

THEATRE

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 22	23 - 36	37 - 50	51 - 62	63 - 75	76 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 9	10 - 18	19 - 29	30 - 42	43 - 56	57 - 69	70 - 100

Independent Project Portfolio

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 19	20 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 39	40 - 50

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 19	20 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 40

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The options at HL tended to reflect a good number of devising projects, allowing candidates to pursue not only an area of interest but a role with particular skill development in mind. There were some outstanding examples of Option B and generally far more than in the past

examination session, though most seemed to be centred on workshops rather than the many possibilities that exist with Option B. It was encouraging to see the number of Option B projects where candidates had outlined very clearly their intent to explore a specific area of theatre practice, this focus quite often assisted candidates in reflecting on skill development and what the explorations in theatre revealed. Some SL projects tended to be aimed solely at responsibilities in support of HL projects rather than an independent area of interest. A sense of independence and self-determination was interlaced within the most successful portfolios at both HL and SL. Teachers and candidates must understand that every area of theatre has the potential to work effectively for all three options (Option A, B and SL). It was clear that successful work stemmed from a solid understanding of the demands of the project and specifically the particular option chosen. It was also very clear the candidates who had experience with similar projects/portfolio-type assignments during the course.

A small number of candidates tended to choose projects that did not meet the requirements of the task. At HL the most frequent example was a lack of theoretical underpinning. Some form of theatrical research must underpin every project at HL. Supportive research (cultural, historical, etc.) may certainly contribute to the project and its development but must not represent the only research. In contrast, many SL candidates chose to include evidence of having done research, which meant that these candidates were not only rewarded under Criterion A for showing initiative, but tended to produce more successful projects demonstrated mostly through evidence of skill development in the portfolio.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A - Preparation

This criterion pertains to evidence of independent work: of what was actually done by the candidate before and during the course of the project. Evidence was presented in the form of chart objectives, mind-maps, notes, drawings, cartoon sketches, improvisations, research, interviews, workshops, planning, text analysis, shaping material diagrams, etc. The most effective evidence in this area was visual. Examiners were looking for initiative: the ability to go beyond the predictable to explore areas relevant to the development of the project; as well as perseverance: the ability to work systematically and thoroughly. For this criterion examiners were also looking at the relevance of choices made in terms of independent work: for example, how relevant were the things done or choices made before and during the course of the project? This differs from “relevant material” in Criterion D. The best work showed clear evidence of setting goals and outlining the necessary steps to achieving such goals. Many candidates showed evidence of independent work and in places as a result of having worked with others; this was encouraging as it demonstrated the type of learning

found within the core syllabus. The quality of independent research for this session was particularly impressive as it tended to reflect a wider range of topic areas despite far fewer portfolios actually submitted for moderation. It was also encouraging to see the creative choices in terms of visual representations of tasks made during the early stages of preparation and throughout the project; this practice is to be commended.

Criterion B - Process

This criterion looks specifically at the candidate's understanding of production elements, theatre practices, as well as skill development in the particular area chosen for the project. Some of the production/performance elements demonstrated in portfolios included: lighting, set design, focus, space, ensemble, movement, voice, audience relationship etc. Theatre practices included a range of traditions, forms and styles. Evidence of skill development needed to be present within the portfolio; it was not enough for the candidate simply to indicate that a particular skill had been developed. To assess this, examiners were looking for how skills were applied practically. At HL understanding the demands of the chosen area was specific to option A or B. In addition, at HL, any project that did not have a theoretical underpinning failed to demonstrate a full understanding of the chosen area, which was a clear problem in many portfolios. At SL, any project that did not increase knowledge and skills in a specific area of theatre failed to demonstrate a full understanding of the chosen area. In most cases candidates were demonstrating skills within the context of something practical; in these instances it was clear that candidates had not only engaged in projects that were of particular interest but also showed evidence of skill development. In some cases candidates seemed to focus purely on involvement in a project rather than showing any evidence of skill development, candidates need to make explicit how they acquired skills and applied them practically. Candidates need to ensure the independent project is more than the opportunity to put on a production or the gathering of information about a particular area, but rather a context in which to explore and develop skills in a particular area of theatre. This idea is at the very core of the component 'Theatre in the making'. In some HL Option B portfolios, candidates chose an area that did not allow significant opportunity to explore theatre practice, which ultimately limited the possibility to demonstrate skill development. In similar projects candidates failed to demonstrate how the practical workshops actually contributed to knowledge or skill development, in these situations the initial scope for the project was problematic and difficulties may have been prevented if more appropriate advice had been given to the candidates before the outset of the project.

