

**2006 HSC Notes from
the Marking Centre
Drama**

© 2007 Copyright Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the Crown in right of the State of New South Wales.

This document contains Material prepared by the Board of Studies NSW for and on behalf of the State of New South Wales. The Material is protected by Crown copyright.

All rights reserved. No part of the Material may be reproduced in Australia or in any other country by any process, electronic or otherwise, in any material form or transmitted to any other person or stored electronically in any form without the prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW, except as permitted by the *Copyright Act 1968*. School candidates in NSW and teachers in schools in NSW may copy reasonable portions of the Material for the purposes of bona fide research or study.

When you access the Material you agree:

- to use the Material for information purposes only
- to reproduce a single copy for personal bona fide study use only and not to reproduce any major extract or the entire Material without the prior permission of the Board of Studies NSW
- to acknowledge that the Material is provided by the Board of Studies NSW
- not to make any charge for providing the Material or any part of the Material to another person or in any way make commercial use of the Material without the prior written consent of the Board of Studies NSW and payment of the appropriate copyright fee
- to include this copyright notice in any copy made
- not to modify the Material or any part of the Material without the express prior written permission of the Board of Studies NSW.

The Material may contain third party copyright materials such as photos, diagrams, quotations, cartoons and artworks. These materials are protected by Australian and international copyright laws and may not be reproduced or transmitted in any format without the copyright owner's specific permission. Unauthorised reproduction, transmission or commercial use of such copyright materials may result in prosecution.

The Board of Studies has made all reasonable attempts to locate owners of third party copyright material and invites anyone from whom permission has not been sought to contact the Copyright Officer, ph (02) 9367 8289, fax (02) 9279 1482.

Published by Board of Studies NSW
GPO Box 5300
Sydney 2001
Australia

Tel: (02) 9367 8111
Fax: (02) 9367 8484
Internet: www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au

ISBN 978 174147 5722

2007104

Contents

Practical Examination	4
Submitted Projects	7
Written Examination	14
Section I – Australian Drama and Theatre.....	14
Section II – Studies in Drama and Theatre.....	15

2006 HSC NOTES FROM THE MARKING CENTRE

DRAMA

Introduction

This document has been produced for the teachers and candidates of the Stage 6 course in Drama. It provides comments with regard to responses to the 2006 Higher School Certificate Examination, indicating the quality of candidate responses and highlighting the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidature in each section and each question.

It is essential for this document to be read in conjunction with the relevant syllabus, the 2006 Higher School Certificate Examination, the Marking Guidelines and other support documents which have been developed by the Board of Studies to assist in the teaching and learning of Stage 6 Drama.

General Comments

In 2006, approximately 5200 candidates attempted the Stage 6 Drama Examination. The majority of candidates once again chose *Performance* for their Individual Project option, with *Design: Costume* the next largest, attracting over 500 candidates. Most other options increased proportionately, with Video Drama numbers growing to over 350.

In the Written Examination more candidates are including experiential class work as part of their supporting material. However, as a general rule, the better responses explained how the playwrights explored the issues theatrically and how their choices affected the audience.

Practical Examination

Group Performance

The majority of candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements for HSC performance examinations. Candidates are reminded, however, of the following requirements for the HSC drama performance examinations:

- The time limits are 6-8 minutes (Individual Performance) and 8-12 minutes (Group Performance).
- Each performer in the group performance is marked individually. As such, it is important for the markers to be able to differentiate each student. If all students are wearing similar costumes a distinguishing ribbon, badge or other indicator will assist the markers to identify each student.
- Candidates who read scripts or improvise pieces are unlikely to satisfy the criteria for the examination.
- Candidates should not use props in a dangerous or threatening way.

- Live performance is a dynamic medium. Candidates should perform their piece for an audience prior to the examination to ensure they are aware of audience responses to their work.

Recommendations relating to Group and Individual Performance

Class work on the Group Performance should commence after the Easter break of the HSC year.

Production effects such as costumes, sets, lighting, video, film, sound, microphones and technical support should be minimal as available facilities and technical equipment vary in schools. External markers will not award extra marks to any performance dependent on technical and/or special effects.

Technical effects should not hinder students' performance skills. It is recommended that limited lighting effects be used (lights up and lights down are sufficient). Strobe lighting is strongly discouraged and markers should be informed when unusual lighting or effects are to be used. The performance should not solely rely upon set, or elaborate costume.

