

# DRAMA

---

<p><b>Paper 0411/11</b> <b>Written Paper 11</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

Many candidates struggle to understand what is meant by the devising process. **Question 10**, in particular, highlights this, and the overall impression from many candidates is that the devising process consists of a) responding to a stimulus, b) discussing ideas, c) writing a script and d) rehearsing and performing it. This appears to be a widely held misconception and the working process of devising, including improvisation and the refining of ideas through trial and error is not generally considered. The exploration and discovery of dramatic ideas and concepts through theatre methodology is missing from the majority of candidate responses. This means that very few candidates are able to score highly in **Question 11**. Centres are urged to address this area with candidates and ensure that candidates are made aware of the necessity of discussing their practical and applied methodology when reviewing their devising process.

## **General comments**

Some candidates do not take note of the number of marks per question, which is given in brackets. Some wrote at length on **Question 1**, **Question 2** and **Question 3** for a maximum of two or three marks each, whilst writing less for **Questions 4 – 11** which were worth more marks.

Many of the weaker answers for devising came from candidates whose practical work seemed to consist of a collection of monologues. Such an approach did not allow candidates to explore drama in depth and made this question difficult to answer. Some candidates focused on personal issues within their group and a lack of interaction while others described the action of the piece and ignored the part of the question about its aims. Such responses were superficial and naïve in their approach.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

Characterised by short, simple answers which clearly identified a way to act the age of ONE of the girls but which also stated why that particular approach would be appropriate. A straightforward question which was generally answered well. Those who identified just a movement, vocal or other skill but did not state why it was appropriate could not access both marks.

### **Question 2**

Interpretation of different physical actions was often quite varied but generally, most candidates clearly identified three different physical actions BINNIE would use to show rivalries with ELEANOR. Rivalries was well understood. Those who did not identify three physical actions or those who wrote about three almost identical physical actions could not access full marks.

### **Question 3**

For some candidates this seemed to be quite a challenging question. Top marks were awarded where responses considered ELEANOR's motivations for her actions and how she reacted to others and to her circumstances and why. They were able to identify different layers to the character of ELEANOR. Most candidates came up with some suggestions on how to play Eleanor, mainly drawing on the passage. Some responses were very basic and limited to simple identification of how ELEANOR would talk/walk etc. Such candidates showed little or no understanding of how ELEANOR's actions are affected by what happens around her and her own determination to show off her gymnastic skills.

#### Question 4

Best responses reflected an understanding of how the director uses the actors to engage the audience and through them to communicate an intention. These responses used appropriate technical vocabulary to identify the performance skills that could be used by the three actors to create an engaging performance. There were some interesting variations on what would engage the audience, such as suggesting inviting them to join in. Others staged the action close to the audience. In most cases, the director's role was well understood. Weakest responses failed to show an understanding of the director's role and missed the nuances of character relationships and how the dynamic between BINNIE and ELEANOR affected the advice given and directorial approach taken. No responses included elements of pace or general tempo of the performance.

#### Question 5

Most candidates did not grasp that 'jungle gym' is the North American term for playground equipment even though the term was explained in the question. Many came up with something that vaguely fitted the description of a 'jungle'. Others focused on lights and colours. Several lost sight of the fact that this is a design question. A lot of weak responses listed ideas such as toys, mats, trees etc. but did not identify any meaning to, or the significance of the choices made. Many wrote about a 'jungle gym' in basic descriptive terms and failed to understand the performance implications as it is an integral part of a full set design for the whole extract.

#### Question 6

This was answered well in the majority of cases, with both dramatic tension and sisterly conflict being well understood. There were no problems related to understanding the idea of directorial input. The strongest answers showed understanding of the role of the director and the idea of 'dramatic tensions' amongst the children. The passage includes the climatic fight between the sisters and the way sibling love is pushed to its limits, but few candidates acknowledged this. The overall directorial concept was rarely addressed. Weaker answers wrote about the action of the passage with little understanding of the growing tensions and both the bullying and the reactive behaviour of the youngsters. Weaker candidates did not understand how broad the creative possibilities were when responding to this question as they did not perceive the many elements included in the director's concept such as props, LX, SFX, actors, surroundings etc.

