

DRAMA

Paper 0411/11 Written Examination
--

Key messages

The Covid virus severely affected some centres. In many cases it was impossible for candidates to experience the full 0411 teaching and learning experience and the attendant opportunities for practical application within performance. Cambridge International has acknowledged these difficulties and special arrangements were implemented for those centres that could not complete delivery of the full syllabus, most notably in the area of devising.

Centres are requested to ensure that candidates who may need to exceed the allotted writing space for **any** question should request an extension booklet and clearly indicate which question is being continued. This applies to any material which will not fit into the specified writing sections of the examination paper.

General comments

Candidates responded favourably to the **Section A** text and many produced effective and capable answers which showed a good grasp of the demands of the extract. Answers for **Section B** were more variable with responses largely dependent upon how much a candidate was able to discuss multi-disciplines within an ensemble context.

Section C responses were variable and the success of these was greatly influenced by the nature of the original devising process.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Virtually every candidate was able to suggest a suitable character and costume exaggeration for two marks.

The majority of candidates opted for the character of YEFROSIMOV although DARAGAN was also quite popular.

Question 2

Candidates opted to approach this question in one of two ways. In the first they focussed on three particular acting skills such as voice, posture, proxemics, etc. whereas in the second they chose to focus on intention and attitude, e.g. insistent, conspiratorial, forthright in order to communicate how DARAGAN might make his points to PONCHIK. Either approach was acceptable, with credit given for each appropriate suggestion. Where there was some repetition, e.g. a high tone of voice followed by a sharp tone of voice, followed by a low tone of voice only 'tone' was credited for one mark.

Question 3

This question sought to elicit responses suggesting how YEFROSIMOV might be played. The majority of responses adopted a broad approach outlining two or three characteristics with most confined to band 2 of the mark scheme. A typical answer might, for example focus on 'madness' reflected in vocal and physical mannerisms. A very few responses included enough detail to warrant a mark in the top band.

Question 4

This question was generally well handled by candidates, most of whom achieved marks either in upper band 2 or band 1. The text provided lots of opportunities for candidates to identify characteristics and actions which could contribute to the sense of menace created by TULLER 1 and TULLER 2. Those responses which did not do so well were those which included elements of description or narrative.

Question 5

This question required a focus on opportunities for a director to 'bring to life' the comedy of the selected passage. A number of candidates seemed unsure about this and some resorted to suggesting the introduction of additional dialogue in order to find something that was funny. Many saw opportunities for slapstick humour where the more perceptive responses were able to discuss opportunities for developing elements of farce.

A large proportion of responses were overly reliant on technical and design features (music, setting, costume, and lighting) which, though by no means irrelevant, should not be seen as the only way to create comedy and consequently responses which considered a combination of approaches did best.

Question 6

This directing question focussed on the creation of climax. There is so much material in the specified passage that candidates were not short of areas for discussion. The vast majority of responses demonstrated an understanding of climax as a theatrical term, but many were unclear as to how to develop one. Those who did were able to make at least a few suggestions as to how it could be achieved. Where there was uncertainty, this was manifested in responses which were either predominantly descriptive and narrative by nature or characterised by an overreliance on sound and lighting. Suggestions included red light, spot effects, strobes, and blackouts, etc. all of which were given credit where they formed part of an integrated unit of action in performance. Actors' facial expression, strained voices and frantic movement formed the focus for acting skills and were used to illustrate how a climax might be achieved within the parameters of the text. The most perceptive responses were able to combine all of these elements in a way which produced a balanced audience experience.

Section B

Question 7

The most important aspect of this question was its reference to ensemble, a term which did not appear to be fully understood by a significant number of candidates. That is not to say that they were unfamiliar with the underlying techniques which contribute to ensemble playing, since these were much in evidence in responses to **Question 8** which followed. In this case, however, most candidates did not seem to be able to marry the two. There was much reliance on the stage directions and a good deal of repetition in the suggested approaches to different sections of the text. There were also examples of narrative.

A few candidates demonstrated some very imaginative solutions but overall the dominant characteristic was one of missed opportunity.