Candidates are reminded of the following.

- The intention of the performance should be clear to the audience.
- Candidates should be careful to make a theatrical statement for the stage, especially if using material inspired by film and video.
- Candidates should be discouraged from over reliance on song, dance or music – unless integral to the meaning and theatricality of the performance.
- Placing the focus of the performance somewhere on stage, for example to a chair or 'invisible character', is problematic for the actor/audience relationship.

GROUP PERFORMANCE

Stronger performances:

- presented an extremely clear theatrical journey with clarity of intention and meaning
- had a unity of purpose where every theatrical moment contributed to the meaning of the piece, through effective choices in the dramatic structure and performance techniques used
- performed as a highly polished ensemble with comprehensive control of the elements of drama (particularly tension and mood) to create powerful audience engagement
- employed vocalisation, physicality and timing with sophistication and effective control to create character/role and meaning appropriate to the chosen style of the piece
- created clearly defined and sustained role(s)/character(s) with a physical, psychological and emotional truth demonstrating clarity in intentions and motivating action
- had interactions with other characters/roles developed and sustained in a complete character journey.

Weaker performances:

- presented a confused, purposeless and/or superficial performance that lacked a sense of theatre
- had disconnected episodic and often unrelated scenes with awkward, unmotivated and superficial transitions (eg blackouts or entrances and exits)
- had imbalanced contributions from performers with minimal understanding and control of dramatic elements
- had little control of the dynamics in physicality, vocals and timing with minimal reference to the chosen style, the meaning of the piece or the character/role being performed
- had character(s)/role(s) that lacked clarity in identity or motivation in the piece
- had interactions with other characters/roles which were often lacking in dynamism, truthfulness and energy.

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT: PERFORMANCE

Stronger performances:

- had a complete theatrical journey for their character and audience
- used strong theatrically constructed scripts
- were well-rehearsed and polished pieces with minimal reliance on props, costumes and technical effects
- had thorough action/objective analysis of the text
- made sophisticated and effective choices dealing with rhythm, pace, timing, energy and intensity
- had a sophisticated control of vocal and movement dynamics appropriate to form and/or style.
- had realised their characters in every moment with absolute conviction and clarity
- had provided a clear journey for the character, developing complexity and dimension.

Weaker performances:

- were often under or over time
- often wrote their own pieces with little theatricality and tended to ‘storytell’
- used films or the internet to source the pieces and/or tended to perform pieces with ‘teenage angst’
- chose pieces that “challenged” them or because they wanted to do something different, failing to use established strengths.
- often lacked spatial awareness in movement
- often played themselves
- regularly broke focus even to the point of checking the audience for response
- had low energy, one-dimensional characters
- felt they had to include all of their performance skills, almost like a checklist, rather than using the appropriate skills for the material they were presenting.

Submitted Projects

Individual Project: Critical Analysis

Portfolio of Theatre Criticism

Projects in this area were generally of a high quality, with a good range of production styles and an overall improvement in structure and writing style. However, discussion of productions needed to demonstrate a greater understanding and appreciation of production elements. Logbooks should contain drafts and notes, and annotations should also be available.

Stronger projects:

- demonstrated confidence and flair in the use of language and style
- were accurate and polished, having been through a thorough process of drafting and editing.

Weaker projects:

- focused on non-theatrical elements and/or retold the plot
- approached the project as a literary analysis of themes and ideas.

Applied Research Project

Candidates should choose a research topic as described in the syllabus and in an area that interests them and that allows them a fresh field of investigation. A number of projects lacked a clear or appropriate hypothesis and, therefore, a sense of purpose and direction. This project must have a question or statement that arises from preliminary research and is thoroughly investigated through appropriate methodology and research.

Candidates must submit projects that are entirely their own work and there must be accurate citing of references and sources. Additionally, logbooks should contain copies of research material, annotations, notes and rough drafts of the project.

Stronger projects:

- involved topics that gave the candidates direct and practical access to the area of investigation
- demonstrated confidence and an authoritative voice
- achieved a clear, well-investigated and persuasive conclusion to the hypothesis.

Weaker projects:

- demonstrated lack of the sophisticated skills required by this project
- lacked an appropriate, purposeful or achievable hypothesis.