#### Question 7

While most understood that Winston is rebelling, some confused describing fear with explaining how it showed his actual acts of rebellion. Having said that, there were some inventive explanations of rebellion. Many called on lights to support rebellion, though that was not really what was required. Best answers understood how to approach the character of WINSTON but were less secure when addressing how they would present him to show his acts of rebellion. Those that understood the text were able to use rehearsal techniques, subplot and the different motivations and actions of the actor to support their ideas. They were clear on how this rebelliousness could be shown on stage. Best answers referred to specific lines (a question requirement) and gave detail on how they could be performed. They also used appropriate vocabulary for physicality, voice, movement, proxemics etc. Weaker responses were full of generic comments on how lines could be said or talked about the narrative of the extract without understanding how WINSTON could be created and shown on stage with all his doubts, fears and courage.

#### Question 8

Most grasped what a repressive regime might look and feel like and described quite convincing atmospheres and impacts on Winston. Many called on lights, sound, costumes (uniforms) and effects as much as acting skills to support responses. Most did cite from the extract to support their points (a question requirement). Best responses understood what 'the atmosphere of a repressive regime' meant. Some candidates understood the fear and foreboding instilled within the atmosphere of total repression. They were able to show how the director would use dramatic techniques on stage to create the atmosphere of a repressive regime for the audience. Weakest answers did not understand the question and wrote about characters or plot with little or no reference to the idea of creating the atmosphere of a repressive regime. Some did not refer to specific lines as requested in the question, nor did they write about the directorial approach.

### Question 9

The less popular question, with only a few good responses which were able to show how to create a lighting design that would communicate a future world of repression and fear. Best answers used a range of design ideas to support the lighting design, and they also used correct terminology. The design part of the question was less important to most than 'lighting' itself. There were some quite detailed LX proposals, which often included sound and effects. Most understood the concept of living in fear from a regime. Some included acting in their answers. Weak responses were very basic, being descriptive and lacking an understanding of how lighting design can create a repressive dystopian world of the future. The weakest answers were characterised by naïve sketches which were inaccurate and confusing.

### Question 10

Best responses understood that the question did not ask for the content of the final performance but rather for what happened during the devising journey from stimulus to final rehearsal. Best answers identified how they used rehearsal and devising techniques to refine and develop their chosen idea through to the final rehearsal. These were the exception, however, and many relied on narrative description and a recounting of the plot or the action. Others did not explain how they progressed beyond the stimulus. Very few answers were strong on the process and some included evaluation, too. However, as in previous sessions, most thought writing a script was the most important element. Weakest responses showed little understanding of the devising process and how ideas develop throughout that process. These answers usually consisted of stating what their stimulus was then jumping to how it was used in the final piece (see key message above). There is a pressing need for better preparation of candidates in terms of the recipe for devising/creating material for performance.

### Question 11

This was an open question inviting evaluation of effectiveness of space, levels and staging. There was a high proportion of plot narrative responses, including a few which repeated much of their **Question 10** responses. A good many only dealt with space. Where examples and assessment of all three strands were explained, answers were better. Evaluation that went beyond 'we did well' or 'great use of levels' always fared better. Best responses gained feedback from audience members or peers, particularly in the devising stages and were able to show how they used staging, levels and space in their performance. Some of the weaker answers came from candidates whose practical work was just a collection of monologues which meant that it was hard for them to evaluate the effectiveness of their use of the three areas. Many did not cover all three elements of the question and consequently could not access higher than Band 4 which was rigorously applied if only one of the areas was explored.

# DRAMA

---

<p><b>Paper 0411/12</b> <b>Written Paper 12</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

There continues to be a lack of understanding about the meaning of the devising process. **Question 10**, in particular, highlights this, whereby the overall impression from many candidates is that the devising process consists of **(a)** responding to a stimulus, **(b)** discussing ideas, **(c)** writing a script and **(d)** performing it. This appears to be a widely held misconception whereby the working process of devising, including improvisation and the refining of ideas through trial and error is not generally considered. The exploration and discovery of dramatic ideas and concepts through theatre methodology is missing from the majority of candidate responses. This means that very few candidates are able to score highly in **Question 11**. Centres are urged to address this shortfall and ensure that candidates are made aware of the necessity of discussing their practical and applied methodology when reviewing their devising process.

## **General comments**

Some candidates do not take note of the number of marks per question which is given in brackets. Some wrote at length on **Question 1**, **Question 2** and **Question 3** for a maximum two or three marks each, while writing less for **Questions 4 – 11** which were worth more.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

Most candidates were able to respond to this question and highlight a feature that would relate to a learning environment. The most common responses were references to whiteboards or a teacher's desk.

