



GENERAL COMMENTS

Generally, students displayed an appropriate level of understanding of the key knowledge and skills specified for each of the examinable outcomes. Most students responded to all the questions on the examination paper. Some students were inconsistent in their responses scoring high marks for one question and 0 for another. Quite often student expression, spelling and handwriting were poor. Students should also consider using bullet points and/or subheadings to structure their responses.

Areas of strength and weakness

Common areas of strength were:

- a thorough understanding of what was required to answer the question
- a sound knowledge, and usage, of drama specific terminology
- ability to clearly distinguish between the terms 'describe/evaluate/analyse/discuss'
- clear and concise responses to questions
- a good understanding of the key skills and knowledge embedded in the course
- use of effective and relevant examples to support answers.

Common areas of weakness were:

- inappropriate amount of time allocated to specific questions
- limited understanding of performance styles
- misunderstanding and/or inappropriate use of drama specific terminology
- not paying sufficient attention to the stem of the question
- over answering of a question leaving insufficient time for remaining questions
- limited understanding of the key knowledge and skills embedded in the course
- inability to use specific examples to support a response.

Advice for students

Students should:

- give careful attention to the stem of a question, and to any words that are emboldened in the question
- note the allocation of marks for each question and be guided by this for the appropriate depth and length of their responses
- ensure they know the difference between dramatic and stagecraft elements, and performance styles and theatrical conventions
- use reading time to plan responses including the amount of time which they should spend on each question.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

The examination paper did not specify that a particular style of written response was required. Responses could be in essay, short answer or point form or a combination of any or all of these forms. Question 1 specified that illustrations and annotations were an acceptable response. Illustrations were used appropriately by some students within their responses to other questions. Most students answered the paper in the order in which it was set out although a small number of students answered the questions in a different order, which was quite acceptable.

Section A

Question 1

1a

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average
%	3	3	12	18	25	20	19	3.94

This question related to the Ensemble Performance in Unit 3.

Question 1a required students to focus on the development of their ensemble performance, and to describe how one stagecraft element and one dramatic element had been used in this development.

Responses that were awarded high marks were characterised by:

- a clear knowledge of the difference between dramatic and stagecraft elements
- appropriate illustrations, often as part of a written response
- good choice of pertinent examples to support the response.

Responses that were awarded low marks were characterised by:

- lack of knowledge of dramatic and stagecraft elements
- generalised responses without pertinent examples to support the response
- responses which only discussed one dramatic element, or one stagecraft element
- confusion between dramatic elements and stagecraft conventions
- minimal evidence of how the elements were applied to non-naturalistic performance
- misunderstanding of the term 'develop'.

1b

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	7	15	33	45	2.15

Question 1b required students to analyse how expressive skills were used to characterise one non-naturalistic character in the ensemble performance. It did not have to be the student's own character. This question had the greatest percentage of full marks awarded. Students tended to over answer this question.

A high rating was characterised by:

- an analytical, rather than descriptive response
- a clear knowledge of how non-naturalism can be used to create character
- a good understanding of a range of expressive skills and their application.

A low rating was characterised by:

- choice of naturalistic rather than non-naturalistic character
- a descriptive rather than analytical response.

Question 2

2a

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	5	9	24	27	35	2.77

This question related to the development and realisation of the Ensemble Performance in Unit 3.

Students were required to describe the development of the ensemble performance in terms of performance style/s and theatrical conventions. Some students tended to focus on definitions and examples rather than how these applied to their own ensemble.

A high rating was characterised by:

- a clear understanding of performance styles and their associated conventions
- a good knowledge of how performance style/s and theatrical conventions can be applied to create meaning through drama
- clear focus on the developmental process, often describing the development sequentially
- appropriate choice of examples to support the response.

A low rating was characterised by:

- confusion between performance styles and theatrical conventions
- misunderstanding of the term 'development'
- confusion between stagecraft elements and theatrical conventions
- a listing of theatrical conventions without appropriate examples.

2b

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average
%	7	4	15	27	28	12	7	3.31

Students were required to evaluate the collaborative process in both the development and the realisation of their ensemble performance.

A maximum of 4 marks was awarded if a student did not include the realisation of the performance. Less than 20 per cent of students included realisation in their response. Students had a good understanding of collaborative process in creating an ensemble. Students did not need to have positive responses to the ensemble experience to achieve well on this question.