Director's Folio

There was a wide range of texts chosen, and candidates were able to excel across the whole range. However, some projects contained directors' concepts that could not be sustained throughout the whole project or that appeared superimposed for the sake of it. A director's concept should attempt to give a fresh interpretation of a text but candidates should be aware that an inappropriate setting or choice of style may affect the integrity of the project. In a number of projects, the analysis of the text was too literary and failed to relate to the play in performance. Analysis must be specifically related to the concept and should clearly show how scenes and moments are to be realised on the stage through such elements as blocking, use of space and levels, interpretation of characters and dialogue. Dramatic meaning manipulated by development of the director's ideas using elements such as symbols, tension, focus and tempo are to be manipulated for dramatic meaning. Theatrical elements such as sets, costumes and lighting should be integrated in the analysis of text.

Candidates should be clear and specific about the relevance of each rehearsal exercise and relate each to scenes or a performance style that the director requires the actor to use. While the format is not prescribed, the guidelines clearly outline areas that must be included. All of these areas should be covered and clearly communicated to the examiners.

Stronger projects:

- clearly communicated the concept and translated it to all areas of the production and the intended audience experience
- demonstrated wide and relevant research and incorporated influences insightfully and effectively into the concept.

Weaker projects:

- were often under or over length and sometimes supported by irrelevant or unclear visuals
- used inappropriate or impractical concepts, demonstrating a superficial knowledge and understanding of live theatre as a dramatic medium.

Individual Project: Design

Most plays were strongly presented across the design areas. Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate a design concept vision for the whole world of the play, and to make visual and written selections which are appropriate to the context and stylistic needs of the play.

Candidates should be aware that cardboard mounting may be appropriate; however, glass and perspex should be avoided. Projects do not need wooden or metal frames, but should be packaged for protection in transportation while also remaining easily accessible for marking. Each design item and all support material should be clearly labelled as per their function within the list of required items.

Candidates should provide all required support material such as fabric samples, other character sketches or floor plans included as part of their project. Items required as part of their project should

not be within their logbook. The design rationale should be presented as a separate item within the project.

Lighting

Stronger projects:

- evoked an atmospheric intention through the chosen lights, creating a theatrical experience appropriate to the specifics of the chosen play
- submitted clear lighting plans which located all the lanterns' positions, indicating the stage area which these lanterns covered
- provided a clear intention in each lighting cue choice which served to dramatically enhance both scenes chosen
- demonstrated a substantial understanding of lanterns, gel colour and placement in lighting the chosen scenes
- supported the dramatic action, mood and setting of the chosen scenes, transporting the audience into the appropriate world of the play.

Weaker projects:

- showed limited or flawed understanding when addressing the lighting needs of the play. Lanterns often failed to provide adequate coverage for the chosen scenes, or key places on the stage were left in darkness
- lacked a director's vision for the play, leading to sometimes confused or incomplete lighting plan, running sheets and cue sheets
- used an often unmodified lighting plan provided by a theatre company, and made simplistic choices of gel colour or lanterns, resulting in an unsuccessful or inappropriate stylistic choice in illuminating the scene.

Costume

Stronger projects:

- developed a design concept which established a clear period and place appropriate for the world of the play. Stronger projects demonstrated this through an appropriate selection of character costumes and support preliminary sketches. These choices showed the central characters' journey through costume transitions, and further enhanced design intentions through a range of selected characters from the total world of the play
- presented unity of concept through designs which indicated the relationships between the chosen characters and their status within the play. Sophisticated works had flair and theatricality in depicting each character, capturing the character in a moment within the play through their choices.

Weaker projects:

- made limited choices, not representing the whole world of the play within their costume choices, tending to focus on only the earlier scenes of the play
- could not articulate a design concept through their renderings, often presenting a mixture of styles and periods appropriate only to the individual characters without a unified design direction
- were often non-theatrical, lacking appropriate body language for the intended character or presenting the character in a moment of their journey. Some projects tended to present fashion style figures with little modification from character to character
- demonstrated a lack of ability to present the required support material for their project. Some projects presented process sketches of the final chosen costume design choices rather than presenting additional costume choices in this support material. Other support material like fabric samples and character scene details was often absent or incomplete.

