

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for the coursework assessment task.

## Candidate 1

The candidate was awarded **20 marks**.

**Topic:** *“A comparative analysis of the theme of vengeance in “Hecuba” and “Medea” by Euripides and “Electra” by Sophocles.”*

### Task

The candidate identifies the focus of the analysis as the theme of vengeance through the techniques of characterisation, symbolism and structure. The focus on the female protagonists is appropriate and allows for a holistic approach/evaluation to the texts.

### Knowledge and Understanding

The candidate focus on structure connects introduction of tragic elements with theme of vengeance across three texts. The candidate moves on to the characterisation of three female protagonists, looking at motivation for acts of vengeance. There is some assertion about Electra’s depiction as “...a symbol of the expectations of woman at the time...”, but the candidate integrates this into the line of argument successfully. Religion as a theme is introduced, although the candidate has not led us to expect this topic – but there is some doubt as to the candidate’s understanding of the meaning of the reference to “shielded host”. This insecurity of understanding is continued in the description of a rhyming statement, relating to the chorus’s final commentary. However, overall the understanding of the plays demonstrates **knowledge and understanding of key elements and central concerns. The dissertation demonstrates relevant textual evidence to support the demands of the task.**

### Analysis

A range of dramatic techniques are mentioned: tragic structure, pathos, dramatic irony, climax etc. However, there is little development of these references within the context of vengeance. The impact of narrative perspective in Medea, Hecuba and Electra is examined with the candidate making evaluative judgements. The candidate undertakes some close analysis to support the analysis of the characterisation of Electra. This improved analysis is continued with reference to Medea; the parallel analysis of Hecuba is marred by typos which confuse the references and line of argument. However, in general the apt descriptor is **relevant analysis of a range of literary techniques . . . which support the line of argument.**

### Evaluation

The candidate undertakes comparison to evaluate the effectiveness of the dramatic techniques. This is evident when the candidate deals with Medea, using appropriate textual evidence. There is relevant evaluation of Electra's importance as "...she embodies the reason for vengeance". A relevant quotation is supplied to justify this. **A relevant evaluative stance** is apparent throughout the dissertation.

### Expression

The process of comparison undertaken is on occasion mechanical, but does allow the candidate to present an overview of the texts within the thematic focus of the dissertation. The candidate uses the language of comparison and evaluation and comes to a short conclusion. The inaccuracies within the script do make it **broadly relevant to the task**, rather than **generally focused**.

Range: There are clear indicators across two band ranges, and it has been placed holistically within the range of 22-19 in order to recognise its strengths.

Mark: 20