

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each stage of this assignment.

Candidate 1 (response to question 1)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**, placing it in the **bottom end of the 6-3 criteria** because of the limited knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and theatre practitioner. The candidate gives one explicit reference to Tiffany's intention and has shown implicit understanding of his theatre practice.

Performance analysis

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 6-3 criteria** because of the limited analysis and relevance to the question, with some misunderstandings and contradictions. Performance analysis is mostly narrative and lacking the detail required to push into the next marking criteria range.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 6-3 criteria** because the candidate demonstrates a limited argument with implicit reference to the question. There is very limited use of sources. There is a basic conclusion, returning to the candidate's implicit understanding of the question.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **4 marks out of 20**.

Candidate 2 (response to question 1)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate was awarded **13 marks**, placing it in the **top end of the 13-10 criteria** because the candidate demonstrates a good knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and theatre practitioner. On occasion the candidate has a confused interpretation of the question and attributes the principal authorship to the playwright Abi Morgan. They demonstrate a good understanding of Graham and Hogget's practice and the directing decisions made related to the acting in sections attributed to Morgan.

Performance analysis

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 13-10 criteria** because there is good and mostly relevant analysis which mainly considers the implications of the question. The candidate was awarded 12 and not 13 as they don't consistently refer back to the question. In the interest of positive marking we are crediting the acting analysis through Graham's Direction.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate was awarded **9 marks**, placing it in the **top end of the 9-7 criteria** because a basic argument is demonstrated although the interpretation of the question around 'authorship' is slightly confused. The candidate makes some use of primary and secondary sources, leading to a basic conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **11 marks out of 20**.

Candidate 3 (response to question 1)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 13-10 criteria** because good knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and theatre practitioner is demonstrated. The candidate introduces their argument by stating Van Hove's aim was to 'leave the audience feeling a sense of sympathy' and create 'a piece of theatre not for the faint-hearted' and anchors their analysis to this understanding.

Performance analysis

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 13-10 criteria** because there is good and relevant analysis which considers the implications of the question. Analysis is lacking greater detail to access the higher range of marks.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 13-10 criteria** because a good argument showing some independence of thought is demonstrated. The candidate makes good use of sources, leading to a sound conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **12 marks out of 20**.

Candidate 4 (response to question 2)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate was awarded **14 marks**, placing it in the **bottom end of the 17-14 criteria** because they demonstrate very good knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and theatre practitioner. The candidate uses their research on Boyd's classical career and practice to influence their analysis, though the link between his previous work and this production can, at times, be slightly generic.

Performance analysis

The candidate was awarded **15 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 17-14 criteria** because there is relevant and effective analysis which considers the implications of the question. Some areas of analysis are stronger than others.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate was awarded **15 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 17-14 criteria** because a very good, coherent argument showing independence of thought is demonstrated. The candidate makes very good use of sources, though the conclusion is sound. The question selected is held in focus throughout the candidate's line of argument.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **15 marks out of 20**.

Candidate 5 (response to question 1)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate was awarded **17 marks**, placing it at the **top end of the 17-14 criteria** because the candidate demonstrates very good knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and theatre practitioner. The candidate draws upon a range of research on Cracknell's practice and deploys this effectively to answer their chosen question.

Performance analysis

The candidate was awarded **16 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 17-14 criteria** because of the detailed, relevant and effective analysis which considers the implications of the chosen question.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate was awarded **15 marks**, placing it in the **middle of the 17-14 criteria** because the candidate demonstrates a very good, coherent argument showing independence of thought. The candidate makes very good use of sources, though the conclusion is sound. The candidate does not address the fact that the production was an adaptation of Strindberg's original by Polly Stenham.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **16 marks out of 20**.

Candidate 6 (response to question 2)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate was awarded **17 marks**, placing it at the **top end of the 17-14 criteria** because they demonstrate very good knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and theatre practitioner. The candidate draws upon a range of quotes from Esplin to frame their analysis. The contrast with Gibson's original adaptation occasionally credits the play text with directorial decisions.

Performance analysis

The candidate was awarded **18 marks**, placing it at the **bottom end of the 20-18 criteria** because of the detailed, relevant and highly effective analysis. The candidate consistently considers the implications of the question. The performance examples selected were described and analysed succinctly and coherently.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate was awarded **18 marks**, placing it at the **bottom end of the 20-18 criteria** because the candidate demonstrates an excellent and coherent argument showing independence of thought and making very good use of sources. This leads to a highly convincing conclusion, including explicit reference to their introductory comment on the production's relevance for a contemporary audience.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **18 marks out of 20**.