

On the whole, candidates' answers reflected thorough preparation of the material, as well as a passion in their response to the subject matter of the questions, particularly those related to topical issues such as social reform and reconciliation. Moreover, many candidates who answered the question on **Waiting for Godot** displayed a depth of involvement with the philosophical elements of the play. Candidates' involvement in the subject matter was, at times, insightful and inspirational. They should remember though that full sentences and justification for an answer is expected at Higher Grade level. It is not sufficient to jot down one-word answers, phrases or answers in note form.

**Question One**

In general, candidates displayed a thorough knowledge of the prescribed plays. Many candidates gave too much information and the synthesis of the essay, as well as the focus on the question, did not reflect *insight and thought*. Candidates are encouraged to read the question, analyse it, plan a rough structure of the essay, reread the question, *think* about the question and add personal insights to the subject matter, always justifying them and relating them to the prescribed texts. A clear introduction, body of information and conclusion focuses the candidate and examiner on the subject matter.

**Question Two**                      ***Woza Albert!***

Candidates displayed a thorough knowledge of the socio-political context, performance elements, themes and content of the play. They should be careful, however, to ensure that each question is answered clearly and thoroughly and that justification is given for any comment made. Answers should be in full sentences, unless otherwise stipulated.

**Question Three**            ***Horn of Sorrow*** and ***Elephant of Africa***

BOTH plays had to be studied. Wherever possible, statements should be substantiated by references to the text. Candidates are encouraged to study the textual notes provided in their copies of the plays. These plays should be studied through experiential performance and insights extracted from this will count in the candidate's favour in a theory examination.

**Question Four**                      ***Nothing But the Truth***

Candidates answered 4.2 with insight and identified with characters. However, some candidates displayed a lack of knowledge of Stanislavsky and confused him with Grotowski. Sufficient information needs to be given for the number of marks allocated, e.g. 5 different points for 5 marks. No marks are given for repetition of a point.

**Question Five**                      ***Waiting for Godot***

Weaker candidates struggled with the academic and philosophical elements of this play, while strong candidates thrived on it. There was clear evidence of a lack of understanding of analytical voice study.

**Question Six**                      ***The Good Person of Setzuan***

Few candidates answered this question. Those who did had a thorough knowledge of epic theatre elements, but displayed some confusion about realistic acting.