A high rating was characterised by:

- a thorough understanding of the nature of collaborative process

- knowledge of the difference between the stages of development and the realisation of the ensemble, and how various members of their ensemble contributed to both
- a response which used pertinent examples to evaluate the effectiveness of the collaborative process.

A low rating was characterised by:

- no mention of the realisation of the ensemble performance
- confusion about meaning of 'realisation' in the performance context
- discussing 'what they realised', meaning what they became aware of throughout the process, but not the realisation of the ensemble performance
- a listing of the process without evaluation
- a limited use of examples.

Question 3

3a (Average mark 6.52/Available marks 12)

Question 3 was based on a selected play from the 2003 Drama Playlist.

About 50 per cent of students wrote on either the outdoor performance of *Mavis Goes to Timor* or *Speaking in Tongues*. The remaining 50 per cent were fairly evenly divided between the other four plays: *Moon Babies*, *Dirty Laundry*, *Macbeth* and the indoor performance of *Mavis Goes to Timor*.

Question 3a required a lengthy and detailed discussion of how two characters were represented through expressive skills and stagecraft elements. Students needed to provide a balanced response for both characters in terms of expressive skills and stagecraft elements. Six marks were allocated for each character discussed; 3 each for expressive skills and stagecraft elements. Some students would have benefited from better revision as their responses indicated that they had forgotten much about the play they had seen in first semester. These students did not have enough specific information or examples to achieve full marks for this question. Some students listed one play then discussed another play from the list (this type of mistake did not affect the student's marks).

A high rating was characterised by:

- a balanced discussion where the student chose two characters and discussed both expressive skills and stagecraft
- a clear understanding of how stagecraft can be used to add meaning to character
- at least three clear examples for both expressive skills and stagecraft for each character
- appropriate use of terminology
- some analysis in the response.

A low rating was characterised by:

- discussion of only one character
- confusion between characters
- discussion of expressive skills without stagecraft
- lack of appropriate vocabulary
- confusion between theatrical elements and stagecraft elements
- general discussion of stagecraft in the play without reference to specific characters
- generalised statements not supported by examples.

3b (2.92/ 6)

Question 3b required students to analyse how meaning was given to subject matter through non-naturalistic theatrical conventions in the play selected from the playlist.

A high rating was characterised by:

- an analytical response
- pertinent examples of non-naturalistic theatrical conventions
- an appropriate level of detail
- clear understanding of relevant theatrical conventions
- good knowledge of how subject matter can be manipulated through the use of theatrical conventions.

A low rating was characterised by:

- descriptive rather than analytical approach
- understanding of non-naturalism confused or absent from the response
- brief responses
- misunderstanding of 'theatrical conventions'
- omitting references to subject matter.

Section B

Question 4

4a (3.41/ 6)

Question 4 relates to the development of the student's solo performance in Unit 4. The most commonly written about prescribed character was The Stereotype, then The Double Agent, Maria von Trapp, Mitsy Sennosuke, Gertrude Bell, Isabella of Castille, Marvellous Melbourne, The Public Servant, Tenterfield Saddler and Meyer Wolfsheim. Students who wrote on Tenterfield Saddler tended to focus their responses on the Peter Allen character rather than the three characters referred to in the prescribed structure.

Question 4a focused on the research of subject matter the student undertook to develop his/her solo performance character. Many students listed the research they did but did not reflect on how they used this research to develop their performance. There was a variety of research evident in student responses, from the simple to the complex, with the Internet being the most common research resource.

A high rating was characterised by:

- evidence of detailed research
- balanced discussion dealing with research of subject matter, and choices made in developing the performance to its final form
- clear examples of how subject matter the student researched was applied to the performance
- evidence of research into performance styles and theatrical conventions appropriate for the prescribed structure
- use of appropriate terminology.

A low rating was characterised by:

- little research undertaken hence not much for students to write about
- a listing of research resources without any reflection on how they were used to develop the performance
- no evidence of research except reading the prescribed structure.

4b (1.87/3)

Students had to recall one of the dramatic elements listed in the prescribed structure for their solo performance. If a student did not write about one of their prescribed dramatic elements no marks could be awarded for this question. More than 20 per cent of students scored zero on this question because they either wrote on a dramatic element that was not prescribed in their chosen structure or they confused dramatic elements with theatrical conventions. Most students who wrote on the correct dramatic element achieved full marks for this question.

