

**2008 HSC Notes from
the Marking Centre
Drama**

© 2009 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

2009023

Contents

Introduction	4
Practical examination.....	4
Submitted projects	7
Written examination.....	13
Section I – Australian drama and theatre.....	13
Section II – Studies in drama and theatre	13

2008 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 contains comments on candidate responses to the 2008 Higher School Certificate examination, indicating the quality of the responses and highlighting their relative strengths and weaknesses.

This document should be read along with the relevant syllabus, the 2008 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 Drama.

Practical examination

Group performance

Candidates should carefully consider their audiences. In some cases, the public contexts for performances in schools and the marking of the examination may make some forms of representation inappropriate. Teachers in particular should carefully consider issues such as child protection legislation in relation to how they are able to appropriately supervise the development of performances that deal with issues of sexuality, abuse, self-harm, drugs or other controversial material. Teachers need to be conscious of their responsibilities and audiences within the school, as well as the broader examination context, and they should be aware of the possible implications for candidates. Advice to schools in relation to these issues is provided in the *HSC Performances and Submitted Works – Advice to Schools Regarding Content* on the Board of Studies website.

Teachers and students are reminded of the following requirements for the HSC drama performance examinations:

- The time limits are: 6–8 minutes (Individual Performance)
 8–12 minutes (Group Performance)
- Each performer in the group performance is marked individually. It is therefore important for the markers to be able to differentiate between students. 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.

- Under no circumstances should candidates use props in a way that is dangerous or threatening to the markers or other members of the audience.
- 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.

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 kept to a minimum as available facilities and technical equipment vary between schools. External markers will not award extra marks for technical and/or special effects.

Schools need to ensure that technical effects do not impinge on or 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.

The following must be made clear to group performance students:

- The intention of the performance should be clear to the audience.
- Candidates need to prepare a theatrical statement for the stage, especially if using material inspired by film or video.
- Candidates are to be discouraged from over-reliance on song, dance or music unless it is integral to the meaning and theatricality of the performance.
- Candidates are discouraged from writing or presenting personal stories.
- Candidates in the group performance are reminded that the work must be original and no extracts from published scripts may be used.
- Placing the focus of the performance on things such as a chair or 'invisible' character is problematic for the actor/audience relationship.

Stronger group 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
- were presented by 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 creation of 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 of intention and motivating action
- had interactions with characters/roles which were developed and sustained in a complete character journey.

Weaker group 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 character/role being performed
- had character(s) or role(s) that lacked clarity in identity and motivation. Often they displayed little physicality and a one-dimensional life that changed or journeyed little throughout the piece
- had interactions with other characters/roles that were often lacking dynamics and energy.

Individual project: performance

Stronger individual performances:

- had a complete and clear theatrical journey for their character and audience
- used strong theatrically constructed scripts
- had 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 exemplary ability to realise their characters in every moment with absolute conviction and clarity.

Weaker individual performances:

- often ran under or over time
- often wrote their own pieces with little theatricality and tended to ‘storytell’
- used movies or the internet to source their pieces and/or tended to perform pieces with teenage angst or mental health issues
- were pieces chosen because the candidate was ‘challenged’ by them or because they wanted to do something different, failing to go with strengths
- often lacked spatial awareness in movement resulting in unmotivated movement, aimless wandering or overuse or inappropriate use of the space
- were often of the candidate playing themselves
- regularly broke focus even to the point of checking the audience for response
- had low energy, one-dimensional characters with little credibility
- included all of the candidate’s 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 critiqued a diverse range of productions and exhibited a clear knowledge and understanding of the purpose of theatre criticism.

Stronger projects:

- provided a clear and effective synthesis and analysis of how key production elements created dramatic meaning for the audience, and carefully selected the production elements that were most relevant to that performance
- supported and substantiated evaluations with insightful research, extensive knowledge and understanding of drama and theatre
- demonstrated sophistication, flair, control and nuance in the use of language, style and structure.

Weaker projects:

- recounted performances and production elements without analysis or research
- provided inappropriate, superficial or extreme justification for their evaluations
- did not control the language, style or structure of the project in an effective way.

Applied research project

Candidates are encouraged to focus on developing a coherent and effective hypothesis from their extensive research that poses a question, demonstrating insight into an area directly related to drama and theatre.

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

Stronger projects:

- allowed the hypothesis to be developed and answered through extensive research and drafting
- demonstrated use of a substantial range of resources, sources, and effective research
- demonstrated sophistication and confidence in the use of language and style and effectively integrated, analysed and synthesised this research into a sophisticated report.