Criterion C - Reflection

This criterion assessed the evidence of learning and development throughout the portfolio as well as reflection throughout the process. Examiners were also looking for some connection to the course as a whole, which could be found from either learning and/or experiences from

the course or in a structure that represented the type of learning found within the course. This does not mean that candidates needed to include numerous journal entries or course descriptions in order to make connections to the core syllabus, but should have provided the reader with how their explorations in theatre had influenced the project. This connection does not need to be in great detail or length but must be addressed. Many portfolios made convincing connections to past work, experiences from the course and how these influences helped to shape not only the project but the approach to learning and understanding theatre practice. Emotional and descriptive accounts were still a problem though not nearly at the level in the past session. Candidates need to approach reflection with a more evaluative and analytical consideration of learning and development. The candidates that chose to limit all reflection to one final section in the portfolio, often failed to show adequate evidence as the section often read as a final summary of the audience's reaction. The candidates that seemed to be lacking in an independent approach to the project had difficulty in presenting evidence of learning as these portfolios tended to read like a descriptive account of someone else's vision.

Criterion D - Presentation

This criterion looks specifically at an appropriate register in terms of subject matter and format. Appropriate subject matter is based on the development of an independent project, specifically the dynamic stages of a creative process: preparation, action and reflection. Other subject matter was not appropriate. This was not a problem during this session as most portfolios were based on an independent project. For an appropriate format examiners were looking for a table of contents, an introduction, clearly marked sections and a conclusion. Generally speaking, most schools/candidates tended to present portfolios that were appropriate to the required format, though in some instances no sections or ineffective section headings were used. In this particular criterion "relevant material" referred to the relevance of the materials chosen for the portfolio. For the most part the choice of materials submitted was relevant to the project, though in a few instances, candidates included materials that showed minimal significance or importance to the actual project/portfolio. Details of the RI, PPP and TPPP should not be included in the portfolio; nor is it appropriate to use the same material or stimulus in more than one assessment task. This was not a particular problem in this examination session. The portfolios needed to be sourced in some manner, which means there had to be some outside influences that contributed to the development of the project (experiences, class work, reading, research, workshops, art, past productions, music, bad dreams etc.) and these sources had to be properly attributed either within the narrative of the portfolio or in the form of footnotes, endnotes or a bibliography. This area was generally quite effectively done with some interesting sources chosen and properly attributed.

The word count limit is 3000 words at HL and 2000 at SL; therefore a candidate who went over the word limit could not get more than a 4 for this criterion. There was no penalty for submitting work under the word limit, though to do this by a large margin was ultimately self-penalising in other criteria. External references (textual, published interviews, articles etc.) do not count towards the word count. Materials produced by the candidate (past writing, journal entries, quotations from class etc.) count towards the word count.

Considering the visual nature of areas of the syllabus, it was surprising that visuals were not used more consistently and effectively, though there was better evidence of this in this examination session, particularly in the representation of practical tasks/activities. Candidates needed to attribute more consistently all types of visuals (including personal photos, diagrams, mind maps etc.). In some cases candidates chose inventive methods of demonstrating learning and skill development through visual means, and often in a manner reflective of other areas of the course such as when used in actions plans, the practical performance proposal and the theatre performance and production presentation; this practice is to be commended.

