Oral Presentation (25%)

In this component, the student is required to make an oral presentation to the teacher of an analysis of an extract lasting no more than five minutes from a prescribed film. The list of films prescribed by the IB is published each year in the November edition of the Diploma Programme coordinator notes, and can also be found on the OCC. It is not carried over from year to year.

Teachers choose three films from the prescribed list. These films must not be studied in class. Should any of the films on the list have already been studied in class when the list is published, these films must not be chosen by the teacher for any of the presentations.

Students should be provided with the names of the three chosen films four week s in advance of the presentation. They will select one film from the three and prepare their presentation within this four-week period.

The aim of the presentation is to encourage a close textual analysis of a continuous extract, relating its features to the film as a whole and to the wider sociocultural context. Students must present a clear understanding of how meaning is constructed through the use of film language. Students may prepare and take notes into the assessment, but they should not read from a prepared document and any notes should be used for reference and guidance only. It is the teacher's responsibility to ensure that students do not read out their presentation.

Students should select an extract lasting no more than five minutes from their chosen film and offer a detailed textual analysis of the extract, placing it in the context of the film as a whole and in a broader sociocultural context, as appropriate. Students should include reasons for choosing the particular extract. Shot-by-shot analysis may form part of the presentation, but this should not be used as a substitute for observations that are drawn together from different parts of the chosen extract.

Any sources consulted during the preparation of the presentation must be acknowledged on the coversheet.

The following must be adhered to in preparing and submitting presentation work.

• The presentation must last no longer than 10 minutes. (*non testers, 3-4 page paper or 6-8 minute pre-recorded oral*)

• ~~The presentation must be recorded on CD.~~

• The presentation must be sent to the external examiner with the appropriate coversheet, including precise details of the chosen extract.

• Playing the film extract must not occupy any of the student's allotted 10-minute commentary time.

Teacher guidance
Students must prepare for this assessment alone and without teacher assistance. Assistance must only be provided in the form of preparing students throughout the course for this type of activity, but not for the final activity itself on which they will be assessed. No discussion of the film should be entered into.

During the presentation, the teacher should not interrupt. The teacher may only remind the student of time left and ask whether they have anything further to say but they must not make reference to specifics or ask leading questions. Students should use as much of the time available as possible. Presentations that are significantly shorter than 10 minutes may be awarded a mark that does not represent the student's full potential.

Goal:

21–25	There is a coherent, incisive, insightful and detailed evaluative interpretation of the extract, displaying an excellent understanding of how meaning is constructed through the use of film language, with an excellent awareness of the extract's relationship to the film as a whole. There is a persuasive explanation for the selection of the extract. The critique shows an excellent awareness of the film's genre and/or its place in a broader sociocultural context. There is an insightful analysis of the director's intention. Simple description is negligible and analysis is clear and thorough.

Film Presentation Subject Report, May 2016
remember this document is a list of notes from the prior year's testers; it is a list what to do and not to do…

The range and suitability of the work submitted
Most candidates focused their Presentation on the selected extract but few used the rest of the film as an opportunity make links and contrasts. Too many of the weaker candidates delivered longs lists of facts, information, quotes and statistics without uses as jumping-off points for analysis. There seemed to be fewer instances of reading from a prepared script. The heart of the presentation task is detailed textual analysis showing how meaning is constructed in filmic terms.

Very few candidates submitted presentations that contained long list of awards and too much emphasis on factual information about the film. The majority of candidates focused on the extract rather than the film as a whole. Fewer candidates retold the plot and described the use of film language (mostly a list of camera shots) without any evaluative analysis. While most candidates concentrated on how film language created meaning, the poorer presentations devoted too little time to this. Better candidates used their allotted time to discuss the extract with pertinent links to other parts of the film. Weaker candidates spent too much time giving factual information about the film as a whole.

Selecting the right extract is an important part of a successful presentation. Stronger candidates often selected an extract that included more than one scene, thus allowing for comparison and contrast.

The strengths and weaknesses of candidates in the treatment of individual areas
Historic/socio-cultural context: A surprising number of candidates dealt poorly (or simplistically) with this. Better candidates did not treat it as a separate category but integrated it into their presentation. Weaker candidates simply identified the genre while stronger candidates discussed how the film conformed to, subverted or changed the genre.

Candidates should be reminded that that they may include genre, socio-cultural context or both. The film they choose should dictate what is the best of these three options. A significant number of candidates omitted a rationale for selecting the extract. Weaker candidates often dealt with it in a single sentence, usually related to plot turning point. Better candidates used this as an opportunity to introduce the presentation.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates
Teacher should instruct candidates to:
- focus on the extract.
- get to the analysis as quickly as possible.
- use "What were the intended effects of the director's choices?" as the overall guiding question for analysis of film language rather than addressing "director's intent" in a single sentence.
- avoid retelling the plot and being overly descriptive.
- pay special attention to the following words in the rubric: "coherent", "evaluative", "detailed" and "how film language creates meaning". Teachers should ensure that candidates understand the expectations connoted by these words and phrases. "Coherent" relates of structure, planning and how convincing the conclusions are, not fluency of delivery. Weaker presentations tended to plod through a checklist of "director's intentions", "genre" and so on, so there was no coherence to the presentation.

"Director's intention" should be embedded throughout the presentation rather than be dealt with as a separate section.

In discussing reactions to the film (at higher level), citing the Rotten Tomatoes score is of little value. Better candidates used quotes from experts as a launching point for their own opinions, comments and analysis. Some standard level candidates included a section devoted to reactions to the film. This is not required at this level and used up valuable time that could be spent on analysis.

Some candidates find it difficult to make links to the rest of the film in terms of anything other than plot. Genre conventions may be a useful way to do this, as well as directorial intent, foreshadowing, repetition of stylistic features, and script structure.

Candidates are expected to research their film. The strongest candidates were able to integrate research on either genre or sociocultural context smoothly with the interpretation of the scene. Weaker candidates' presentations showed no evidence of research or used sources that could not be considered scholarly or academic.