

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 achieved the **bottom end of the 7-9 criteria (7 marks)**. The candidate demonstrates a basic knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and theatre practitioner. The candidate references the co-directorship and states that they have different perspectives and experiences to bring to the play, but this is not linked to their practice in the production in any detail. The reference to the company warm-up was not made relevant to the question and linked to the status of the acting.

Analysis

The candidate achieved the **middle of the 7-9 criteria (8 marks)**. The analysis of the production is basic, and relevance of the analysed examples is basic also, with an attempt to consider the implications of the question. The candidate's analysis was simplistic and asserted that the actors were given higher status in communicating the narrative and the issues. However, the analysed examples did not convincingly exemplify this and were not given with clarity.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate achieved the **middle of the 7-9 criteria (8 marks)**. The candidate gives a basic argument throughout, making some use of sources, leading to a basic, repetitive conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **8 marks out of 20**.

Candidate 2 (response to question 2)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate achieved the **top of the 7-9 criteria (9 marks)**. Knowledge and understanding is often implied as opposed to explicitly stated. Statements were made about Cracknell's interpretative decisions, but they were not used effectively to demonstrate understanding. The quote from Cracknell is tagged on to the second paragraph and is not used convincingly to support the candidate's understanding. There is misunderstanding evident about the use of the chorus within this production.

Analysis

The candidate achieved the **middle end of the 10-13 criteria (12 marks)**. The analysis is mostly relevant and mainly considers the implications of the question. The analysis is linked back to candidate's understanding of directional interpretation. At times, the candidate gave lengthy, narrative driven examples which were not linked to the implication of the question.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate achieves the **lower end of the 10-13 criteria (11 marks)**. The candidate demonstrates a good argument showing some independence of thought. At times the argument is unclear due to the lack of secure understanding of the practitioner's intentions. The candidate does, however, make some use of sources, and leads to a sound conclusion.

Total marks

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

Candidate 3 (response to question 1)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate achieved the **higher end of the 14-17 criteria (16 marks)**. The candidate demonstrates very good knowledge and understanding of theatre practice and of the theatre practitioner. There is a wealth of Berkoff's practice that they could select but they deploy knowledge of the practitioner and their influences effectively in response to the question.

Analysis

The candidate achieved the **lower end of the 18-20 criteria (18 marks)**. The candidate gave detailed, relevant and highly effective analysis which considers the implications of the question. The examples selected are described and analysed succinctly and coherently. These examples are deployed effectively to address the question and build their argument.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate achieved the **top of the 14-17 criteria (17 marks)**. The candidate demonstrates a very good, coherent argument showing independence of thought, making good use of resources and leading to a convincing conclusion.

Total marks

The candidate was awarded **17 marks out of 20**.

Candidate 4 (response to question 2)

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate achieved the **top end of the 18-20 criteria (20 marks)**. The candidate demonstrates excellent knowledge and understanding of the theatre practice and practitioner. This permeates the assignment skilfully and the candidate uses their knowledge convincingly to build their argument and respond to the question.

Analysis

The candidate achieved the **top end of the 18-20 criteria (20 marks)**. The analysis is detailed, relevant and highly effective. The candidate consistently considers the implications of the question. The candidate's secure knowledge underpins their ability to analyse the examples with insight and address the question.

Structure and line of argument

The candidate achieved the **top end of the 18-20 criteria (20 marks)**. The candidate demonstrates an excellent and coherent argument, showing independence of thought, making excellent use of sources, and leading to a highly convincing conclusion.

Total marks

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