Criterion E – Application of Research and Practice (HL only)

For this particular criterion examiners were looking for candidates' ability to integrate and apply research to the development of the project and whether such research was relevant to understanding the development of projects. For "integrate" examiners looked for evidence of a cognitive process of combining information, experiences or understanding and for "apply" evidence of its specific practical application to the development of the project. There needed to be evidence of the relevancy contained within the portfolio; it was not enough for the candidate simply to state that the research was relevant. This was a problem in some work this session particularly in Option B portfolios. This was by far the greatest problem with the HL portfolios and candidates who failed to initiate the project with a theoretical underpinning and/or neglected to use sources of any kind had difficulty achieving marks under this criterion. It was pleasing to see the number of candidates who did in fact establish a theoretical underpinning and also demonstrated clearly how the research was relevant (and in some cases fundamental) to the development of the project. It was also quite pleasing to see this attempted in far more Option B projects at HL.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

A fundamental consideration for the teaching of future candidates is based on the concept that the independent project represents the type of learning that will have taken place during the course and therefore not only should the project be introduced quite early in the course but the structure of the core components should be reflected in the approach to the project.

The best projects reflected the learning and structure of the core components. It was very good to see the number of portfolios this session that actually made reference to the core components as an approach to the project. The journal should also be fundamental to the shape and style of the portfolio because presumably candidates will have had experience in recording their processes from other projects and therefore have experienced effective methods of recording. This consideration also applies to research; there needs to be more effective dramaturgical assignments and projects during the course so that candidates have had sufficient opportunities to develop the skills needed in approaching a project based on a theoretical underpinning. It would also benefit candidates significantly if encouraged to pursue independent areas of interest when conducting research for the project rather than simply choosing areas already explored in class, this would allow candidates to experience new roles and areas of theatre practice.

Candidates should be advised to section their portfolios based on whatever is appropriate to the particular project and content of the portfolio. The format requirements in the Subject Guide specify that clearly marked headings must be used in the portfolio; unfortunately, many teachers and candidates took this to mean that the headings must be titled: preparation, action and reflection. Though candidates are certainly entitled to do this, there were problems in almost every portfolio that was structured this way. First off, HL candidates who did this tended to limit research to only the first section 'preparation' thereby limiting their ability to show how the research was integrated and applied throughout the project. And second, the candidates who limited reflection to only one section, had difficulty in demonstrating sustained reflection, as specified in the grading criteria.

Further comments

Teachers must be familiar with the assessment criteria in order to assess their candidates' work. Teachers should allocate marks according to the content of the portfolio only. In far too many cases the teacher moderated the candidate or the actual project, rather than the portfolio. Teachers should not make annotations throughout the portfolio and should relate comments on the cover sheet to the wording in the assessment criteria. Comments pertaining to the candidate or the project are not helpful in the moderation process. Teachers must ensure that the cover sheet is accurately completed. Teachers and candidates must sign the cover sheet and teachers are responsible for ensuring that all information is accurate (specifically the word count and whether the portfolio represents the candidate's own work). Every page must have the candidate's name and candidate number and pages should be bound together securely. Individual plastic covers should not be used on every page as examiners are expected to comment throughout and this makes the task very difficult and unnecessarily time consuming.

Practical Performance Proposal

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 25

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 1	2 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 25

The Practical Performance Proposals, at HL ranged from those pieces of work which presented a vague unformed collection of ideas to sophisticated and detailed schemes of an envisaged onstage event. The outstanding examples usually began with a 'pitch' full of descriptions evocative of an onstage vision. This image was then supported by clear explanations of choices and clarifying refinements plus some insight into a process of stimulus exploration; all this was usually subtended by a commentary which showed clearly an understanding of how theory/research led to 'practical effects' onstage. At the other end of the criteria spectrum were proposals which offered a vague 'abstract' from the work in Section 2; supporting material which lacked relevance and development finally epilogued by a commentary which contained material more appropriate in Section 2.

Three stimuli, in particular, were most often chosen by candidates. These were the Calvin and Hobbes cartoon, the music piece 'I Giorni' and the Dylan Thomas poem. These alternatives were closely followed by a preference for the Theosophical maps and finally, a long way behind the others was the selection of the Indonesian Folk tale. Examples of weak and strong proposals were seen in the use of all the stimuli. A couple of proposals did not use the set stimuli and so did not meet the requirements of the task. Teachers must ensure that the candidate choose only **one** of the **IB set stimuli**, as instructed in the Subject guide, and work on this **independently over a set four week period**.