Question 8

The challenge of this question was its requirement for candidates to combine the three elements of sound, light and movement for dramatic effect. Practical suggestions included a focus on colour with occasional use of focussed spotlights, traditional songs and acapella. As far as movement was concerned responses often showed a little understanding – e.g. well-rehearsed *'so as not to bump into each other'*, but overall, the treatment of the movement element was less successful than the other two disciplines with only one or two really effective all-round answers.

Question 9

The majority of candidates appeared to prefer this question. There was obviously great enthusiasm for the character of ROELF which resulted in a high proportion of detailed and insightful responses. Candidates had perhaps studied this character in some detail because there was certainly very good evidence of a foundation of understanding upon which application could be built. Answers were detailed and appropriate and candidates were able to make a number of creative suggestions as to how the role of ROELF could be performed with well-chosen references to the text.

Section C

Question 10

The fundamental challenge presented by this question was how candidates 'made' their character dramatically interesting. This implies much more than what they actually did in performance but also invites a discussion of the process of character development. Some responses amounted to nothing more than a narrative account of what the character did. Others combined a degree of narrative with some focus on character development in the form of character traits, physicality etc. but even here the discussion centred on the 'what' not the 'how'.

Question 11

This question had a requirement to evaluate the outcome of the devising process with close reference to it. Candidates were able to give an account of the characters in their piece and explain how they contributed to the storyline but it proved challenging for candidates to demonstrate an understanding of how the characters influenced each other and any subsequent plot twists and turns.

Attempts to evaluate were variable in their success with the majority of responses making implied or intrinsic evaluative comment without getting to a clearly defined conclusion other than *'we were successful'*.

DRAMA

Paper 0411/12 Written Examination
--

Key messages

Candidates should use the number of marks that are available for each question as a guide as to how much to write. Candidates continue to write too much for 2 and 3 mark questions. The space provided in the answer booklet should also help act as a guide. Many candidates use bullet points for 2 and 3 mark questions. This is acceptable.

Candidates should ensure that they read each question thoroughly. Some candidates did not acknowledge if more than one example was required. Others missed important bits of detail within the question, and this limited the number of marks that were available to them as these candidates did not then address the question in full.

In the longer essay style questions worth 10 or 15 marks, some candidates write lengthy introductory paragraphs that do not relate to the question. This is an inefficient use of time.

Candidates must ensure that they demonstrate their practical understanding when addressing the questions. Some candidates offer strong literary responses to some of the longer essay style questions but do not offer developed practical solutions.

Candidates need to show a greater level of intent when writing about the devising work. In many examples, the script is the starting point. Candidates need to demonstrate and explain the decisions made during the devising process. This type of information is helpful when candidates are asked to evaluate the effectiveness of their work, explaining why they did what they did, what impact/effect was intended and whether this was successful.

Evaluation continues to be a weaker skill. Candidates often demonstrate unsupported assertions of effectiveness.

In **Section C**, candidates should avoid a narrative response where they retell the plot of their devised piece. Such responses do not demonstrate practical understanding.

General comments

Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the new syllabus and the different requirements of **Sections A, B and C**. This meant that nearly all candidates answered only **Question 8** or **Question 9**, as requested.

Candidates engaged effectively with the two texts. Responses were mostly well-considered, and many candidates were able to demonstrate a good understanding and a level of practical application.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

The majority if not all candidates named a character and described a costume which could be exaggerated, although the comic effect was not always obvious. Suggestions were credited.

Some candidates gave detailed responses that showed good insight in terms of the period, the play, the character, and a particular approach to costume design. These examples went way beyond the 2 marks that were available for this question and serve as a good example of why it is important to note the number of marks available as a guide as to how much information is needed.

Question 2

Many candidates used lines from the script or stage directions to inform their answer. Most were able to clearly identify three separate suggestions. The suggestion had to be a clear piece of practical advice. Examples such as 'I would try to persuade him' were not credited as the approach, or dramatic action, is too vague.

Some candidates repeated themselves within the three approaches, or their suggestions were too similar. In these examples each suggestion was credited only once.

Question 3

The most successful candidates were able to explain a range of aspects of Molière's character displayed within this section and offer an actor's perspective on how the whole sequence might be performed. Most candidates focused on just one or two parts of the extract and missed opportunities for the higher levels of the mark scheme.

