial Intelligence in movies, the representation of female superheroes, mental illness in independent films, filmmakers including Guillermo del Toro, David Fincher, Denis Villeneuve and the representation of lesbians in film. Research questions and hypotheses were broader this year which enabled candidates to expand their research beyond their own textual analysis. There were, however, a larger number of research projects that relied too heavily on the textual analysis of their chosen films rather than using secondary sources to support their arguments. Without clear reference to secondary source material, candidates made generalised assumptions based on their own analyses. There were, however, some very sophisticated responses. As with last year's session, the candidates who chose to investigate a series of research questions tended to produce more focused responses. Most candidates, however, are still failing to produce a description of key texts despite frequent reference to this in previous reports.

Planning

Candidates respond well to the prescribed list in the specification and produce a range of detailed and focused planning materials. There continued to be an impressive level of detail in the planning submitted by some candidates. Candidates who made clear links to their research produced purposeful planning materials with clear intentions. It was pleasing to see candidates producing a script as part of their planning for the non-filmed option. In previous sessions this draft element was often overlooked. Most candidates used the correct formatting for their draft scripts.

Creative Realisation

There were some strong short films and examples of key frames in this session; although generally the quality of the artefacts was less impressive than in previous sessions. Again, as in previous sessions, candidates who produced focused research projects, generally produced high quality creative artefacts. Centres are encouraging candidates to think carefully about how their research projects can link into their own work. There was some creative use of digital special effects in some of the filmed extracts this year and a convincing comedy film that was handled well; this is often a difficult genre to pull off. There were also some dialogue-heavy, ambitious pieces which were handled with skill. There were a few issues with focus and clarity in some of the films and candidates are encouraged to consider the lighting conditions when they are filming. An Edgar Wright inspired piece was well executed and enjoyable and was a clear attempt to emulate Wright's directorial style; this stylistic approach often works very well. As in previous sessions, the non-filmed task was popular with most centres choosing this option or a combination of non-filmed and filmed. There were some lengthy and detailed scripts in this session; some of the best seen. The quality of the key frames continues to be erratic. There were far less incidents of candidates producing key frames in portrait rather than landscape format and this was pleasing to see. Some key frames were sent in black and white even though the intended film was colour. If centres choose to produce key frames it is important that they are printed to replicate the filmed sequence they represent. The use of Photoshop to create lighting and special effects seemed less evident in this session. Comments on sound were missing from some of the key frames and there were still candidates who produced very similar images in their sequences. Candidates should aim to explore a range of camera shots to demonstrate as appropriate.

Evaluation

The evaluations were generally very well handled in this session. Candidates made good use of exemplification from their research product to analyse the aims and success of the artefacts. As in last year's report candidates are encouraged to include screen caps from their research and their own artefacts to support their evaluations.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance
programme your call may be recorded or monitored