



2012 Drama

Advanced Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2012

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Advanced Higher Drama

Grade related criteria

Candidates must answer two questions, one from section A and one from section B. Candidates must answer on a different practitioner in each response.

40 marks are allocated to this paper: each question is worth 20 marks.

If a candidate answers two questions from section A *or* two from Section B *or* answers on the same practitioner in both sections markers should mark both essays but award the candidate only the higher of the two marks for the whole paper.

Responses should be marked holistically and according to the grade-related criteria described below. *As such candidates will be awarded according to the quality of thought demonstrated in their answers. They will not solely be rewarded for the quantity of the knowledge conveyed.*

“Quality of thought” should be taken as including the extent to which, in response to a given question, the candidate –

- *provides an answer which is relevant to the question and relates explicitly to the terms of the question posed*
- makes the various distinctions demanded by the questions
- responds to all the elements demanded by the question
- explains, analyses, discusses and assesses rather than simply describes or narrates
- argues a case when requested to do so
- takes account of criticism and interpretations
- answers with clarity and fluency and in language appropriate to critical writing at this level

Particular attention is drawn to the first bullet point, as responses that fail to meet this criterion and do not answer the question posed will not be eligible for the full range of marks.

A reminder

Outcome 1

The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the theories of acting and directing of two leading C20 practitioners.

Performance criteria

- (a) Describes correctly and in some detail the influences and key events that mark the emergence of two leading C20 theatre practitioners.
- (b) Analyses in some detail alternative acting/production methodologies adopted/developed by two leading C20 theatre practitioners.
- (c) Describes correctly and in some detail alternative directorial theories and practices of the two C20 theatre practitioners.
- (d) Uses texts appropriately to exemplify the performance theories of two C20 theatre practitioners.

Note on range for the outcomes

All the performance criteria apply to the overall context in which the practitioner worked and include – the developing role of the director, influences (creative, political, historical and social), innovative acting and directing methodologies, innovative staging concepts, innovative playhouse architecture and actor-audience relationships.

Outcome 2

The candidate will explore aspects of theatre practice in one or two recent productions that they feel reflect the theories and/or practices of one C20 practitioner.

Performance criteria

- (a) Analyses in detail one or two contemporary performances.
- (b) Discusses the ways in which, within the candidate's interpretation, these performances may be related to the theories and/or practice of one of the C20 theatre practitioners specified in the course of study.

The exam rubric makes it clear that candidates must refer to a different set C20 practitioner in each of their responses.

It is further recommended that, in Section B, candidates focus on one or two productions in significant detail rather than try to comment on too many productions with limited detail or analysis.

Mark range – 17-20

A piece of work at this level will demonstrate –

- a thorough understanding of the topic and its implications – there will be a considerable body of evidence, selected appropriately and used to provide a coherent response to the question posed
- robust thinking on the majority of the issues discussed
- a wide knowledge and appropriate use of critical responses to the topic – there will be awareness of alternative interpretations
- a consistent ability to organise material to support an argument
- an ability to express the argument in a fluent and lucid manner
- the line of argument will be well developed, clearly and coherently throughout the essay – there will be a fluent presentation of the conclusion, supported by and arising in a logical manner from a well-structured argument.

Mark range – 14-16

A piece of work at this level will demonstrate –

- a good understanding of the topic and its implications – a substantial quality of accurate, relevant knowledge will have been presented
- a competent knowledge and use of critical contributions on the topic – there will be convincing use of the evidence presented and of the critical and historical interpretations available
- a consistent ability to organise material to support an argument
- an ability to express the argument in a fluent and lucid manner – there will be a rigorous structure leading to a relevant and well-supported conclusion.

However, such a piece of work will generally show less independence of thought and mastery of detail than one judged to be “Excellent”. There may be some errors or misjudgements with regard to issues that are not central to the argument. A low mark within this band indicates more such failings than a high one. A high mark indicates that the work is close to the kind of quality needed for an “Excellent” mark but has fallen down on a few points.