Question 4

Many candidates, but not all, demonstrated their understanding of the term 'proximity'. There were some obvious moments, for example Lagrange's use of the sword that were not always addressed. To achieve band 1, candidates needed to provide details of *changes* in proxemics supported with close reference to the passage, thus demonstrating understanding beyond simple quotations from the text and/or stage directions.

Question 5

Some candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of situational comedy with Bouton intruding on Molière and Armande's intimate encounter, but many did not really get to grips with the practical advice a director might give to bring out the comedy. Most candidates cited the obvious moment within the given extract involving the kiss/nose incident. Many simply described what was funny but gave no directorial comment. This type of question is a good example of when candidates should ensure that they have fully read, and understood, the detail that is being asked for within the question. Candidates often miss the directorial angle when used in comparable questions.

Question 6

This question brought about a good response enabling many candidates to demonstrate their understanding of Louis. Most candidates were able to provide plenty of direction for an actor, with the better responses understanding that they needed to direct the actor to portray the status of Louis in this scene, and not just offer ideas for showing the status of a generic king. A few did not focus sufficiently on the actor and offered ideas about the design aspects of other characters to the exclusion of advice for playing the role.

Section B

Question 7

This was a demanding question, and many candidates were able to show their understanding of the opening to the piece. Some candidates addressed only part of the section specified. Some candidates did not fully address all three aspects identified in the question: songs, movement, and story-telling skills. The stronger

candidates were able to bring their descriptions to life through their effective, detailed use of practical application.

Question 8

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to demonstrate a good understanding of Bongi. The more successful responses examined the whole section, although a line-by-line approach did not often provide the detailed discussion that is required for the higher bands. Stronger candidates considered Bongi's relationship/interaction with other characters in their answers. A few candidates correctly identified, and explored, the complexity of Bongi's character.

Some candidates demonstrated a strong literary understanding tied to the text but offered few developed practical solutions.

Question 9

This question enabled candidates to offer some imaginative ideas about the use of physicality, sound, and ensemble skills. Some candidate responses covered these three aspects in meticulous detail, clearly linking their discussion to the extract, whereas others did not reference all three aspects and/or did not use the text to support their answers. To be able to access the full range of marks available, candidates should ensure they read the question carefully and note the explicit detail within the question.

To access the higher bands, candidates should be able to demonstrate detailed practical suggestions. This needs to go beyond a simple description of the character.

Section C

Question 10

The stronger responses explored and discussed the devising process and the decisions that were made to ensure dramatic tension in the devised piece. The strongest candidates were able to demonstrate their use of dramatic technique in a way that brought their answer to life. A few candidates used dramatic terminology but their understanding of this was not always clear and did not evidence how the piece worked in performance in front of an audience.

There were a few candidates who focused on structure in this question.

Question 11

There were some excellent answers with thorough evaluation and pertinent comments about structure. However, many candidates did not understand dramatic structure. Candidates interpreted the term 'elements' in a variety of different ways including story/plot, characterisation, the use of design and even dramatic intentions. All of these were credited with the stronger responses providing practical evaluation.

DRAMA

Paper 0411/13 Written Examination
--

Key messages

- Candidates need to be aware of the mark allocation for each question to ensure that they are not spending a disproportionate amount of time on questions which carry less marks. Longer responses should be for the questions carrying 15 marks.
- Candidates need to read the question carefully to ensure that they understand the specific demands of the question and that they respond to what the question actually asks, rather than what they think it asks.
- Evaluation is an essential skill that is an integral tool when approaching an examination question. Centres are encouraged to support their candidates in training them to write responses which reflect an evaluative depth and use practical examples throughout to support any assertions.
- In some of the questions candidates focused on the wrong section of the extract and ignored the parameters set by the question. In these cases, no marks could be awarded.
- **Section C** focuses on the evolution and performance of the devised piece. Candidates are required to evaluate the creative development of the work throughout the devising process, identifying what the dramatic intention was, the ideas that were explored, rejected and retained and how the final piece reflected the dramatic potential of the stimulus and how effectively this was demonstrated in the final performance.

General comments

The extracts, 'Madame Zoyka' and 'A Woman in Waiting' both seemed to be popular and elicited some very strong responses which reflected a good understanding of the extracts and their historical context. Good candidates highlighted the dramatic challenges and possibilities that both extracts represented for a director and/or an actor performing in front of a live audience.

