

## Assessment Report

# Level 3 Drama 2017

Standards **91514** **91518**

### Part A: Commentary

Many candidates demonstrated the ability to write concisely to questions asked and within the space provided in the answer booklets. At Level 3, candidates are expected to be able to make connections between what they read and / or see, the intentions of those who created the work, the context in which it was created, their own experience and understanding of the performance and theatre.

Candidates generally responded confidently to the change in the structure of questions in the 91514 paper, which was intended to support the reduction of repetition of points made.

Teachers and candidates are encouraged to become familiar with Assessment Specifications as well as the explanatory notes of each standard that outline the contexts that may be covered in both paper, as well as the requirements at each level of achievement.

Questions are designed so that candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding and not just write rote-learned answers verbatim. Candidates who achieved well showed an ability to shape their responses to appropriately answer the questions being asked.

It is recommended that candidates prepare for this examination by familiarising themselves with the likely language of the questions. At this level, understanding of the terms 'techniques', 'conventions', 'technologies' and 'elements' is expected and candidates should be able to select and name components of these as required without further explanation in the question. This was a common weakness of those who did not achieve the standard.

### Part B: Report on standards

#### **91514: Interpret a text from a prescribed playwright to demonstrate knowledge of a theatre form or period**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- gave simple responses, with limited detail or direct evidence from the text studied
- understood and accurately identified aspects required, for example, a technology in question one or a performance convention in question three
- made straightforward connections between the text studied and the wider context of the theatre form or period.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- failed to make connections between the text studied and the form or period studied
- included details in their answers that were unnecessary for the question asked
- misread or misidentified aspects of the form or period required by the questions
- gave erroneous, generalised or inaccurate information about the form or period, for example, incorrect dates.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- made clear connections between the text studied and the form or period
- supported responses with relevant detail, including evidence from the text studied, with clear and accurate information about the playwright, social, historical or political context of the form or period
- responded to the requirements of the questions, for example, linked the use of technology to the communication of character.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- made perceptive connections between the text studied and the form or period, including the purpose of the playwright, developments in theatre practice that occurred in the form or period or the impact of the performance on the audience
- gave responses that were detailed, concise and incorporated evidence throughout the answer to support points made
- demonstrated a thorough understanding of the text, form and period, and were able to discuss the world of the play and the playwright.

### **Standard specific comments**

The choice of texts / plays chosen by candidates contributed to their overall performance. Texts that had clear roots in their historical context, such as works by Sophocles, Shakespeare, Beckett, Brecht, Betts, Miller and Pinter provided rich material with which to answer several questions. Texts that were less rich were more likely to result in candidates repeating points made previously.

Candidates who used the work of Sarah Kane were sometimes limited by themes and ideas presented in these plays.

Candidates were more likely to be successful if they could confidently and accurately discriminate between a technology, a technique and a convention.

---

## **91518: Demonstrate understanding of live drama performance**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used drama terminology correctly
- provided limited or generalised detail from the performance
- misinterpreted some sections of a question, for example, they did not identify a theatre form but went on to try to explain how a feature was used in performance
- used simple sketches to support their answer, labelling rather than annotating diagrams
- gave answers that assumed knowledge of the performance.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not complete all sections of all questions, or did not attempt one or more questions
- misread or misinterpreted questions
- misused terminology in answers
- overemphasised the plot of the performance in their answers at the expense of the aspect addressed by the question
- failed to support answers with evidence from the performance
- wrote about a film or recorded performance rather than a live performance.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- supported their answers with specific detail from the live performance that enabled the marker to clearly visualise the aspect being described
- included detail that was pertinent to the question
- made connections between different aspects of the performance or could comment on more than one aspect of the performance in the answer (i.e. more than one drama technique)
- used correct terminology accurately and confidently
- supported answers with well annotated sketches.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- wrote fluently with insight and perception, linking the three parts of the question together as a whole
- sketched and annotated comprehensively and perceptively
- selected examples from the live performance that were detailed and appropriate and illuminating with respect to the question
- used terminology with authority
- understood and could clearly communicate the director's and / or designer's intentions as well as key ideas and themes from the performance
- made links to the wider world of the play, the playwright's intentions and / or their own experiences of live performance
- evaluated aspects of the performance, showing the ability to critique and reflect on their own and others' performance.

### **Standard specific comments**

Drama performances that were complex in form and realisation provided rich material upon which candidates could construct answers. Candidates also wrote well about performances that had strong concepts and clear intentions

The range of live performances viewed included contemporary theatre, Shakespeare, musical theatre and devised pieces.

### **[Drama subject page](#)**

#### **Previous years' reports**

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)