With regard to formal HL examination requirements, it must be stressed that **candidates are not permitted to submit the same material for more than one assessment task. And, it is the responsibility of the teacher to ensure that all requisite detail on the cover sheet is accurate and that the work meets the specific requirements of the assessment task.** On the practical side, work was often not securely bound and each sheet did not contain the candidate's name and number thus making it difficult to identify separate pieces of work that had become unattached.

The areas of the programme which appeared difficult for candidates

A major difficulty, apparent at HL lay in the writing of an effective pitch and in keeping the focus on applied theory/research in the commentary. Often, in poorer pitch examples, candidates did not communicate a vision of performance in a 'dynamic manner' but simply retold a plot or idea of a narrative or discussed the theories they felt were pertinent to their artistic choices (sometimes without actually conveying these choices themselves).

Section 2 seemed to present few difficulties as the bulk of the presented proposals offered evidence of 'exploration of the dramatic potential of the stimulus' which was usually approached as a brainstorm or spider diagram with the process being initiated by the stimulus. Although the quality varied greatly, the majority of the proposals dealt with performance space, design elements and some discussion of the reasons for choices in these areas. Examples of onstage action were often presented as a storyboard - although often these were narrative descriptions rather than explanations of how the action would take place onstage. Some candidates chose an approach which they termed minimalism. This often entailed little or no description of set, stage dressing or other production elements. Unless a detailed explanation of the nature of minimalism and why it was chosen was apparent then it became difficult for the examiner to assess 'understanding of the production elements and how they function in performance'. However, it should be stressed that those candidates who chose a minimalist approach and clearly showed they understood this artistic movement in relation to production elements and/or acting did well against the appropriate element of the criteria.

As with the May exam cohort the Section 3 commentaries for HL candidates presented particular difficulties. Two words/phrases in the assessment criteria guide the intent of the commentary. These are 'understand' and 'practical effects' both of which refer to the theory/research which has been referred to in the proposal. The word 'understand' seeks evidence in the proposal of not only an understanding of the theory inherent in

the research, but also of how research/theory has been integrated into the concept of the performance at an intellectual level. For example, if Brecht is chosen then the candidate should exhibit an understanding of Epic theatre and why this is an appropriate choice of theory for their particular performance. The phrase 'practical effects' seeks specific examples in their performance of how this theory/research has been applied at a practical level. The better quality Section 3 work kept focus on the 'wider theoretical context of the proposed performance,' whereas lower band work tended to discuss ideas more appropriate to Section 2 e.g. personal artistic choices. Some candidates chose to discuss a large range of practitioners in the commentary. Often individual conventions would be selected from contrasting theories suggesting a 'pick and mix' approach with no justification or real link to intent. Another anomaly in some commentaries was superficial and, sometimes, dubious, links between occurrences onstage and theory. For example, an actor on stage opens a door and this is proposed as Brechtian Epic theatre approaches as she is breaking the fourth wall. These clearly show no 'understanding' of the theory/research.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skills tended to vary from school to school. The stronger proposals showed a clear understanding of the skills needed to complete the 'mise-en-scene' process which obviously stemmed from practical experience of this process during the course. Each stage of the creation of a piece of theatre from the initial reaction to the stimulus; further exploration and research; forming of specific ideas and the translation of these into onstage happenings had been clearly recorded. These proposals usually ended with a focused commentary which discussed highly relevant theory sprinkled with examples of how the theory was manifest onstage or in action.

There were fewer weaker proposals but, as in the May cohort, there were those which tended to offer a series of unrelated ideas lacking structure and depth which showed little understanding of the task and few examples of being aware of the necessary skills. In these cases there was no evidence of an understanding of a process which led to a performance, nor enough information to envision a piece of theatre. The commentaries tended to either write generally of a theory with vague unrelated references to the performance or re-iterate information already presented in Section 2.

In the more accomplished HL proposals all sections contributed to a strong overall vision as developed by a director with an awareness of the theatrical process and an explanation on how to practically achieve this vision. The commentary always supported this vision and clearly showed basic theoretical understanding, conceptual

integration understanding and examples of 'practical effects ' of how these theories/research have been applied.