### **Question 2**

Some candidates did not recognise the word 'physical' in the question. A common error is where candidates include reference to vocal elements in lieu of physical ones. This led to some suggestions that did not access the mark scheme fully. Those who did not identify three physical actions or those who wrote about three almost identical physical actions could not access full marks.

### **Question 3**

Most candidates were able to show understanding of ROCKY's character, with higher marks being awarded to those candidates who offered some character insight and the most detail relating to how it could be performed.

### **Question 4**

There were some confused responses. Over the years the idea of 'bringing out the comedy' has previously led to similar challenges. It is recognised that 'comedy' is often a matter of personal taste. However, in this instance, there were supporting comments in the stage directions to help and guide candidates but many appeared not to have noticed this. This factor, coupled with the lack of detail in the advice given, meant that access to band 1 was very rare.

### Question 5

Many candidates were able to describe basic factors such as colour but this is a design question and generally design was missed by candidates. Some responses were not clear that it was puppets they were designing – the suggestions would equally have worked for actors. Where candidates offered only a visual description of puppets they could not gain access to band 1. Those who recognise the importance of how the puppets might be constructed/manipulated and included this in the description achieved the higher marks.

### Question 6

Most candidates missed the angle of 'to show the different personalities' and concentrated more on suggestions that matched specific lines. Some responses tended to focus on one or two characters thereby leading to an uneven discussion which was supposed to consider the personalities of all three children. Many candidates do not give sufficient detail to access bands 1 and 2.

### Question 7

Most candidates accessed this question and showed understanding. However, some responses were superficial with broad, general responses that lacked the specificity to access higher bands. The question requires candidates to refer to specific lines in their answers and those who did not were unable to access marks higher than mid band. Many concentrated more on Julia's love for WINSTON than her hatred of BIG BROTHER.

### Question 8

There was not much of a difference between the number of candidates who opted for **Question 8** compared to those who preferred **Question 9**. For those who attempted this question, there was good understanding. Some candidates relied heavily on the use of effects which provided a narrow response. As with **Question 7** candidates are asked to refer to specific lines in their answers and where they did not, a lack of detail and specificity proved to be the differentiator.

### Question 9

With one or two exceptionally insightful examples, very few candidates provided the level of detail and specificity that enabled them to access bands 1 and 2. Many responses did not evidence an understanding of set design and offered a simple description of the set without any reference to how it might be used in performance. Neither did they demonstrate consideration of desired effects upon the audience. Practicality is as much an important part of set design as the way it looks and only responses which demonstrate an awareness of the need for a set to work in a performance context can access the highest marks.

### Question 10

Nearly all candidates showed little to no understanding of what the devising process actually entails (see Key message above) with many simply describing the final performance. The process of turning ideas into a final performance, including the sifting of early ideas, trying things out, improvising, refining ideas, rehearsing etc. was not considered. As a consequence, the majority of candidates did not achieve higher than band 3. There is a pressing need for better preparation of candidates in terms of the recipe for devising/creating material for performance.

### Question 11

Many candidates were able to describe their performance and were inclined to make bold statements such as 'this engaged the audience' but without necessarily explaining how. Generally, candidates do not demonstrate evaluative skills and the lack of this impacted upon the level of marks awarded with many not being able to access higher than the mid band.

# DRAMA

---

<p><b>Paper 0411/13</b> <b>Written Paper 13</b></p>
---

## Key messages

There continues to be a lack of understanding about the meaning of the devising process. **Question 10**, in particular, highlights this, where the overall impression from many candidates is that the devising process consists of **(a)** responding to a stimulus, **(b)** discussing ideas, **(c)** writing a script and **(d)** performing it. This appears to be a widely held misconception and the working process of devising, including improvisation and the refining of ideas through trial and error is not generally considered. The exploration and discovery of dramatic ideas and concepts through theatre methodology is missing from the majority of candidate responses. This means that very few candidates are able to score highly in **Question 11**. Centres are urged to address this shortfall and ensure that candidates are made aware of the necessity of discussing their practical and applied methodology when reviewing their devising process.

## General comments

Some candidates do not take note of the number of marks available per question, which is given in brackets. Some wrote at length on **Question 1**, **Question 2** and **Question 3** for a maximum of two or three marks each, while writing less for **Questions 4 – 11** which were worth more.

## Specific questions

### **Question 1**

This question required short, simple answers which clearly suggested one way that FARLEY could intimidate VICTOR. Those who identified an intimidation action but did not identify why this would be appropriate to FARLEY's character achieved only one mark. Many candidates wrote far too much for a two mark question (see General comments above).