Promotion & Program

Stronger projects:

- had original directorial vision, communicating their thematic and theatrical understanding of the play through evocative choices in images and design choices
- demonstrated a clear link in the promotional copy and design to their chosen real or imagined theatre company through appropriate choices in representing the company's philosophical stance and director's vision for the chosen play
- demonstrated a sophisticated awareness of the need to present the world of the play to the appropriate target audience through both the visual choices and written material
- demonstrated flair and originality in the writing of the director's notes, flyer and promotional media article
- possessed unity within the visual and written materials, creating a theatrical reading of the play focusing on the tension and atmosphere appropriate to the world of the play.

Weaker projects:

- used the design elements in a superficial or ineffective way, developing simplistic symbols without recognising the atmosphere and place within the play's context
- wrote reviews rather than previewing a show in the media release material
- had a limited understanding of the chosen theatre company's promotion practice, making inappropriate or flawed designs which did not represent the established theatre company's correct profile or would not entice the appropriate target audience to the theatrical production
- communicated the world of the play through inconsistent or limited choices and made inappropriate choices about the size or function of each of the items
- presented inappropriate visual choices in layout, font or colour, making it difficult for the visual elements of the design items to function.

Set

Stronger projects:

- demonstrated a highly sophisticated and evocative design concept that captured the whole play
- designed a ‘unit’ set that reflected understanding of all scenic requirements. These projects were theatrical, atmospheric and completely delivered the intention of the playwright thematically, in presenting their design choices
- chose evocative colours, textures and materials to represent the world of the play, showing understanding of the role of the set designer to take the audience on a visual journey of the play
- presented a model in accordance to the 1:25 scale. Sound materials were used and were definitely in the context of a theatre
- provided detailed floor plans, scenic explanations and scale drawings or photographs indicating how each scene would be presented, with furniture and set pieces enhancing, not detracting from, their overall vision of the play.

Weaker Projects:

- did not cover all scenes in the play or only designed one scene, making no reference to other scenes in the play
- presented models which were under scale, flimsy in their execution, or oversize
- overused dolls’ furniture which was not to scale
- did not include floor plans or any written descriptions, explanations, scale drawings or photographs indicating how the whole play would be represented on the stage
- did not indicate the theatre they were designing for
- did not consider the practicality of how the set should work for the actors, providing no indication of entrances, exits or levels.

Individual Project: Scriptwriting

General Comments

Candidates are encouraged to increase their understanding of theatre and, in particular, the conventions of playwriting, through attending live performances and reading a wide range of plays. Examiners experience the play in the actual written text and, as a blueprint for performance, clarity of description is vitally important. Clearly and appropriately described tools such as dialogue, character voices, setting, stage directions, verbal imagery, and production effects will achieve greater dramatic impact, believability, and engagement for an audience.

Candidates are reminded that they are writing for an audience, for actors and for a director, so the text should clearly communicate theatrical elements and focus on engaging an audience from the opening set description.

Candidates are encouraged to organise a reading of their text in front of an audience and to then further workshop the script, so that the theatrical experience can be refined and enriched, ensuring the script represents a sustained theatrical experience.

While writing from their own experiences is to be encouraged, candidates are reminded to appeal to a wide audience. Experience of life should also be developed through observation, reflection and engaging in wide and critical reading and theatrical performances.

Stronger projects:

- displayed sophisticated theatrical understanding, skilfully manipulating dialogue, images, sound and mood to create a total theatrical experience
- sustained the theatrical concept to the end, creating a believable world and a sense of journey for the characters/roles and for the audience
- created characters with individual and distinct voices
- chose effective and appropriate dramatic elements, manipulating them imaginatively to enact the concept
- resolved the action and explored mood, theme and style to a satisfying resolution
- imaginatively and appropriately manipulated production elements, technical aspects and acting practicalities.

Weaker projects:

- created concepts and used text more suited to TV or film than live theatre
- employed incomplete concepts, basic plots or two-dimensional characterisation that failed to explore deep thematic meaning
- showed little awareness of dramatic rhythms and failed to vary dramatic elements or dramatic action
- contained confused or limited dramatic action due to lack of purpose or lack of understanding of style or form
- attempted to correct poor characterisation and unmotivated dialogue with over-written director's notes or description of action.