However, some schools presented work of high quality but there were suggestions in the proposals, through the use of language and common ideas, of collaborative work. The following paragraph from p28 of the Subject guide clearly states that, **'The stimuli must not be explored in class and candidates must not have any prior knowledge about the nature of them. Candidates must prepare for this assessment alone and without teacher assistance. Assistance must only be provided in the form of preparing candidates throughout the course for this type of activity, but not for the final activity itself on which they will be assessed, and no discussion on the stimuli should be entered into.'**

The middle band examples of work consisted of several different types. There were those which showed imaginative interpretation, had a performance concept but lacked depth in the explanations of production elements. Others showed imagination and described, in detail, the use of and effects from production elements but mentioned no onstage action. Another group of middle band exemplars showed imaginative interpretation of the stimulus, described action and showed understanding of production elements but offered no evidence of 'exploration of the dramatic potential **of the stimulus**'. The Section 3 commentaries from work in these bands either spoke of theory and how it related to their production (integration) but usually omitted 'practical effects' examples or offered general, non-specific illustrations.

Lower band work proposals, more often than not, lacked evidence that the candidates were aware of a process of realisation or of what that process entails. It was often clear that the imagination had been engaged with the stimulus and ideas were flowing. However, this was usually as far as the proposal went with no discussion on themes, concepts or choice guiding principles of any sort. If any production elements were described, it was inevitably an open box set (sometimes a proscenium) with no reasoning why this type of space was appropriate. Sometime costumes were mentioned but, again, in a superficial manner. Section 3 commentaries of lower band proposals were usually a series of comments which repeated what had already been said in Section 2 or a narrative outline of the plot.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

The Practical Performance Proposal is a real and relevant theatre competence which is best learned through a series of practical experiences which should allow the candidate to actually follow the process during the two year course. In this way all learning modes

are stimulated and the final assessment exercise is real.

Experiences in all the areas of the core programme, theatre in the making, theatre in performance, theatre in the world AND the Independent project should offer the opportunity for candidates to acquire applicable knowledge and skills for the successful completion of this assessment tool. The relevance of the core component experiences to the PPP needs to be constantly stressed and the links affirmed.

The teacher must understand the task description and the marking criteria in the Subject guide to share these with candidates so that the requirements of the task can be met. It is highly recommended that the teacher attend a workshop on the revised program which offers the opportunity to investigate the potential of the syllabus and, through sharing with other teachers, gain a deeper insight into the assessment tasks.

As well as the global PPP process, skills specific to the task should also be integrated into regular class work. Pitch writing must be practiced to help candidates develop the skill of writing in such a way that powerful images can be clearly discerned from the chosen text. Exploration of how a concept can be applied in a coherent fashion and what this means to a performance needs to be explained and experienced throughout the course. How the production elements function and why must be explained, acquired and accomplished through regular class activity. Different ways of recording and clearly communicating visions and ideas must be investigated and experienced by the candidate. The application of theory/research to theatre performance and production must be modeled by the teacher and so practically assumed by the candidate in class.

Research Investigation

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 14	15 - 19	20 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 40

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Mark range: 0 - 3 4 - 6 7 - 9 10 - 12 13 - 16 17 - 19 20 - 30

The areas of the programme in which the candidates appeared well prepared. Levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

This assessment task is an opportunity for candidates to venture beyond the familiar and the known, to research and gain an understanding of a theatre practice from a different culture, period of history or tradition and then examine how this research might inform the production of a play/piece of theatre from this practice. Most candidates understood the purpose of the task and fulfilled the criteria and met the requirements.

A range of theatre practices were selected and the candidates generally engaged with the research task and provided appropriate evidence and information for the observations they were making, applying the practice to the play/piece of theatre.

The most successful Research Investigations had clear, focussed and specific questions that brought together practice, play and aspect of play in the actual wording of the question. This helped the candidate to concentrate on developing an answer to the question they had set.

Almost all the Research Investigations were presented as formal research essays and most candidates met the word requirement.

Areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

Candidates found the art of coming up with the right question difficult. This is a key element of the Research Investigation as it is what focuses and directs the candidate.

Some candidates are still not consistently attributing their sources or explaining where they got the evidence for some of the observations they make.