### **Question 2**

This question required straightforward responses which clearly identified THREE DIFFERENT physical actions. Strongest answers referred to the text and how those actions reflected VICTOR's character and his relationship with TARA. Those candidates who did not offer three DIFFERENT physical actions or who wrote about one action only, but in three different variations, could not access full marks.

### **Question 3**

Top marks could be achieved by those who offered suggestions on a range of performance techniques, demonstrating an understanding of the complexity of TARA's character and her fear of the Monster as well as her use of the doll as a safety blanket/protector. Best responses showed a good understanding of the range of physical and/or vocal skills that would effectively convey her fears. Responses were sometimes very basic and, in some cases, consisted of lists or bullet points which showed no real understanding in depth.

### **Question 4**

There were some excellent responses which explored the relationship between the two characters and were able to show how the director could manipulate the audience to make them feel sympathy for VICTOR using textual references to justify directorial choices. Weakest responses were very basic and showed little

understanding of the dynamics within the relationship nor did they mention the directorial approach. Some responses were totally descriptive, just outlining the narrative of the passage.

#### Question 5

There were some excellent answers which demonstrated understanding of how the monster could be presented, taking their clues from the text, often identifying how the monster should embody elements of FARLEY in it. Best answers used evidence in the text to support their ideas. Conversely, some responses included very basic and quite crude design ideas. This was a straightforward question which allowed the candidates free rein, but choices should be justified with reference to the passage.

#### Question 6

The best answers were able to identify the dynamics of the relationship between the two characters but also were able to show how the power struggle between them changes and how VICTOR finds the strength to face his bully and dominate him. These answers identified a range of physical and verbal techniques that a director would encourage actors to use to show the change. Some also mentioned design techniques that could support these changes. Weaker answers simply chronicled the action of the play with little or no reference to the directorial approach or how to show the gradually changing power struggle.

#### Question 7

The strongest responses considered the acting skills employed by the actor to convey his weariness, frustration and anger. They explored subplot and the different levels of the character. They identified how these elements of the character could be shown on stage. The best answers referred to specific lines (a question requirement) and gave detail on how they could be performed. A wide range of terminology referencing physicality, voice, movement, and proxemics achieved top marks. Generic comments on how lines could be spoken, or writing out full lines from the play and then offering a basic gloss like 'in a tired voice' typified weaker responses that were lacking in subject specific terminology and which did not refer to the clues in the extract which would have supported their ideas.

#### Question 8

There were some excellent responses to this question. This was a popular choice with many candidates, and they clearly had a lot of compassion for MARY's character. Some demonstrated developed knowledge and understanding of the social background of the play and identified issues relating to women's roles in society as well as poverty and they were able to show how the director could choose to highlight issues to the audience via the character of MARY. Simplistic responses which ignored the directing part of the question and wrote rambling accounts of MARY's character and showed no understanding of directing techniques could not score highly.

#### Question 9

This was a less popular question – either answered very well or very badly. There were a few excellent responses which reflected a clear understanding of how lighting conveyed atmosphere and environment. These used correct technical terminology and produced some good lighting designs to support their choices. Some responses were basic and quite simplistic showing no real understanding of the role of lighting design nor the potential power of a good design to affect the audience. Some candidates offered rudimentary and inadequate drawings which did nothing to support the response. A disappointing standard overall.

#### Question 10

Very few candidates were able to differentiate between the devising process and the final performance (see Key message above). The few who understood the creative process were able to identify the ideas that inspired the final performance and to then chart how they had experimented with those ideas using different rehearsal and devising techniques, shaping, selecting and refining the ideas through to their use in the final piece. Most responses were of a weak standard and answers often comprised just a narrative of their work without any idea about how the material could be synthesised. They would often just identify the initial idea or stimulus then jump to how they used them in the performance. Very few used basic terms such as improvisation, an essential tool in devising and revising of ideas. There is a pressing need for better preparation of candidates in terms of the recipe for devising/creating material for performance.

### Question 11

This question was often misinterpreted to mean how candidates strived to achieve their aims in terms of their personal performance. Examiners accepted that the question could be interpreted in this way and consequently made allowances to accommodate such an approach. Other candidates understood, rightly, that they were required to explore their overall group aims and intentions for their piece and then attempted to evaluate how successful they were in achieving those aims. The best responses gained feedback from audience members and quoted this in their work. Many of the weaker answers came from candidates whose practical work seemed to consist of a montage of monologues. Such an approach did not allow candidates to explore drama in depth and made this question difficult to answer. Some candidates focused on personal issues within their group such as a lack of interaction, whilst others simply described the action of the piece ignoring the part of the question about performance aims. Such responses were superficial and naïve and could not access the higher mark bands.