Individual Project: Video Drama

The projects submitted canvassed a full range of film and video genres. Better projects showed a sophisticated understanding and ability to manipulate the narrative conventions of the chosen genre. The better projects also showed technical capability, particularly with light and sound. Candidates should constantly revisit and remind themselves of the marking criteria – that above all else, they must engage an audience through control of dramatic elements of mood, tension and atmosphere.

Stronger projects:

- showed strong narrative control of the elements of drama, creating clearly realised moments of tension and mood that totally engaged the audience
- demonstrated an ability to trust the image to tell the story by using the conventions of video language or a chosen genre in a very sophisticated manner
- reflected a refined control of production values in support of the elements of drama, and flair in using camera framing and movement, judicious casting, clear and vibrant live sound and dramatic use of location and lighting

- utilised editing skills and postproduction effects to develop and enhance mood and tension in the narrative
- demonstrated skilful use of sound effects and music to reinforce the dramatic elements.

Weaker projects:

- presented confused or simplistic narratives which showed little consideration for the elements of tension, pace and mood
- demonstrated limited skills in conveying a narrative visually by constructing images and layering sound and making meaningful links from one scene to the next
- showed minimal skill in using the camera to create dramatic meaning. Shots were poorly framed or over-exposed or out of focus
- used muffled or incoherent live sound and made poor choices of locations, lighting and casting
- used editing to ‘string shots together’, with little connection to the dramatic intention of the narrative
- used music inappropriately so that it drove or dominated the narrative instead of supporting it.

Written Examination

Section I – Australian Drama and Theatre

General Comments

Candidates are reminded they must engage with the question in the development of their response. It is important to select and analyse relevant workshop experiences and examples from the plays to support their discussion, instead of recounting and describing these experiences. Better responses demonstrated a clear understanding and appreciation of the plays in performance.

Question 1

Stronger responses:

- demonstrated a sophisticated, detailed and insightful engagement with the question
- discussed how theatrical and dramatic elements are employed to bring ideas to life through a range of images
- used the term ‘ideas’ as a springboard to explore Australian social, historical, political, personal, artistic and cultural concerns as they emerge in a performance context
- made insightful and analytical references to the plays in performance, whether in imagined, workshopped or professional performance contexts
- employed appropriate theatrical terminology
- demonstrated an understanding and appreciation of the playwrights’ intentions and audience reception
- presented their discussion in a logically structured and coherent manner.

Weaker responses:

- did not directly address the specific requirement of the question and ignored key terms including ‘ideas’, ‘images’ and ‘engaging the audience’
- discussed the plays as literary texts rather than as scripts for performance
- based their responses upon the general implications of the rubric to the detriment of the specific question
- used inappropriate or superficial textual evidence and/or token employment of workshop experience
- relied on formulaic or prepared responses, using key terms from previous HSC questions
- gave personal, biased opinions, retold the plot, made sweeping generalisations and/or provided inaccuracies or misinformation that were not relevant to the question
- employed theatrical terminology inaccurately or inappropriately.

Section II – Studies in Drama and Theatre

Question 2 – Tragedy

Stronger responses:

- addressed all aspects of the question with insight and clarity, including an interpretation of the quotation
- demonstrated a sound knowledge and understanding of both texts and their social and cultural contexts, and could apply this knowledge to support their argument
- compared the classical and modern tragedies, identifying their dramatic elements, similarities and differences, and the reason for their individual appeal to a modern audience
- understood and discussed the suffering of the protagonist as a theatrical experience for the audience
- balanced their analysis of the individual/societal discussion with pertinent examples from workshop experiences and productions
- presented workable, often innovative, ideas for contemporary staging.

Weaker responses:

- did not deal with all aspects of the question
- made little reference to the quotation, seeming to answer a previously prepared question
- demonstrated a superficial or misguided grasp of the central themes of the plays
- showed little understanding of the dramatic elements of tragedy, and therefore an inability to reflect upon its impact on a contemporary audience
- recounted the plot and focused on historical information
- presented a literary response with few or no references to performance for a contemporary audience
- provided little or no practical evidence from workshop or production experiences.

Question 3 – Irish Drama

Stronger responses:

- deconstructed and addressed all aspects of the question insightfully
- demonstrated a depth of understanding of the texts which allowed support of the argument with relevant and passionate theatrical moments
- recognised the ties between Irish and Australian cultures which might increase the relevance of the plays for an Australian audience
- showed a thorough understanding of Irish history and culture and were able to incorporate this into their essays
- discussed the theatricality of the staging, providing examples from workshops and productions to support the view that distinctively Irish plays can still be relevant to an Australian audience.