Many candidates used additional sheets to complete their response. This is acceptable, but candidates should be aware that some questions only require shorter answers in order to achieve good marks.

Candidates should identify the main thrust of the question and seek to fully address the set question, using specific examples from the text or their own work to illustrate their ideas.

The candidates who completed **Section C** and who were able to fully evaluate the creative process and the final performance were rewarded appropriately. Weaker candidates tended to write narrative responses focusing on content rather than why that content was developed and how it was used.

Some terms were misunderstood or ignored by a few candidates. This meant that there was no real focus to the responses and they tended to remain vague and did not use specific examples from the text or the devised work to support their ideas.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question was generally well answered with most candidates able to identify a character and an item of costume that would create a comic effect. Weaker candidates were not able to link the costume to the creation of comedy and did not go beyond naming a character and identifying an article of clothing.

Question 2

Candidates were required to identify THREE aspects of AMETISTOV's character and identify how these would be emphasised in performance. Candidates who had an appreciation of the extract and an understanding of the relationship between Ametistov and Zoya and how that plays out in this passage were able to achieve good marks. Some candidates focused on aspects of characterisation rather than character traits and personality. Others bullet pointed three aspects without justifying how these could be emphasised in performance. The passage is rich in terms of highlighting Ametistov's character, including his self-righteousness, his sense of entitlement and his manipulation of Zoya's emotions.

Question 3

The question asks the candidates to imagine they are playing Beltoff in this passage and show how they would play the role. It is important to understand how manipulative Beltoff is at this point and how he tries to coerce Zoya to give up some rooms in her apartment as well as to bully Manyushka. Some candidates ignored the question and listed how they would approach the performance of the role of Beltoff in a performance of the full extract.

Best responses were able to identify specific moments in the passage which reflected Beltoff's character and were able to discuss in detail how they would portray those facets of Beltoff's character during those moments.

Question 4

Candidates who understood the term 'vocal projection' were able to score well on this question. The strongest responses referenced the text throughout and identified moments of contrast in vocal projection between the characters of Zoya and Manyushka. There is much potential for contrast in this passage which swings from loud, high energy, excited moments to more sombre, low energy moments. Weaker responses focused less on projection and more on other vocal techniques and in some cases spent a lot of time focusing on the vocal delivery of the character of Beltoff.

Question 5

The question asked the candidates to place themselves in the role of director and to identify how they would bring the comedy to life in the set passage. This was a challenging question for some candidates who struggled with the concept of bringing comedy to life and were unable to identify how this could be achieved by a director in practical terms at the end of the extract.

There were some excellent responses which explored how to use comedic techniques such as contrast and exaggeration, slapstick comedy and the use of dramatic irony to create comedy. Some candidates drew excellent connections with farce and the techniques of Commedia dell'arte as ways to shape comedy.

Question 6

Highest scoring candidates were able to interpret 'changing dynamics' as referring to variations in levels of energy, physical movement, pace or emotional intensity. There are distinct episodes within this passage where different stories unfold and develop. Strong candidates were able to identify how a director might direct the actors in order to bring out the different stories and the changing dynamics and used specific moments in the passage to illustrate their ideas.

Some candidates did not mention the directorial approach at all, and such responses remained vague and lacking in terms of evaluative depth.

Section B

Question 7

The extract 'A Woman in Waiting' was clearly very popular with candidates and there were many candidates who understood the style of the extract and the historical, political and social context of the work. The question asked candidates to consider how, as a solo actor, they would overcome the challenge of 'creating a collage of different characters'.

There was a lot of opportunity in this passage for candidates to suggest possible approaches to creating an ensemble performance.

The best answers outlined the challenges and identified the conventions of testimonial theatre and story telling. They were then able to break down the differences between the characters within the 'collage' and to identify how they would approach playing those multiple roles in order to achieve the most effective dramatic impact.

Strong responses explored additional ways of differentiating characters using devices such as space, levels and lighting as well as identifying the physical and vocal delivery that could be used to bring the many characters to life.

Some candidates wrote about material beyond line 313 of the extract, and this was self-penalising as marks could not be awarded for references beyond the set passage.

