

Scholarship

2010 Assessment Report

Drama

COMMENTARY

Candidates were mostly well prepared and confident in performance, applying drama theory and techniques to create performed portfolio material of a good overall standard. Critical analysis and oral justification to camera were mostly handled with assurance, although superficial or memorised explanations sometimes detracted from otherwise competent evidence.

Part 1 Text Based Performance

The extended list of possible texts for 2010 resulted in some fresh material. Performed out of their intended context, some extracts overextended candidates. Intentions for performance including interpretive choices were usually clear and time constraints managed well.

Part 2 Self Devised Performance

This section offered good opportunities for demonstrating familiarity with performance theory as well as the selected theorist. Oral explanations combined with annotation of the devised script showed a fair grasp of the skills and knowledge required.

Part 3 Impromptu Performance

The impromptu question challenged candidates to introduce and maintain new characters to develop an idea or theme already encountered. Role development was, in general, more confidently treated than the action of the scene.

Justification to the camera also treated character more fully than the development of ideas or theme through some progression of a situation.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- created drama which was highly engaging and original
- used refined, seamless and highly effective techniques
- sustained a sense of immediacy and conviction in their performance
- utilised the confines of the performance space with intelligence
- demonstrated a clear and compelling personal voice when explaining their performances
- applied performance theory with authority, relating effectively to the selected theorist
- interpreted prescribed text perceptively.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- created drama which was competent
- used effective and well chosen techniques
- sustained clear, consistent focus throughout their performances
- showed appropriate awareness of the performance space
- demonstrated versatility in their choices
- analysed performances accurately and clearly
- applied theory appropriately to devised work.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

typically:

- invested little conviction in their performance or interpreted material superficially
- lost effectiveness by inadequate vocal control
- were unable to sustain momentum in impromptu work
- failed to convey character detail, resulting in bland or banal roles
- struggled to explain intentions clearly
- demonstrated an inadequate or inappropriate grasp of the selected theorist
- misjudged the playing area or failed to perform as to a supposed audience.

OTHER COMMENTS

For **Part 1** candidates:

- should choose a text with appropriate critical material available for extended research e.g. comparison with other interpretations may provide stronger analysis
- using a compilation text should consider necessary transitions (e.g. between roles or times) as well as opportunities for demonstrating a comprehensive range of techniques and use the performance space as fully as possible.

Evidence towards demonstrating complexity and depth of understanding may be provided by any part of the examination so that a wide range of performed evidence (Parts 1 and 2) should be prepared.