Weaker projects:

- presented an inappropriate or broad hypothesis
- relied on irrelevant, minimal, incomplete or inappropriate data or research which often did not substantiate the hypothesis
- did not control the structure or style of their essay, or presented projects that lacked formatting, footnoting, editing and proofreading.

Director's folio

Candidates should focus on developing an understanding of the function of the director and the process of analysing a play from a director's perspective. Students should carefully follow the requirements of the project as specified in the syllabus.

Stronger projects:

- developed and presented director's visions that were effective and inspired by aspects of the play
- demonstrated extensive knowledge and understanding of the play's ideas, dramatic elements, style and staging demands, and responded to these with a highly effective realisation on stage
- demonstrated an intelligent awareness of how elements of drama can be manipulated through directorial and design choices to create engaging theatre
- clearly articulated the intended audience experience through all areas of the project and used effective rehearsal techniques with actors to support this.

Weaker projects:

- demonstrated a superficial engagement with the text and presented an undeveloped, inappropriate, impractical or imposed directorial concept that may have disregarded the historical, social and political context of the play
- lacked an understanding of the practicalities of staging the production and approached the project in a literary manner rather than demonstrating an understanding of how dramatic elements and theatrical techniques could be used to realise the vision on stage
- provided inappropriate or impractical design concepts which may not have been supported by the directorial concept
- demonstrated limited understanding of the intended audience experience.

Individual project: Design

Design as an individual project area offers candidates the chance to apply the elements of drama through a design concept that supports the director and actor in bringing the audience into the world of the chosen play.

Stronger design candidates were able to interpret the set texts insightfully and communicated a creative, well-researched stylistic approach. The candidate's vision for the chosen play was realised through a sophisticated design concept and their choices demonstrated a clear intent and thorough understanding of the play.

Lighting

Stronger projects:

- presented an insightful concept for their selected play, deliberately manipulating audience engagement through highly appropriate atmospheric and mood choices that transported the audience into an appropriate world for the play
- contained a unified design that was clearly evident in all aspects of the work from the candidate's vision to rig plan, choices and colours on the rigging sheets, articulated time cues and accurate easy-to-follow running script
- presented well-plotted cues that demonstrated, through the running script, cue sheets and overlays, clear choices in establishing the dramatic action, mood and setting of the chosen scenes
- submitted support material that demonstrated clear links between the intended lighting states and the equipment selected to deliver these design choices.

Weaker projects:

- had an insufficiently articulated directorial vision for the play to be realised through lighting design choices
- made inappropriate and/or impractical technical choices when selecting lanterns (especially regarding strength of chosen lights to cover key staging requirements), rigging positions, angle and direction, circuit loads and channel allocations
- demonstrated a lack of understanding regarding appropriateness of colour choices and/or employed overly simplified symbolic colour gels which did not take into account the mixing of colour on stage
- used a few varied lights as a substitute for a full well-justified rig, leaving areas of the stage in darkness, or presented their designs as simple washes or strong colour. This misunderstanding of lighting conventions for a play sometimes culminated in a 'rock eisteddfod dance spectacular' solution that was highly inappropriate for the selected scenes of the set text.

Costume

Candidates are reminded that cardboard mounting may be appropriate, however wooden frames, glass and perspex should be avoided.

Stronger projects:

- presented unity and flair in their design concept for the chosen play through renderings and support material which clearly established the world of the play
- presented designs for the central characters in key moments of the play employing appropriate stance and body language to indicate relationships to other characters and their status within the play
- presented a range of choices of character and design that were appropriate to the stylistic and contextual concerns of the chosen play
- included support material which further developed the candidate's vision of the play as a theatrical experience for an audience through evocative choices of fabric samples, preliminary sketches for characters and/or notations of costumes and characters.

Weaker projects:

- demonstrated a limited understanding of the world of the play through partially realised designs for inappropriately chosen or a limited number of characters
- included draft sketches of the same costume as support rather than submitting the required four other costumes in notation or sketched form
- presented interpretations of the play that depended on enforced ideas often inappropriate to the world of the play, sometimes presenting an inappropriate mixture of styles and/or periods, perhaps appropriate to individual characters, but without a unified design concept
- presented renderings that were fashion designs and non-theatrical, with little modification from character to character, and/or lacking appropriate body language to create a sense of the character in a moment of their journey.

Promotion and program

Stronger projects:

- demonstrated an insightful directorial vision, capturing the atmosphere of the world of the play on stage, clearly communicated through visual design choices and the director's notes in the program
- presented a unified design approach with subtle variations in their visual selections which demonstrated a clear design vision and insightful interpretation of the chosen set text
- demonstrated a well-researched knowledge of the world of the play and a thorough knowledge of the chosen theatre company's profile to appeal to an appropriate target audience
- demonstrated flair in the written material, making sophisticated language choices incorporating appropriate sales or marketing language to promote and attract potential audiences.