Question 8

This question was very popular with candidates. Weaker responses consisted of narrative descriptions of the different characters without identifying how they would approach playing the characters and the solutions they would use to overcome the challenge of presenting multiple characters as a solo actor.

There were many vivid, creative, imaginative and believable design ideas offered which were presented in a way that helped the reader to picture the candidates' designs.

The best responses showed an excellent understanding of the extract and of exciting staging possibilities which reflected cultural and societal issues.

Many candidates were able to highlight the design ideas given in the introduction to the passage such as the crate, the suspended dress, the toilet and the sand and were able to elaborate on those given ideas and to make them their own by identifying how they would present them in innovative ways in order to create maximum impact.

Question 9

This question required the candidates to identify the directorial decisions which would be made in order to establish the changing moods of the drama in Scene 1. In order to successfully tackle this question candidates needed to recognise that Scene 1 contained a range of moods, including pre-birth, birth, anxiety of the small child, celebration of the birth through rhythmic praising, the anticipation of going to the city, excitement about Christmas and the confusion when the child sees the white man for the first time.

Candidates who were most successful were those who were able to work through the extract and show how they, as a director, would present these. Clear references to the text and a chronological approach to the extract helped candidates to structure their response effectively. There were some highly imaginative directing ideas which demonstrated a real understanding of the art of making theatre.

Weaker responses did not understand the term 'changing dynamics' and presented lengthy narrative descriptions with no reference to the directorial role and how important creative decisions would ensure that the changing moods were established for an audience.

A few candidates chose the **Question 9** directing question but then offered a design response which did not meet the demands of the question.

Section C

Question 10

The strongest responses were able to explain the nature of the stimulus used and to review how the devising process was used to create the devised piece. They were able to identify how they experimented with different ideas and how they refined those ideas, rejecting and retaining ideas which contributed to the shaping of the final piece. There was a real sense of an understanding of the journey taken when creating work and they supported their ideas with a range of well-chosen examples.

Weaker candidates did not explore the process but focused on what they finished with in terms of content, instead of evaluating how the work was developed. Such responses tended to be quite vague and narrative in approach and although they were able to describe the story of the content, they did not include practical examples to support the creative/devising journey.

Question 11

The focus of this question is the relationship between the stimulus and its realisation, the success of the candidates in maximising the dramatic potential and how effectively they demonstrated this in the final performance.

Best responses were able to discuss the final performance in detail and were able to evaluate the success of the devised performance using clear, practical examples from the performance to illustrate their ideas.

Some candidates struggled with the term 'dramatic potential' and did not make close reference to their final performance to support their answer, even though that advice was stated clearly as part of the question.

DRAMA

Paper 0411/02 Coursework

Key messages

Centres are commended for producing work in such challenging and unpredictable situations. Considering how hard it has been to see live theatre in the last two years, candidates did well to emulate live performance with a good degree of stagecraft. There were some very impressive performances where dedication and commitment shone through. Moderators reported on the enthusiasm with which candidates approached live performance on stage; even weaker performances showed an enthusiasm for live performance, which shows that a key aim of the syllabus was achieved, namely, to foster enjoyment of drama.

Administration

The session ran smoothly and there were relatively few administrative issues. The new Submit for Assessment platform proved a great improvement on the previous shipping of DVDs/USB memory sticks. Inevitably, there were a number of teething problems with the system breaking down and/or centres not uploading the correct materials. A number of centres failed to provide the ICMS forms for all of the candidates in the cohort; others posted videos that had been saved in a way that made them unopenable. Files were not always correctly labelled with names and candidate numbers, which is essential. Centres are reminded that the candidate's name must match that on the file as the ICMS form.

The ICMS forms themselves were generally completed in a helpful and succinct manner. The majority of centres provided detailed and really helpful comments, which aided moderation by explaining and supporting the marks awarded. There were several exceptions where the comments made were too thin to be of very much help in supporting the mark. In some cases, the comments merely replicated the wording of the assessment criteria. There were a few isolated incidents where centres had merely copied and pasted comments for different candidates even where the candidates concerned had received quite different marks. There were instances of very good practice where teachers included an explanation as to why a higher mark should not be given.