Some HL candidates are still not critiquing appropriately and it is evident that some are not clear on the criteria that need to be applied in order to critique a source.

The strengths and weaknesses of candidates in the treatment of individual areas

Criterion A - Research Skills

Candidates should be encouraged to consult a range of sources - books, electronic, visual and live. The less varied the sources the more simplistic and basic the observations that candidates make about a particular practice. In some instances unreliable sources were used which provided the candidates with misinformation. This would have been identified by the candidate if sources were cross referenced.

Some candidates still have difficulties understanding how to attribute sources. In some instances a bibliography was not included. Attribution of sources is an area where candidates need particular help. Often ideas, information and observations are made based on research but there is no indication as to the source. There are a variety of ways of acknowledging the source; through footnotes, endnotes or within the commission itself, and candidates need to be aware and proficient in all of these. They should choose one particular referencing system and use that consistently throughout.

The research has to be focussed on a theatre practice. A few candidates chose a period of history or fashion and this is not appropriate for the task.

A range of sources were not always consulted. The range varies depending on the practice, as some practices (e.g. Noh Theatre) have many sources and others (e.g. Karagoz) have far fewer. Range is therefore relative to the practice selected.

Whenever any observation is made or piece of information is provided the candidate must ensure that they specify the source.

Candidates must be aware that they also need to attribute all illustrations used.

Criterion B - Task Relevance

The most successful Research Investigations managed to provide information that was relevant and focussed, showing that they understood both the theatre practice and the practice of theatre. They showed an understanding of the theatre practice they had researched and its application to the piece of theatre/play from that practice.

Perseverance, which is part of the criteria, requires the candidates to continue investigating by going deeper into the material rather than settling for the first piece of information that they find. By persevering and showing initiative the researcher follows a trail that takes them to the heart and essence of the practice being researched and helps them to answer the question with depth. The aim of this component is for candidates to research and understand an

unfamiliar theatre practice and apply this to the selected play/piece of theatre from this practice. Without perseverance only a superficial understanding is gained.

For some candidates there is still a misunderstanding of the task. Some candidates are not researching into a *theatre* practice but are focussing on researching a culture or a period.

There were also some cases of a step by step 'How to...' research investigation e.g. how to make a mask, how to apply makeup, how to make a costume, how to direct a play, how to project the voice. One of the problems of this type of approach is that it is often not applied to the piece of theatre/play that is being presented and remains generic information. This does **not** meet the requirements of the task. The research has to be consistently applied to the piece of theatre otherwise there is no indication that the candidate has understood the practice and how it functions in practice.

There was some confusion on what 'aspect' means. This is not an area of production (e.g. design, direct, perform) but rather an element of one of these or an aspect of the play/piece of theatre (e.g. use of a fan, exits and entrances, facial expressions, a particular scene, a piece of action, a design and use of a costume etc).

A lot of attention needs to be paid on properly formulating and responding to the question set by the candidate. The question should be focussed but open so that it encourages exploration. The question is organic in nature and the candidate should understand that the question will be refined and redrafted the more information they have. In essence the question will gain its focus at the point at which the candidate has done the research and has a clear argument. It can be changed right up to the last minute.

The Research Investigation must not be an analysis of a production they have seen as this becomes a critical response and not a research task. Nor must it be a literary analysis of a text. This is particularly dangerous when a candidate is looking at character development and ends up focussing on character analysis.

Candidates and teachers should make sure the play/piece of theatre comes from the practice being researched.

Criterion C - Presentation

The Research Investigation should not be addressed to or focussed on one particular practitioner. The idea is that this piece of research informs the production NOT the practitioner. For example, research into a fight sequence in a Kabuki production a particular play would benefit choreographer, director, performer and designer and research into the gestures of Il Dottore in a Commedia production of a particular play would be of benefit to

performer, director, and designer. If it is addressed to one particular practitioner or if it is offering advice rather than research information then it will be in the wrong register.

The Research Investigation should also be analytical rather than descriptive. Some candidates chose to describe action scene-by-scene or moment-by-moment. This is not appropriate as the task is not to describe action but to provide material that will INFORM action.

