

**Performances**

The standard this year as reported by panel chairs was strong, indicating on-going quality teaching and learning in the subject. Old hands and new panel members continue to learn a great deal during the experience of participating on panels either in the assessment process or as observers.

The timing of groups was adhered to in all centres. Candidates were provided with the correct time to present their solos and participate in the drama ensemble work and this works in favour of the candidates. Please be mindful that the two solo pieces should be presented in five minutes. In one centre the solo pieces exceeded eight minutes which is unnecessary for assessment purposes and the timing of the group program. Perhaps in some instances the work could contain more contrast in the choice of material to show a range of skills. Poetry, prose and monologues were presented and where the choice of material reflected contrast the candidates were clearly advantaged.

The use of simple costumes, properties and representational sets for this course is all that is necessary as the focus is on the genre, the skills of voice, and characterisation rather than cluttered stages. The use of theatre blacks for solos was very successful enabling the panel of examiners and the candidates themselves to focus on their solos.

Once again it was pleasing to see candidates who chose monologues attempt an appropriate accent in the context of their selections but it is not essential.

The majority of candidates were very secure in the delivery of their lines and there was a genuine attempt to be more accurate in memorisation this year. It is important to check the pronunciation of words in the context of pieces early in the rehearsal of material so candidates feel comfortable with correct pronunciation on the day.

We have all experienced candidates who withdraw from the course or pre-tertiary at late stages and we have had to have another candidate read in the role in the ensemble piece. This year some examiners experienced this and found that the other candidates who were secure with their work could not avoid sneaking a peak at the script. It is very tempting! Perhaps if the other candidate used the script subtly this could be avoided.

In centres where there was an audience it was great for the performers. The audiences were very supportive and respectful of the candidates and their work. It was great to have music being played between groups to avoid that awkward silence for the examiners and audience.

Thank you to all the schools and colleges for their hospitality and attention to detail with seating and viewing arrangements for the examining panel, organisation of running orders and material.

## Written Examination Paper

### Section A

Some responses had a lack of explanation did not expand on the 'how' and 'why'. Essay structure was sound, although there needed to be better introductions to spring board an answer. The introduction to the essay is important as it shows candidates are reading the question. The analysis of genre and style was well-expressed. The technicalities of 'how' something was done was lacking. For example, when discussing how specific vocal skills were used they were listed and not explained more fully in the context of the paragraph. The majority of candidates are using appropriate vocabulary in their responses. There is still a great deal of plot re-telling of the productions viewed. Candidates need to avoid generalisations where explanations or examples don't support the comment. There is still confusion in responses when candidates do not underline the titles differentiating between, for example, *Macbeth* the play and Macbeth the character. There were some candidates who wrote about two school productions and they were penalised. This year there was tendency for some responses to be quite short. It is important that candidates know the facts about directors, actors etc. in their chosen productions. In responses those who could name these it made the world of difference. Those who didn't know those facts gave the impression they hadn't prepared for the exam.

### Section B

Candidates were able to clearly identify each section of the question for inclusion in their answers. On a number of occasions they neglected to use the language or re-visit the wording of the first part of the question and launched into the dot point answers. They used a great deal of descriptive phrases and in a number of responses did not go one step further and provide a justification for why they did particular things with their character etc. They are still not answering the question from a what did you do, why did you do it and how did you do it perspective. A major concern was that the length of some responses was rather short. The responses about characterisation were satisfactory, but often they provided a shopping list of pitch, pace, pause etc. without saying how and why they were used or enhanced the performance. There was a lack of technical terminology used however more in-depth answers were able to discuss, for example, the colour of lighting for a particular purpose.

**All correspondence should be addressed to:**

Tasmanian Qualifications Authority  
PO Box 147, Sandy Bay 7006  
Ph: (03) 6233 6364 Fax: (03) 6224 0175  
Email: [reception@tqa.tas.gov.au](mailto:reception@tqa.tas.gov.au)  
Internet: <http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au>