Most centres supplied distinguishing factors for candidates to help moderators identify them in the group pieces; candidates also identified themselves at the start of the recording. In several cases, however, the identifying descriptions on the ICMS forms were either missing or too vague to help the moderator. Some centres did not include candidate introductions; in other cases, introductions were spoken too quickly; occasionally, the candidates were not in costume. There were very few close-ups where moderators could see facial expressions and a sizable number were shot from a distance, which made it hard to identify candidates.

Scripted pieces

Moderators reported that the overall standard of performance was high and there was little discernible difference in quality between individual and group pieces. Some candidates used different plays by the same playwright for their solo and group scripted pieces. While this is permitted, it often restricted candidates' opportunities to explore different styles, genres and acting techniques. In monologues, some candidates used fellow students as silent partners on stage, which provided a focus for addressing comments or asking questions. Occasionally, however, it meant the loss of direct face-on views of the candidate, who only shared side profiles.

There was a good sense of stagecraft in many pieces and many examples where candidates had mastered the acting techniques necessary to bring the script to life for an audience. Stronger performances were typified by excellent articulation and enunciation although there were inevitably a significant number where the candidates had gone through the motions of learning lines with limited consideration of their meaning. One of the most common weaknesses was where the performance was extremely static, thus not giving

opportunity to integrate the movement of the character and staging. There was sometimes no real understanding of why a move was made, or what was the motive for sitting or standing. Some candidates gave little thought to their use of chairs and tables, which often served little purpose other than unhelpfully rooting the performance in the same place.

Many candidates gave a good impression of knowing the context of the play from which their extract was taken. The best performances demonstrated thorough research and preparation, including stylistic approaches from key practitioners and consideration of the contexts of the plays. There was, therefore, a welcome sense that centres were generally more adept at choosing scripted material to suit their candidates' abilities and interests, while continuing to stretch and challenge. There was also evidence of careful cutting of the performance extracts in order for them to make sense to an audience.

There was some excellent use of costume, lighting, sound and sets in scripted performances. While the use of costume is not specifically assessed, it was often used effectively to add a sense of period, status and context to performances. Some candidates chose to wear their school uniform while performing their monologues, which in most cases showed a lack of understanding of character and context. If costumes are not available, candidates should opt for neutral clothing. Some performances used a background music track of sad or emotional music to support the dialogue. These were almost always distracting and the drama of the pieces rarely required such musical accompaniment to convey mood and meaning or support the acting.

A number of centres were extremely generous when awarding marks for AO3; pacing, levels of emotional intensity and engagement with the audience were often marked leniently, thus requiring moderation adjustments to bring marks into line with the Cambridge International standard.

Devised pieces

There were many examples of devised pieces that were carefully structured and communicated well to the audience. The choice of stimuli for the devised work was much better focused this session and much of the devised work was innovative, creative and exciting. The most impressive examples were rich in physicality with well-crafted movement and sensitively chosen music, judicious use of props/effects and pushing at boundaries in terms of content. The best devised work experimented with different styles and genres, used space and staging in interesting ways and allowed characters to be explored.

There were a few wordy, action-free performances that did not allow characters to develop. Groups who produced lengthy, wordy expositions did themselves few favours. There was a pervasive sense of teenage angst in a large number of pieces, and this did not often translate itself into effective drama. Instead, it tended to result in over-wordy pieces, mini soap operas, with a heavy reliance on sitting at tables. Where mime was used, it was often well considered and realistic, sustained and credible although the miming of door entrances/exits, handling phones or cups of drinks was often challenging. The over-use of entrances and exits with or without blackouts served no useful purpose and scenes sometimes needed editing to make them punchier.