Weaker responses:

- did not deal with all aspects of the question
- discussed Irish culture and character in terms of stereotypes and superficialities, such as accents
- made simplistic links such as ‘pub culture’ between Ireland and Australia
- dealt only superficially with how the staging of a distinctively Irish play might be relevant to an audience
- made little reference to workshop experience, relying on film and literary comments.

Question 4 – Brecht

Stronger responses:

- analysed and addressed all aspects of the question
- considered both the ‘how’ and ‘why’ aspects of the question
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of Brecht’s political and artistic goals and the theatrical techniques he employed to present them, using relevant evidence from the plays
- recognised that the issues Brecht was addressing are still current
- explained how and why Brecht’s techniques might relate to contemporary practice
- made clear and insightful links between Brechtian discourse and current issues which might be utilised to heighten the contemporary relevance of his work
- demonstrated clearly how the plays might now be staged to increase their relevance, using workshops or production experience to support the argument.

Weaker responses:

- failed to cover both areas of the question, often ignoring the quotation
- demonstrated only superficial knowledge of the plays
- listed Brechtian techniques without linking to the plays
- described issues of a socialist nature without reference to the plays
- included large amounts of biographical material and plot retelling
- described classroom performance but were unable to relate it adequately to the question.

Question 5 – Site-specific, Street and Event Theatre

Stronger responses:

- presented an insightful response to the question by synthesising their own work with that of the practitioners
- discussed the techniques, styles and conventions employed by the performance makers to affect the thinking of the audience
- dealt with substantial participation in an event of their own making which had clear artistic and social goals
- related the process of their own performance to the processes of the practitioners
- discussed the importance of pre- and post-performance activities in the structure of an event
- used appropriate evidence from the work of the performance makers as well as their own experience to support their argument.

Weaker responses:

- dealt only superficially with the question
- described events without analysing audience engagement and participation
- did not discuss the political goals of performances, seeing enjoyment as sufficient reason for an event to take place
- participated in insignificant, insubstantial events which could only be described and did not allow analysis
- made no references to the texts.

Question 6 – Approaches to Acting

Stronger responses:

- deconstructed and addressed all aspects of the question insightfully
- maintained the required form of comparison and contrast throughout the essay
- made clear links between preparatory theatre exercises, the philosophy behind their development and their implications in terms of theatre practice
- demonstrated how each practitioner's approach impacted upon the audience, through the use of space, lighting, set design, relationships between performers and specific physicality
- referred to productions by, or influenced by, the practitioners which epitomised their philosophies and theatre practice
- presented relevant experiential evidence which elucidated training techniques but also related directly to audience engagement.

Weaker responses:

- failed to compare and contrast the work of the two practitioners
- presented only a superficial knowledge of the philosophical basis of the practitioners' approaches
- made little attempt to link philosophy with training, leading directly to performance

- listed preparatory exercises such as Suzuki's *Stomping* and Boal's *Theatre Games* without giving them a theatrical context
- provided little experiential or production evidence to support an argument.

Question 7 – American Drama

Stronger responses:

- analysed and addressed all aspects of the question insightfully
- evaluated the relationship between the plays and their social context, and how this affected the themes and the use of dramatic elements
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of original performance techniques supported by relevant evidence
- explored how a modern audience would respond to the plays, presenting workshop experience to support their findings
- discussed possible methods of strengthening the actor/audience relationship, and the impact of the performance on a contemporary audience
- incorporated a discussion of contemporary productions and their effectiveness in engaging an audience.

Weaker responses:

- did not consider all aspects of the question
- did not respond to the concept of the plays being locked into a specific context
- listed theatrical techniques without reference to the question or a sense of performance
- wrote a textual analysis which did not explore performance possibilities
- did not consider how the plays might be staged for a contemporary audience, or provided inappropriate and impractical ideas which demonstrated a lack of understanding of the text
- presented limited or irrelevant workshop material which did not support a point of view.