It was surprising how little care was taken with visuals and presentation. Some of these were poorly reproduced, not clearly marked or captioned and some were not sourced. In some instances the essays were badly presented, with gaps on the page and changing fonts. Presentation is assessed.

Appendices were also sometimes full of random information and in some instances the script where this was not necessary. Appendices should be carefully constructed and relevant as they count as visual and textual information.

Large quotations (textual material) sometimes impede the flow of the essay. These should be fluidly built into the text and should be carefully selected.

Criterion D (HL only) - Critique of Sources

This should form **a separate part at the end** of the Research Investigation.

There are two parts to this – 1.the source and 2.how a candidate used the source.

Candidates were generally able to discuss and demonstrate the relevance of the sources but were less skilled at critiquing the source in terms of its value, reliability, and position in the wider context of sources on this matter. Some candidates simply described the content of the source rather than its focus and its contribution to the field.

Candidates should be aware that as a separate piece of work accompanying the Research Investigation this carries a quarter of the marks and should therefore be substantial not necessarily in quantity but in the quality of what it deals with.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In preparation for this assessment tasks teachers need to prepare the candidates to:

- Research widely and then narrow and focus their research. This is about how to read a source, focussing, skimming, note taking, using index and bibliographies to lead to further research.

- Differentiate between what is useful research and what is just general background information. This is best learned through actually having to research a specific area set by the teacher and then apply that research to an element of their class work. This would develop an understanding of the term 'applied' research.
- Choose practices that have particular conventions or ways of working to avoid creative choices and approaches
- Learn how sources are attributed, choose a referencing system and look at how this system attributes sources within the essay as well as in the form of endnotes/footnotes etc and in the bibliography.
- Structure an academic essay.
- Know what criteria are to be used in order to critique a source.
- Be able to formulate questions. The skill of getting the question right is key to the success of this task.

Theatre Performance & Production Presentation

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 -10	11 - 16	17 - 21	22 – 25	26 - 30	31 - 40

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 14	15 – 18	19 - 22	23 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The work submitted reflected a wide range of performance in the component. Criterion A looks for an analysis of selected work from the two year course, the word "analysis" is a key descriptor in that the selected work needs to be analyzed according to the criterion. The importance of engaging with work from world theatre traditions and/or practice from more than one culture within the area of study is clear, and some candidates found this difficult to achieve. The assumption that a passing mention of an unfamiliar tradition is enough in the

context of the presentation either at HL or SL needs to be corrected. At HL in the context of Criterion B, C and D and at SL in the context of B and C, it should be stressed that the reference needs to be detailed. Further, that it should be supported by research at HL and at both SL and HL consideration should be given through careful and specific reflection as to the relationship of different traditions and/or practices to one another. A comparative mode of understanding is built into the descriptors of Criterion B which recognizes “the ability to identify relationships between essential elements of the performance and production processes of theatrical traditions for more than one culture” as crucial.

The application of theatre skills in a practical way is also a key subject for analysis. Candidates were generally adept at identifying practical activities and describing them but were often unable to move to the next stage which is to look at their comparative analysis. For example the skill of an actor working from the theory of Stanislavski may be different in kind from an actor who is practically applying the ideas of Artaud, just as a Beijing Opera make-up design has particular aims that distinguish it from make-up for a naturalistic play.

Candidate performance against each criterion

What may constitute “diverse productions” requires clarification in the context of Criterion A. A “diverse performance” may be a piece of work developed and staged by the peer group which a candidate may watch, it can also of course be covered by visits to the theatre to watch plays from a variety of traditions/practices in a number of styles. The key point is that the work requires analysis; requires connections to be made; needs to be applied as a stimulus for the candidate’s own work; can form part of a unit of work which seeks to explore a particular style or staging practice. In other words the performance is never isolated either at SL or HL, it needs to be brought into a critical relationship to other aspects of the candidate’s work and that relationship requires analysis and exploration and will be reflected upon as set out in the descriptors for Criterion C.