Examples of repertoire seen in June 2022

Playwright	Title
A	
Albee, Edward	<i>Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?</i>
Anouilh, Jean	<i>Antigone</i>
Aristophanes	<i>The Knights</i>
Arnone, Joseph	<i>Outer Reaches of Space</i>
Arnone, Joseph	<i>Straight to the Nitty Gritty</i>
Arnone, Joseph	<i>Eye of the Whale</i>
Arnone, Joseph	<i>Checking in</i>
Arnone, Joseph	<i>Three Thousand Dollars and a New Life</i>
Ayckbourn, Alan	<i>Invisible Friends</i>
Ayckbourn, Alan	<i>Confusion</i>
Ayckbourn, Alan	<i>Gizmo</i>

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0411 Drama June 2022
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

Playwright	Title
B Becket, Samuel Berkof/Kafka Bovell, Andrew	<i>Waiting for Godot</i> <i>The Trial</i> <i>Things I know to be True</i>
C Campton, David Chekhov, Anton Chekhov, Anton Chekhov, Anton Chekhov, Anton Churchill, Carol	<i>Cage Birds</i> <i>Ivanof</i> <i>The Cherry Orchard</i> <i>The Seagull</i> <i>Three Sisters</i> <i>Seven Jewish Children</i>
D Daniels, Sarah Davis, Gabriel Davis, Gabriel De La Barca, Pedro Durang, Christopher	<i>The Gut Girls</i> <i>Dreams in Captivity</i> <i>Goodbye Charles</i> <i>The Painter of his own Dishonour</i> <i>Laughing Wild</i>
E Euripides	<i>Medea</i>
F	
G Gaiman, Neil Godber, John Godber, John	<i>Ocean at the End of the Lane</i> <i>Shakers</i> <i>Teechers</i>
H	
I Ibsen, Henrik Ibsen, Henrik	<i>A Doll's House</i> <i>An Enemy of the People</i>
J Jonson, Ben	<i>Volpone</i>
K Kane, Sarah Kane, Sarah Kass, Sam Keatley, Charlotte Kelly, Denis Kirkwood, Lucy	<i>4:48 Psychosis</i> <i>Crave</i> <i>Lusting After Pipina's Wife</i> <i>My Mother Said I Never Should</i> <i>DNA</i> <i>Mosquitos</i>
L Lorca	<i>Yerma</i>
M Macdonald, Sharman MacMillan, Duncan Martin, Jason D Martin, Jason D McGee, Lisa McDonagh, Martin Miller, Arthur Miller, Arthur Murray Smith, Joanna	<i>After Juliet</i> <i>1984</i> <i>When It Rains Gasoline</i> <i>Dying Light</i> <i>Girls and Dolls</i> <i>The Pillowman</i> <i>The Crucible</i> <i>Death of a Salesman</i> <i>Honour</i>

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0411 Drama June 2022
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

Playwright	Title
N Neff, Debra Nichols, Peter	<i>What Theo Did</i> <i>Day in the Death of Joe Egg</i>
O O'Hare, Eugene Oswald, Debra	<i>Hospital Food</i> <i>DAGS</i>
P Pinter, Harold Placey, Evan Placey, Evan Powell, Kelly Punter, Michael	<i>The Dumb Waiter</i> <i>Jekyll and Hyde</i> <i>Girls Like That</i> <i>Like Dreaming Backwards</i> <i>Darker Shores</i>
R Ravenhill, Mark Reade, Simon Rotimi, Oto Rotimi, Oto Jack Thorne	<i>Yesterday an Incident Occurred</i> <i>Private Peaceful</i> <i>Our Husband has Gone Mad Again</i> <i>The Gods Are Not To Blame</i> <i>Harry Potter and the Cursed Child</i>
S Schaffer, Peter Shakespeare Shakespeare Shakespeare Shakespeare Shaw, George Bernard Soyinka, Wole Sophocles Steel, Gordon Stephenson, Shelagh Stephens, Simon	<i>Amadeus</i> <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i> <i>King Lear</i> <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> <i>Twelfth Night</i> <i>St Joan</i> <i>The Lion and The Jewel</i> <i>Antigone</i> <i>Like a Virgin</i> <i>Five Kinds of Silence</i> <i>Punk Rock</i>
T Treadwell, Sophie	<i>Machinel</i>
W Wade, Laura Wade, Laura Wilde, Oscar Wilde, Oscar Wilde, Oscar Williams, Tennessee Wymark, Olwyn	<i>The Watsons</i> <i>Colder than here</i> <i>Salome</i> <i>The Importance of Being Earnest</i> <i>An Ideal Husband</i> <i>A Streetcar Named Desire</i> <i>Find me</i>
Z Zeccola, Joseph	<i>Scuba Lessons</i>