

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each stage of this project-dissertation.

Candidate 1

How accurately is mental health represented in theatre? An analysis of modern playwrights and productions.

Analysing theory and performance examples that explore a chosen performance issue

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because some examples of features of performance and theatre practice are used in an attempt to develop an argument and present the issue. The analysis can be imbalanced and lacking in relevance. There are basic references. There are some misunderstandings in the argument and repetition within the analysis, which lacks depth.

Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways the performance issue has been explored

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because a simplistic understanding of the issue is shown by the selection and organisation of materials. Contrasts and comparisons are limited. There is inconsistent use of examples, leading to a basic argument. Minimal practitioner or company work is included, with limited or implied comparison. There is some use of primary and secondary sources.

Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because this is a straightforward dissertation on the chosen title which offers a limited argument. It lacks discernment between relevant and irrelevant points. There is limited reflective and evaluative comments in their own voice, leading to a basic conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **9 marks**.

Candidate 2

Is Ivo Van Hove successful in his revival of classical plays?

Analysing theory and performance examples that explore a chosen performance issue

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they used fairly detailed examples of features of performance, and aspects of theory are effectively used to develop a mostly relevant argument. Mostly detailed analysis, which draws out some implications related to their question. There are accurate references.

Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways the performance issue has been explored

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because some understanding of the issue is shown by the selection and organisation of materials. It draws out some contrasts and comparisons within Hove's practice. The candidate gives a fairly broad range of examples, leading to a sound argument. There is effective use of primary and secondary sources.

Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because this is a focused dissertation on the chosen title. Analysed material is applied to develop a mainly relevant argument. The dissertation loses clarity through excessive narrative summary. Regular reflective and evaluative comments show their opinion, leading to a basic conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **17 marks**.

Candidate 3

To what degree can modern directors of Medea go against a failed Bechdel test to re-incarnate it as a feminist production?

Analysing theory and performance examples that explore a chosen performance issue

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because detailed examples of features of performance and aspects of theory are effectively used to develop a relevant argument. Mostly detailed analysis explains and draws out implications. There are adequate references. The analysed examples are inconsistently deployed at times but marking positively and holistically the candidate's response falls into the 7-8 category.

Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways the performance issue has been explored

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because some understanding of the issue is shown by the selection and organisation of materials. Some contrasts and comparisons are drawn out. There is a fairly broad range of examples, though imbalanced in favour of Boyd's production, leading to a fairly convincing argument. There is some use of primary and secondary sources.

Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because this is a consistently focused dissertation on the chosen title. Analysed material is applied to develop a mainly relevant argument. The candidate consistently returns to their own voice to express a clear opinion. The candidate creates a coherent line of argument, leading to a convincing conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **20 marks**.

Candidate 4

Disability in theatre: Are actors no longer able to act?

Analysing theory and performance examples that explore a chosen performance issue

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because detailed examples of features of performance and theatre practice are effectively used to develop a relevant argument. Mostly detailed analysis explains and draws out implications. There are accurate references. Some analysed examples were too generalised to merit the higher mark in this category.

Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways the performance issue has been explored

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because a good understanding of the issue is shown by the selection and organisation of materials. The candidate draws out contrasts and comparisons through a relevant range of examples, leading to a convincing argument. Practitioner work is considered, with some creative thinking. There is effective use of primary and secondary sources.

Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because this is a consistently focused dissertation on the chosen title. A clear, concise and relevant argument develops from a well-structured range of analysed material. The candidate consistently returns to their own voice to express a clear opinion. The candidate creates a coherent line of argument, leading to a convincing conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **23 marks**.

Candidate 5

Masculinity: Theatre as an exploratory medium.

Analysing theory and performance examples that explore a chosen performance issue

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because highly detailed examples of features of performance and theatre practice are effectively used to develop an insightful argument. Detailed analysis explains and draws out implications. The candidate gives coherent and accurate references.

To access 10 marks in the category, the Ryan Calais Cameron production of 'For Black Boys Who Have Considered Suicide When the Hue Gets too Heavy' needed more thorough consideration.

Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways the performance issue has been explored

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because an excellent understanding of the issue is shown by the selection and organisation of materials. The candidate draws out contrasts and comparisons through a relevant range of examples, leading to an insightful argument. Practitioner work is fully considered, with creative thinking. There is effective use of primary and secondary sources.

Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because this is a consistently focused dissertation on the chosen title. A clear, lucid and relevant argument develops from a well-structured range of analysed material. The enquiry is led by a fluent expression of opinion in their own voice. Personal thinking drives the exploration of material, leading to a comprehensive conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **27 marks**.

Candidate 6

Can the depth of a novel ever be fully realised on stage?

Analysing theory and performance examples that explore a chosen performance issue

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** as highly detailed examples of features of performance and aspects of theory/theatre practice are effectively used to develop an insightful argument. A consistent depth of understanding supports the analysis and draws out implications. The candidate gives coherent and accurate referencing throughout.

Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways the performance issue has been explored

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because an excellent understanding of the issue is shown by the selection and organisation of materials. It draws out contrasts and comparisons through a range of highly relevant examples, leading to an insightful argument. Practitioner work is fully considered, with creative thinking. There is highly effective use of primary and secondary sources.

Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because this is a coherent and rigorous dissertation focusing firmly on the chosen title. A consistently clear and lucid argument develops naturally from a securely structured series of well-analysed and synthesised examples. The enquiry is led by a fluent expression of opinion in their own voice. Personal thinking drives the exploration of material, leading to a comprehensive conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **30 marks**.