# DRAMA

---

<p><b>Paper 0411/02</b> <b>Coursework</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

1. The individual piece should be chosen to ensure the candidate can demonstrate their strengths, rather than selecting a piece that does not enable them to showcase their skills.
2. Extracts for group text-based pieces need to be selected carefully to allow everyone in the group to play a meaningful role, which might mean that the selection process is extended as possible texts are 'tried out' before settling on the final choice for submission.
3. Devised group pieces need to have a consistent intention and approach so that there is a strong sense of the group having something to say to their audience.

## **Administration**

The November series had fewer candidates than in June and the administration ran extremely smoothly. Most centres submitted well organised, detailed documentation with helpfully completed ICMS forms and very clear video recordings.

A few ICMS forms offered insufficient detail about the work, with minimal indication of what the candidates were performing and why marks had been awarded. In some cases, the forms contained arithmetical errors. Centres are reminded that the ICMS forms are the key documents relied on by the Moderator to understand the centre's rationale in awarding marks.

Centres are also reminded of the requirement to upload the ICMS forms for all candidates as some centres wrongly uploaded the forms for only those in the sample. Additionally, **all** ICMS forms should be uploaded as **a single pdf file** on Submit for Assessment. A small number of centres wrongly uploaded the ICMS forms as separate PDFs, which is very unhelpful to the moderation process as each form then has to be downloaded individually. Finally, centres are reminded of the need to ensure that the marks on each ICMS form are correctly totalled up and then transferred accurately into Submit for Assessment.

There were occasional issues when centres failed to submit the top and bottom candidate or who failed to present a spread of marks in their sample. It is essential that both the highest and lowest-marked candidate are included in the sample.

## *Recordings*

There were many excellent recordings, where the centre had taken time to ensure that the filming was done well, and where the result was appropriate for the Moderator to see and hear all aspects of the performance.

## *Candidate identification*

Moderators drew attention to the varying quality of candidate **identification**. It should be noted that every candidate is required to identify themselves before each of their three pieces. Notes on the ICMS forms such as 'fourth to enter' or 'second to sit on the left' were of little help. Even where candidates identified themselves to camera in the line-up at the start, it was often difficult to catch their names as so many rushed through in a rather embarrassed fashion. There is an expectation in a drama assessment that candidates are able to deliver their name and candidate number clearly, accurately and without embarrassment. It is also essential that when they announce their names, they are dressed in whatever costume they will be wearing in the performance itself.

### *Quality of marking*

The majority of centres awarded marks in accordance with the assessment criteria in the syllabus and were therefore closely in line with the Cambridge standard.

Where Moderators made scaling recommendations, it was most often because AO3 (Performance Skills) had been overmarked across all three pieces. However, there were many examples of considerable overmarking in AO2, devising original drama. There was a tendency to reward candidates for effort and attendance rather than their contribution to the devising process. It should be noted, though, that simply turning up is not worthy of marks.

### **Scripted Pieces: Individual Pieces**

There was a high standard of work presented in individual performances. Strong candidates had prepared thoroughly, taken account of stage space, characteristics, relationships with others and the fact that an audience was present. Such candidates delivered performances that were totally engaging and convincing but even the weakest candidates showed performance discipline and focus. Breakdowns were very rare and the worst that could be said is that the weakest performances were lifeless and lacked differentiation.

There were several monologues, however, that suffered from over-reliance on sitting down, with the candidate being rooted to a desk and chair and (often) mumbling to camera. In the weakest examples, candidates even gave the impression of having the script on the table in front of them. Those who performed from behind a table or a settee made their tasks of relating to an audience much harder.

### **Scripted Pieces: Group Pieces**

To some extent, the comments on individual pieces relating to choice of texts apply equal well to the group scripted performances.

Centres often selected texts from the annual list included in the Principal Examiner's Report, which is entirely acceptable. The June 2024 list is reproduced at the end of this report and, although not prescriptive in any way, is a valuable resource for future planning if required.