Mark range – 10-13

A piece of work at this level will demonstrate –

- a reasonable or adequate understanding of the topic and its implications – there will be a reasonable quality of accurate, relevant knowledge that will have been applied to address the terms of the question posed
- some knowledge of critical responses to the topic – there will be valid analysis supported by evidence which takes account of critical and historical interpretations
- some ability to formulate and state an argument – there will be a structured argument leading to relevant supported conclusions.

However, it will also be less clearly organised than those in higher bands, and there may be some significant errors, misjudgements or omissions of important details. At the lower end of the category the response may be lacking in detail and include significant errors, omissions and misunderstandings or irrelevancies. The grasp shown of critical and interpretative points will probably be sketchy, and the organisation of material and argument weak. The response will, nevertheless, be an answer to the question actually posed.

Mark range – 5-10

A piece of work at this level will demonstrate –

- a basic understanding of the topic and its implications
- a basic ability to formulate and state an argument.

However, there will be important deficiencies in such a piece of work, both in terms of adequate detail and critical understanding. There will be pronounced errors and misunderstandings, and the answer may be so badly organised as to be difficult to follow. The response may not answer the question posed.

Note that a response that does not answer or respond in a clear manner to the question posed can achieve a grade no higher than “Fail”. Such a grading must be given irrespective of the *amount* of material the candidate presents.

Mark range – 1-5

A piece of work at this level will show very serious weaknesses. Understanding of critical issues will be poor, and the answer may be so badly organised as to be difficult to follow. If there is any attempt at critical or interpretative discussion it will be inappropriate or confused. The response may not answer the question posed.

New Pegged Mark Descriptors for Advanced Higher Drama

0-4 marks

Structure

Poorly organised with serious weaknesses showing a weak presentation of the argument. There may not be an introduction or conclusion.

Understanding

Lacks understanding of the topic. The essay is narrative and descriptive rather than offering an analysis. Shows an elementary knowledge.

Accuracy and Relevance

Knowledge is patchy showing serious errors and serious omissions. Elements of factual content may relate loosely to the title.

Line of Argument

Very little argument offered. Does not answer the question posed.

5-9 marks

Structure

Poorly organised, often difficult to follow. Introduction and conclusion are ineffective.

Understanding

Shows a basic understanding of the topic but lacks detail. Shows important deficiencies in critical understanding.

Accuracy and Relevance

Candidate is apt to write everything they know about the topic in the hope something will hit the mark. Little discernment is shown. Factual content may show some relation to the title but does not adequately cover the material.

Line of Argument

Simplistic argument offered which does not fully address the question posed.

10-13 marks

Structure

Shows some ability to organise material but it may be loose. The introduction and conclusion may be functional.

Understanding

Shows a reasonable understanding of the question posed. The factual content and approach relate to the title.

Accuracy and Relevance

There is an attempt to answer the question and analyse the issues but the argument is not deep or sustained.

Line of Argument

There is a limited but perceptible reference to sources. The line of argument is generally clear and largely accurate.

14-16 marks

Structure

Shows an ability to formulate a clear and fluent argument with a pertinent opening and a well supported conclusion arising logically from the evidence and arguments presented in the main body of the essay. There is an attempt at synthesising the elements together.

Understanding

Shows a good understanding of the topic and its implications. The factual content and approach are focused on the title.

Accuracy and Relevance

There is an assured grasp of the aims of the question and the candidate tackles it with consistent analysis. The essay shows a substantial amount of accurate and relevant material.

Line of Argument

There is a confident and coherent argument produced showing an awareness of the width and depth of the knowledge required for a quality essay. The expression is clear and accurate with appropriate sourcing of primary and secondary material.

17-20 marks

Structure

Excellent organisation of materials to support a sophisticated argument structured so that it builds and develops convincingly throughout the essay. There is a fluent and insightful presentation of the material and a supported conclusion giving a robust overview and qualitative judgement of the relevant factors.

Understanding

Shows a thorough understanding and a considerable depth of knowledge of critical thinking on the topic. The factual content is clear and consistent with the title.

Accuracy and Relevance

There is a detailed and effective analysis, which advances the argument and considers various possible implications of the question, often going beyond the obvious.

Line of Argument

There is a confident and coherent argument showing independence of thought and creative thinking, which makes excellent use of primary and secondary sources. The essay shows clarity, fluency and sophistication of thought.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]