A high rating was characterised by:

- three clear examples of how a dramatic element listed in the prescribed structure for their solo performance was applied in the performance, either developmentally or in the final performance
- sound knowledge of the selected dramatic element
- a good understanding of how dramatic elements can be applied to a performance.

A low rating was characterised by:

- confusion between dramatic elements and theatrical conventions
- references to a dramatic element which was not listed for the selected prescribed structure
- lack of knowledge about how dramatic elements can be applied to performance.

Question 5

Question 5 was comprised of four parts and related to the analysis of the processes involved in the development of a solo performance. Students were required to examine the illustration provided and consider how it could be used as stimulus for a solo performance. Students should have been able to draw on key knowledge and skills acquired through the development of their own solo performance in Unit 4. Some students ran out of time and their answers were brief or incomplete. About 15 per cent of students did not complete Question 5. In answering this question students needed to be clear that they were referring to a solo rather than an ensemble performance. When discussing more than one character they needed to refer to 'character transformation' or other techniques to make it clear that they were not preparing an ensemble performance.

5a

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average 1.96
%	7	22	37	34	

In Question 5a students had to choose one or more performance styles and explain why they would use this style/s to develop a solo performance based on the image. Students generally answered this question well.

A high rating was characterised by:

- a clear understanding of performance style/s and their relevant applications
- appropriate use of terminology
- clear reasons given to justify the choice of style/s.

A low rating was characterised by:

- inappropriate use of terminology
- confusion about the concept of performance style/s
- style chosen but no justification given
- justification inappropriate for chosen performance style.

5b

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	6	14	34	27	19	2.38

Students had to outline how they would use the image in the development of this solo performance. Some students outlined a narrative based on the stimulus, or explained how characters could be developed from the stimulus and others looked at how space could be used in a solo performance. All these responses were acceptable. Some students responded less appropriately by discussing construction techniques they would use in the development of the solo, which then meant they did not answer 5c well for fear of repetition.

A high rating was characterised by:

- an insightful and creative response to the stimulus
- clear explanation through use of example/s of how the stimulus could provide ideas for the development of a solo performance
- analytical observation of the picture.

A low rating was characterised by:

- simple story telling with no reference to a solo performance
- lack of practical application of knowledge acquired in Unit 4
- a discussion of construction techniques without reference to the stimulus material
- response conflicted with performance style chosen in Question 5a.

5c

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	17	26	33	17	7	1.69

Students had to explain how they would use one construction technique in the development of this performance. Some students ran out of time and did not attempt this question.

Students were given 'improvisation' as an example of a construction technique. Many students wrote about applying improvisation but any other construction technique was also acceptable. Students had a very poor knowledge of construction techniques which was evident in their responses. A number of students chose to discuss a variety of construction techniques and hence could only be awarded marks for one of these. This question was the most poorly answered question on the examination paper.

A high rating was characterised by:

- good knowledge of a construction technique and how it can be applied to the development of a solo performance
- confining the response to one construction technique but giving three clear examples of how it could be applied
- appropriate use of terminology
- evident development of ideas through Questions 5a, b and c.

A low rating was characterised by:

- mentioning a range of construction techniques
- confusion with terminology
- limited or no understanding of the concept of constructing techniques.

5d

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	16	20	37	27	1.75

Question 5d required students to list a stagecraft element, and then to explain its use in the solo performance. Students chose a range of stagecraft elements, including costume, lighting, props and sound as the most common. Most students understood what was required but a few students confused stagecraft elements with dramatic elements.

Many students used illustrations to explain the stagecraft element they chose to use for this solo. Some students ran out of time and did not attempt this question. Generally, students who attempted this question responded well.

A high rating was characterised by:

A clear choice of stagecraft followed by:

- two or three examples of its application
- illustrations clearly annotated to explain their use in the solo
- stagecraft applications highly appropriate to a solo performance, often with reference to transformation of time, place and character
- stagecraft applications that demonstrate knowledge of how stagecraft can be used to create greater levels of meaning in drama.

A low rating was characterised by:

- a brief or unfinished response
- confusion between dramatic elements and stagecraft elements
- illustrations without annotations explaining how the stagecraft element would be used
- choosing to discuss a variety of stagecraft elements
- inappropriate examples for a solo performance, e.g. complex costuming for multiple characters, not allowing for quick character transformations.

© VCAA 2003

Published by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority
41 St Andrews Place, East Melbourne 3002

Photocopying: This publication can only be photocopied for the use of students and teachers in Victorian Schools.