Most candidates were comfortable with the group scripted pieces and there were some excellent examples of good work with natural rapport between the performers and an excellent flow to the piece. Although there was a range of success in performance terms, in most pieces there was a good understanding of the art of Acting and effective use of techniques such as vocals, physicality, gesture and communication with an audience. The strengths and weaknesses of individual candidate's acting skills did not vary greatly from those seen in their individual performances. However, the impact of performing as an ensemble was a key differentiator. Candidates who delivered a strong individual performance sometimes struggled to understand the changing dynamics of an ensemble, or did not know what to do when they had no lines.

### **Devised pieces**

The strongest pieces were innovative, creative and exciting with sound, movement and physicality, showing a judicious use of appropriate props/effects and pushing at boundaries of expression.

Weaker examples tend to be naturalistic examples with little or no sense of 'character' or shape of the piece. This type of work was often predictable and in most cases very narrative, tending to spell out every detail of the plot. At its worst, this approach looked more like a workshop or classroom lesson than a piece of drama for the stage.

A number of features emerged as typical of weaker pieces. There were several examples of over-wordy pieces, mini soap operas, and hackneyed scenarios. In such cases, scenes sometimes needed editing, either because they were too long, or too short. Over-use of entrances and exits with or without blackouts served no useful purpose.

## IGCSE Coursework texts 2024

The following performance texts provide examples of what was seen by Moderators in 2024. They are provided for information and there is no requirement for centres to use any of them for their own work, although they may consider these if they wish.

<b>Playwright</b>	<b>Play</b>
Alan Ayckbourn	<i>A Walk in the Park</i> <i>Invisible Friends</i>
Aeschylus	<i>Agamemnon</i> <i>The Watchman</i>
Edward Albee	<i>Zoo story</i>
Richard Bean	<i>One Man Two Gov'nors</i>
Samuel Beckett	<i>Waiting for Godot</i>
Steven Berkoff	<i>Metamorphosis</i>
Edward Bond	<i>The Sea</i>
Andrew Bovell	<i>Things I know to be True</i>
Jim Cartwright	<i>Road</i>
Anton Chekhov	<i>The Cherry Orchard</i>
Caryl Churchill	<i>Cloud Nine</i> <i>Top Girls</i>
Gabriel Davis	<i>Goodbye Charles</i>
Christopher Durang	<i>Baby with the bathwater</i>
Euripides	<i>Hecuba</i> <i>Medea</i>
Dario Fo	<i>Accidental Death of an Anarchist</i>
John Godber	<i>Bouncers</i> <i>Shakers</i> <i>Teechers</i>
Henrik Ibsen	<i>A Doll's House</i>
Debbie Isitt	<i>The Woman who cooked her husband</i>
Charlotte Keatley	<i>My mother said I never should</i>
Dennis Kelly	<i>DNA</i>
Neil Labute	<i>The Shape of Things</i>
C S Lewis	<i>Voyage of the Dawn Treader</i>
Martin McDonagh	<i>The Pillow Man</i>
Sharman McDonald	<i>After Juliet</i>
Arthur Miller	<i>All My Sons</i> <i>Death of a Salesman</i> <i>The Crucible</i>
John Osborne	<i>Look Back in Anger</i>
Harold Pinter	<i>The Birthday Party</i> <i>The Caretaker</i> <i>The Homecoming</i>
Mark Ravenhill	<i>Pool No Water</i>
Yasmina Reza	<i>Art</i>
Philip Ridley	<i>Karamazoo</i>
Peter Shaffer	<i>Amadeus</i>
William Shakespeare	<i>Hamlet</i> <i>Henry V</i> <i>Merchant of Venice</i> <i>Midsummer Night's Dream</i> <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>
Neil Simon	<i>Brighton Beach</i> <i>Rumours</i> <i>The Odd Couple</i>
Gordon Steele	<i>Like a Virgin</i>
John Steinbeck	<i>Of Mice and Men</i>
Simon Stephens	<i>The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time</i>
Shelagh Stephenson	<i>Five Kinds of Silence</i> <i>The Memory of Water</i>

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education  
0411 Drama November 2024  
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

Timberlake Wertenbaker	<i>Our Country's Good</i>
Debbie Tucker Green	<i>Random</i>
Enda Walsh	<i>Chatroom</i>
Oscar Wilde	<i>Importance of Being Earnest</i> <i>Salome</i> <i>The Ideal Husband</i>
Nigel Williams	<i>Lord of the Flies</i>
August Wilson	<i>Fences</i>
Lanford Wilson	<i>Brontosaurus</i>