Question 8 – Seventeenth-Century Comedy

Stronger responses:

- analysed and addressed all parts of the question sustaining an argument throughout
- demonstrated an understanding of the context of seventeenth-century comedy in terms of the relationship between the characters on stage and the audience
- showed a deep knowledge of both texts which enabled pertinent references to be made to support the argument
- demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the characters, which enabled their humorous qualities to be discussed
- discussed the techniques of characterisation that had meaning for a seventeenth-century audience but that might not work in the same way for a contemporary audience
- made appropriate suggestions as to how relevance might be, or has been, increased for a contemporary audience, using experiential and production evidence to support points made.

Weaker responses:

- were unable to sustain a clear, sustained argument in response to the question
- addressed the question, but focused on one or two aspects of performance such as costume and props, without explaining their significance in terms of the question
- demonstrated a limited understanding of the texts, or simply retold the narrative
- did not discuss why the characters remain amusing to a contemporary audience, or why they were amusing in their own time
- failed to present relevant staging possibilities to adapt the plays to a contemporary audience
- did not use pertinent experiential evidence to support suggestions for contemporary staging.

Drama

2006 HSC Examination Mapping Grid

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
Section I — Australian Drama and Theatre (Core Study)			
1	20	Australian Drama And Theatre (Core Study) – Dramatic Traditions in Australia or Contemporary Australian Theatre Practice	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
Section II — Studies in Drama and Theatre			
2	20	Studies in Drama And Theatre – Tragedy	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
3	20	Studies in Drama And Theatre – Irish Drama	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
4	20	Studies in Drama And Theatre – Brecht	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
5	20	Studies in Drama And Theatre – Site-Specific, Street and Event Theatre	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
6	20	Studies in Drama And Theatre – Approaches to Acting	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
7	20	Studies in Drama And Theatre – American Drama	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
8	20	Studies in Drama And Theatre – Seventeenth-Century Comedy	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3

2006 HSC Drama Marking Guidelines

Section I — Australian Drama and Theatre (Core Study)

Question 1

Outcomes assessed: H3.1, H3.2, H3.3

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an insightful understanding and appreciation of the ways in which the ideas and images in Australian plays can be staged and how they engage their audiences • Provides an insightful discussion of the varying theatrical styles and techniques in AT LEAST TWO of the texts • Provides an insightful response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair • Provides an insightful response to the question with well-substantiated supporting evidence 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a substantial understanding and appreciation of the ways in which the ideas and images in Australian plays can be staged and how they engage their audiences • Provides a substantial discussion of the varying theatrical styles and techniques in AT LEAST TWO of the texts • Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner • Provides a substantial response to the question with appropriate supporting evidence 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the ways in which the ideas and/or images in Australian plays can be staged, with some reference to the audience • Provides an adequate discussion of the varying theatrical styles and/or techniques in AT LEAST TWO of the texts • Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question • Provides an adequate response with some supporting evidence 	9–12

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates a basic understanding of some of the ideas and/or images in Australian plays• Provides a basic discussion of some of the theatrical styles and/or techniques of the texts• Provides a series of points related to some of the issues in the question• Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspects of the content of the question• Comments minimally on some of the theatrical styles and/or techniques in the texts• Provides underdeveloped points which may not be related to the question• Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence	1–4

Section II — Studies in Drama and Theatre

Questions 2–8

Outcomes assessed: H3.1, H3.2, H3.3

MARKING GUIDELINES

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interprets and explains insightfully the issues addressed in the question• Demonstrates an insightful understanding and appreciation of the specific theatrical and dramatic styles and issues relevant to the topic• Provides an insightful response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair• Provides an insightful response to the question with well-substantiated supporting evidence	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interprets and explains the issues addressed in the question• Demonstrates a substantial understanding and appreciation of the specific theatrical and dramatic styles and issues relevant to the question• Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner• Provides a substantial response to the question with appropriate supporting evidence	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explains broadly the issues addressed in the question• Demonstrates an adequate understanding and appreciation of the specific theatrical and dramatic styles and issues relevant to the question• Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question• Provides an adequate response with some supporting evidence	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outlines some of the issues addressed in the question• Demonstrates a basic understanding of the specific theatrical and dramatic styles and issues relevant to the question• Provides a series of points related to some of the issues in the question• Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question• Demonstrates a minimal understanding of some theatrical and dramatic issues and styles• Provides underdeveloped points which may not be related to the question• Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence	1–4