Weaker projects:

- established a minimal design vision, displaying limited knowledge of the chosen set text and the practical role of designing promotional material in engaging the target audience
- used simplistic, clichéd images and/or images from past productions without manipulating them to present a unified directorial vision for the production, often making visual choices based only on the title of the play rather than a well-researched directional vision
- included inappropriate visual and written choices that reflected little understanding of the world of the play, their chosen theatre company, and the intended target audience
- demonstrated a lack of understanding of the purpose of each element of the project and/or were incomplete or minimal in their written material, for example the written material tended to review, rather than promote, the play
- lacked evidence of an understanding of the profile of the chosen established theatre company and its stylistic promotional approach.

Set

Stronger projects:

- presented a sophisticated concept for their chosen play which evoked a clear theatrical experience through highly appropriate design/visual choices within the context of their chosen theatre
- constructed sets that supported the dramatic action, mood and setting of the chosen scene, while still considering the whole world of the play and later scenic changes
- demonstrated a clear selection process of well-chosen building materials and appropriate visual metaphor
- submitted support material with clear floor plans and scene changes. This included detailed prop placement, a scaled figure and sightlines for the audience.

Weaker projects:

- presented a simplistic or flawed director's or designer's concept for the play, dealing with an isolated scene without clear intention for the use of the stage space to create a theatrical experience appropriate to the world of the play
- demonstrated minimal ability to realise a set designed for the practicalities of performance, for example lacking an actor entrance and exit space
- consisted of models that were not constructed to a 1:25 scale and were made of inappropriate materials demonstrating insufficient awareness of colour and texture.

Individual project: Scriptwriting

General comments

Candidates are reminded that they are writing for actors as well as a director and that, ultimately, their objective is to create an engaging live theatrical experience for an audience. To this end, candidates are encouraged to workshop their play in order to refine and enrich the theatricality of their script.

Similarly, candidates are encouraged to experiment with a wide range of styles and dramatic conventions in the realisation of their dramatic vision. Resolution and coherence are not exclusive to realism/naturalism. Originality of concept can be attained by presenting a new or individual take on universal themes or concepts. Candidates are encouraged to find their individual voice.

Stronger projects:

- developed a sustained theatrical vision, creating a coherent world and an engaging journey for the characters and for the audience
- manipulated dramatic action with flair and precision, displaying both control and insight in the use of mood, rhythm, tension and, appropriate to style, narrative resolution
- displayed a sophisticated use of language to create visual and verbal imagery, appropriate and distinct character voices, and relationships
- clearly wrote for the stage, taking advantage of and manipulating the unique qualities of live performance, and appropriately manipulating production elements, technical aspects and acting practicalities.

Weaker projects:

- lacked structural and/or thematic coherence
- contained dramatic action that lacked direction and/or resolution, paying insufficient attention to the needs of the audience, the actors or directors
- contained concepts, plots, characterisation and/or scene structures more suitable for TV or film than live theatre
- overused technical effects, set and/or prop changes, which adversely affected audience engagement
- dealt with issues, concepts or topics in an unoriginal or overly derivative manner, and which did not reflect the student's individual voice.

Individual project: Video drama

Candidates are reminded that the focus, especially in the first criteria, is on narrative. It is essential that candidates approach this project recognising the need to develop and structure a dramatic narrative (ie a series of events driven by character and linked by cause and effect to engage the viewer in a coherent journey). Further, candidates are encouraged to investigate and use the conventions of visual language, composing and linking images to develop this narrative. The best projects trusted images and visual language to convey narrative.

Candidates are reminded that the only acceptable submission formats are DVD-R, DVD-RW or VHS tape. A number of candidates sent in projects in the incorrect format or which had not been properly converted to DVD. Similarly, candidates are reminded to check the broadcast quality of the project before submission.

Stronger projects:

- demonstrated a sophisticated use of visual language and the elements of drama in conveying clear and engaging narratives creating mood and tension
- showed a powerful awareness and manipulation of narrative or visual conventions in engaging the viewer
- used effective editing, post-production sound and effects, appropriate to the genre.

Weaker projects:

- contained superficial, predictable or incoherent narratives that showed little or no understanding of how to use the elements of drama in engaging the viewer
- displayed little control of the camera in manipulating visual elements to reveal the narrative
- relied on using cameras as recording devices, where scenes are enacted before a camera, rather than consciously composing and linking images
- made poor choices in post-production which did little to develop mood, pace or tension
- were reflective or mood pieces that lacked tension and/or conflict or were one strand or one joke narratives.