The quality of reflection at HL depended on the way the work selected for analysis was presented. The use of narrative as a dominant mode impairs critical reflection and tends to encourage anecdotal reflection of the kind that is expressed through “commentary” rather than critically insightful reflection. Many schools focused strongly on units of work deriving from Theatre in the Making favouring devising as a preferred approach to the production process. The results were often encouraging since the devising process well nigh obliges the candidate to assess how production elements work together to produce desired performance outcomes for an audience, thus in applying a focus here Criterion B was brought into play. This was accentuated too in the use of experimentation in this approach to theatre which again played into Criterion B.

The importance of research into practice and the application of that research is a distinguishing mark of the higher level presentations. Too often research was not explicitly cited so the moderator was left to conjecture as to the extent of the research in a given presentation. Candidates should not be reluctant to be explicit about this skill and can also connect research to the images chosen to accompany the presentation. At times these were clearly part of a researched approach but were not described as such. The importance of theory is limited in these presentations unless it is applied to practical work. The mention of a body of theory is not sufficient in itself to cover this criterion, rather the candidate needs to select aspects of the theory researched and ensure that it is integrated into the work presented constantly and in specific detail. The strength which accrues to a presentation is invariably associated with the critical position the candidate takes in relation to the work being presented. The more secure the underpinning and the more detailed, the more likely it is that the examiner will appreciate the points of view articulated.

When used appropriately the images enhanced the work. The better the candidate the more likely that careful thought had been given not only to the content of the images but also the order in which they might be presented and the uses that might be made of them. The use of images as framing devices usually characterized a candidate who had considered the structure of the presentation, an obvious prerequisite to an effective presentation that was too often neglected. There was, among the better candidates a clear selection of material being undertaken and prior thought as to how the images might enhance the written word could usually be noted in the way the image was verbally headlined and the uses that might be made of it.

Less than half of the presentations actually lasted for the allotted time and it was not unusual for candidates with apparently quite a lot to say to end before the 30 minutes.

The application of the criteria by teachers fluctuated with the performance of their candidates though a correct application of the criteria was invariably a key indicator for the performance of the candidate. The more accurate and judicious, the better the standard of the work, marks that were wildly exaggerated usually applied to candidates who were floundering in their understanding of the criteria. Candidate profiles veered between a full tightly written transcript and highly descriptive analysis of the candidate's two year contribution to a few hastily scrawled lines that told the examiner little but underlined a rather careless approach to the assessment task that was often, though not invariably reflected by an indifferent performance by the candidate.

The SL work was not, relatively speaking, as strong at the upper end of attainment as the HL and there was a higher percentage of lower achievement. The abiding problem lay in a tendency not to focus on the assessment criteria. Analysis demanded by Criterion A was too often translated as narrative. The identification of relationships, so crucial to synthesis under

Criterion B was either presented in general rather than specific terms or too often ignored as the narrative flow pushed the candidate from one unit of work to another with little by way of links or continuities to establish relationships between the units.

Criterion C; reflection is quite clear on the direction this reflection should take: “on the content of the course”, on “group creative processes”, on the “candidate’s own work and the work of others” and contextually on how “the candidate’s work connects with the work of others and the course as a whole”. This systematic reflection on practice is too often exchanged for what appear to be intuitive responses to minor narratives on the course where the candidate looms large as subject and object and where the work is secondary to the agent who dispatches it. This focus on the individual in relation to the work, not as a figure adopting and learning theatrical roles, but more as an individual protagonist in an autobiography is a characteristic of weaker work. Work where the chosen focus moves the candidate away from the demands of the criteria into a fatal embrace with the self as the progenitor of the work not as the critic of it. The best candidates never allowed their focus to be immersed in the subjective but made a subject of the work and delighted in its patterns and complexity. As always in theatre, the best SL candidates were the equal of the best HL ones.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates at both SL and HL would do well to study the assessment criteria and by doing so discern how they are linked to one another. Since if this relationship can be reflected by the way the presentation is built and the content of it many more meaningful presentations will be produced.

Remarks on the use of images and the application of the criteria by teachers and candidate profiles differ little to what has already been observed in the HL work. Thorough, painstaking teachers who fully comply with the demands of their part of the task are likely to produce candidates with similar characteristics. Again this is not a rule but certainly a tendency.