Written examination

Section I – Australian drama and theatre

General comments

The question required candidates to give particular reference to actor–audience relationships that were created either implicitly, in classroom workshop contexts or in more comprehensively mounted productions of the set play texts.

Candidates should engage directly with the specific terms and requirements of the question.

Question 1

Stronger responses:

- demonstrated a comprehensive, insightful and sophisticated engagement with the question
- addressed the key terms of the question and applied them effectively in the construction of balanced and analytical responses
- demonstrated a sophisticated understanding and appreciation of the dramatic forms and theatrical styles particular to each play
- identified and analysed the impact of theatrical and dramatic elements of the plays upon audiences in specific performance contexts
- presented their discussion in a structured and coherent manner
- employed appropriate theatrical terminology in their analysis.

Weaker responses:

- did not specifically address the key terms of the question such as ‘audiences made to engage’, ‘cultural issues’ and ‘personal concerns’ in their approach to the question
- described workshop or performance experiences simplistically and displayed a superficial understanding of dramatic forms and theatrical styles
- demonstrated superficial and/or inaccurate knowledge of the dramatic action of plays
- relied on formulaic or prepared responses that often employed key terms of previous HSC questions as the basis for the response
- presented a literary response with few or no references to the plays in performance.

Section II – Studies in drama and theatre

Question 2 – Tragedy

Stronger responses:

- addressed the question explicitly with insight and clarity, focusing on how an audience is drawn into the protagonist’s plight

- demonstrated extensive knowledge and understanding of both plays, discussing the plays theatrically with an awareness of an audience’s responses
- used dramatic terms such as *catharsis* and *hubris* to elucidate their discussion
- referred explicitly to the ways different dramatic devices and techniques, from within the text and from the staging of the plays, drew an audience into the protagonist’s plight
- supported their analysis of the tragic plight with judicious examples from their own workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Weaker responses:

- wrote of the historical background of tragedy without linking this to the question
- wrote generally about tragedy, listing and explaining various terms such as *catharsis* and *hubris* but ignoring the question
- wrote ‘why’ rather than ‘how’ an audience is drawn into the protagonist’s plight
- presented a literary response with few or no references to in-class workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Question 3 – Irish drama

Stronger responses:

- addressed the question explicitly and with insight, using relevant references to discuss ‘Irish character’, assessing whether the plays present ‘insulting’ stereotypes
- examined what the plays reveal about Irish people and how they have been shaped by their history and circumstances, linking this to their depiction on stage
- referred explicitly to the ways different dramatic devices and techniques influence the staging of the plays to depict Irish character
- supported their discussion of Irish character with judicious examples from their own workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Weaker responses:

- wrote of the historical and socioeconomic background of Irish drama which had little or no relevance to any aspect of the question
- wrote generally about the plays with interspersed references to the question only
- misunderstood what the question was asking, often misinterpreting the term ‘the Irish character’ and resorted to retelling the plays’ plots or describing characters from the plays
- presented a literary response with few or no references to in-class workshop experiences and/or productions seen or may have mentioned film versions of the plays only.

Question 4 – Brecht

Stronger responses:

- addressed the question explicitly with insight and clarity, focusing on how Brecht forced an audience to see a character’s political context
- demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding of both plays and could discuss them theatrically
- understood the political context of the characters and discussed them with insight

- referred explicitly to how Brecht’s crafting of different dramatic devices and techniques, from within the text and from the staging of the plays, created the political context of the characters
- balanced their analysis of the characters and contexts with judicious examples from their own workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Weaker responses:

- wrote about characters generally without linking it to their political contexts
- ignored the question asked and wrote generally or superficially about Brecht’s techniques such as Gestus and alienation
- made few references to direct examples from the plays or their staging
- presented a literary response with few or no references to in-class workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Question 5 – Site-specific, street and event theatre

Stronger responses:

- presented an insightful response answering the question ‘to what extent’ social goals were achieved, synthesising the practitioners’ works and their own
- explicitly identified the social goals of Cameron, Fox and their own work
- discussed the techniques, styles and devices employed by performers in specific examples which affected an audience and achieved social goals
- analysed and discussed participation in a substantial event of their own making which had clear social goals
- used appropriate evidence from the texts and their own experience to support their argument.

Weaker responses:

- ignored the question ‘to what extent’ social goals were met or simply said they were met
- described or retold events of the practitioners or their own work without analysis of what made it ‘successful’
- did not identify explicitly the social goals of performance and lacked specific references to the texts
- described examples of their own experience which were superficial and/or purpose or lacked social goals.

Question 6 – Approaches to acting

Stronger responses:

- responded insightfully and comprehensively to all parts of the question identifying different kinds of actor/audience relationships
- made clear links between the practitioners’ philosophies, preparatory exercises and their theatre practice/aesthetic
- gave strong evidence of their own relevant experiential learning in workshops as the foundations for understanding the creation of a distinctive actor/audience relationship
- synthesised their own experience of actor training methods, giving examples of how these translated into more powerful actor audience engagements

- referred to productions by, or influenced by, the practitioners which epitomised their philosophies and aesthetics.

Weaker responses:

- failed to refer to the work of two practitioners
- presented a superficial knowledge of the philosophical basis of the practitioners' approaches, with no real appreciation of the 'aesthetics'
- listed training techniques without linking them to the importance of communicating powerfully with an audience
- provided little personal workshop experience and/or production evidence.

Question 7 – American drama

Stronger responses:

- addressed the question explicitly with insight and clarity, focusing on what characters 'want from each other'
- demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding of both plays and could discuss the plays theatrically
- focused explicitly on how different dramatic devices and techniques, from within the text and from the staging of the plays, revealed what characters wanted from each other
- balanced their analysis of the characters' wants with judicious examples from their own workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Weaker responses:

- ignored the question and wrote generally about characters' desires, without addressing what they desire 'from each other'
- wrote about expressionism and symbolism, without linking these to the question
- wrote about characters' relationships using textual rather than theatrical examples
- presented a literary response with few or no references to in-class workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Question 8 – Seventeenth-century comedy

Stronger responses:

- addressed the question directly with insight and clarity, focusing on what was attractive and revealing about the superficial displays of different character types
- discussed explicitly the superficial elements of the character types, outlining what was attractive and revealing about them
- referred explicitly to the ways different dramatic devices and techniques such as manners, asides, costumes, dramatic irony, satire, gesture – from within the text and from the staging of the plays – can be attractive and/or revealing
- supported an analysis of superficial displays on stage with judicious examples from their own workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Weaker responses:

- lacked a clear, sustained response to the question, answered last year's question or wrote prepared answers that did not address this year's question
- wrote about the plays' historical period and background without linking this to the question
- failed to address what was attractive and revealing about the superficial displays of the characters or only described the characters and/or retold the plot
- presented a literary response which relied heavily on quotations with few or no references to in-class workshop experiences and/or productions seen.

Drama

2008 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



2008 HSC Drama Marking Guidelines

The following marking guidelines were developed by the examination committee for the 2008 HSC examination in Drama, and were used at the marking centre in marking student responses. For each question the marking guidelines are contained in a table showing the criteria associated with each mark or mark range.

The information in the marking guidelines is further supplemented as required by the Supervisor of Marking and the senior markers at the marking centre.

A range of different organisations produce booklets of sample answers for HSC examinations, and other notes for students and teachers. The Board of Studies does not attest to the correctness or suitability of the answers, sample responses or explanations provided. Nevertheless, many students and teachers have found such publications to be useful in their preparation for the HSC examinations.

A copy of the Mapping Grid, which maps each question in the examination to course outcomes and content as detailed in the syllabus, is also included.

2008 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 how audiences are made to engage with Australian cultural issues and the personal concerns of the characters on stage • Provides an insightful response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair • Provides well-substantiated supporting evidence * 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates substantial understanding and appreciation of how audiences are made to engage with Australian cultural issues and the personal concerns of the characters on stage • Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner • Provides relevant supporting evidence * 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an adequate understanding of how audiences are made to engage with Australian cultural issues and the personal concerns of the characters on stage • Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question • Provides adequate supporting evidence * 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a basic understanding of how audiences are made to engage with Australian cultural issues and the personal concerns of the characters on stage • 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 how audiences are made to engage with Australian cultural issues and the personal concerns of the characters on stage • Provides undeveloped points which may not be related to the question • Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text and/or practical experiences, that relate to the question

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 techniques and styles relevant to the question• Provides an insightful response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair• Provides 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 of the specific theatrical and dramatic techniques and styles relevant to the question• Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner• Provides relevant supporting evidence *	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explains broadly the issues addressed in the question• Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the specific theatrical and dramatic techniques and styles relevant to the question• Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question• Provides some relevant supporting evidence *	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outlines some of the issues addressed in the question• Demonstrates a basic understanding of some theatrical and dramatic techniques and styles 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 styles• Provides undeveloped points which may not be related to the question• Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence *	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text and/or practical experiences that relate to the question