

# Commentary on candidate evidence

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

## Candidate 1

Does Macbeth travel abroad?

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because some features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory are used in an attempt to develop an argument and/or present the issue. There is some straightforward analysis that falls short of drawing out implications at times. The candidate gives adequate references. There are some misunderstandings in the argument. There are some examples of both good and poor analysis.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they show some understanding of the issue by the selection and organisation of materials. They draw out some contrasts and comparisons. There is an inconsistent use of examples, leading to a basic argument. There is some use of primary and secondary sources. The candidate has a clear preference for the first production, but lacks an understanding of Gold's directorial choice to focus on the relationships in his production.

### **Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because this is a straightforward dissertation on the chosen title. It offers a limited argument. At times, it loses clarity through structure and choice of material. The candidate gives reflective and evaluative comments in their own voice, leading to a basic conclusion. The candidate has a clear voice, but their misunderstandings hamper their ability to express their argument.

### **Total marks**

The candidate was awarded **13 marks**.

## Candidate 2

Does the National Theatre portray women successfully in their adaptations of classic feminist plays?

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because some features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory are used to develop an argument. There is some straightforward analysis, drawing out some of the implications. There are adequate references. There are some misunderstandings in the argument. There are some features of performance described but the dissertation is narrative at times.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they show a good understanding of the issue. The candidate draws out some contrasts and comparisons. There is an inconsistent use of examples, leading to a sound argument. There is some 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. At times, it loses clarity through choice of material. The candidate's evaluative comments show their opinion. Their structure is effective in developing a mainly coherent argument, leading to a sound conclusion. The candidate, at times, focuses on the playwrights in the first two productions which impacts their argument.

#### **Total marks**

The candidate was awarded **15 marks**.

## Candidate 3

Scotland's Theatre vs Racism

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because there are detailed features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory which are used to develop a relevant argument. The candidate's detailed analysis draws out implications. There are adequate references. A misunderstanding but not central to the argument. The detailed features of performance are described in such a way that the reader can picture the moment taking place in a performance space.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because they show a good understanding of the issue by the selection and organisation of materials. The candidate draws out contrasts and comparisons through a range of examples, leading to a convincing argument. There is some use of primary and secondary sources. There is a more effective use of primary than secondary sources. The candidate consistently returns to their argument after detailing their performance examples.

### **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. A relevant argument develops from a well-structured range of analysed material. Reflective and evaluative comments show the candidate's opinion. The candidate creates a coherent line of argument, leading to a convincing conclusion.

#### **Total marks**

The candidate was awarded **21 marks**.

## Candidate 4

Can Iranian theatre practitioners still express their voice?

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because **detailed features** of performance, with **highly detailed features** of theatre practice and/or aspects of theory, are used to develop a relevant argument. A depth of understanding supports the analysis and draws out implications. The candidate gives coherent and accurate references. The candidate offers contextual information that is highly relevant to the analysis of practitioner's practice. The dissertation does not demonstrate consistently highly detailed features of performance, as the examples from the last production are less thorough. However, the highly detailed features of practice secure the mark.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because the dissertation shows an excellent understanding of the issue by the selection and organisation of materials. It draws out contrasts and comparisons through a relevant range of examples, leading to a convincing argument. There is highly 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 rigorous, focussed dissertation on the chosen title. A relevant argument develops from a well-structured range of analysed material. The candidate consistently returns to their own voice to express a clear opinion. Personal thinking drives the exploration of material, leading to a comprehensive conclusion.

#### **Total marks**

The candidate was awarded **27 marks**.

## Candidate 5

Is Female Rage and Domestic Abuse overdramatized in theatre?

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because some features of performance and theatre practice are used in an attempt to develop an argument and/or present the issue. There is some straightforward analysis that falls short of drawing out implications. There are basic references. There are some misunderstandings in the argument. This candidate frequently describes the narrative of the productions, which is something that is common in Advanced Higher Drama dissertations that are awarded marks similar to this.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they show a basic understanding of the issue by the selection and organisation of materials. There is little attempt to contrast and compare. There is inconsistent use of examples, leading to a basic argument. There is limited use of sources. The sources are not integrated in the dissertation to help the candidate support and build their argument. It is common for Advanced Higher Drama dissertations that are awarded this mark to provide little attempt to draw out contrasts and comparisons.

### **Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion**

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because it is a straightforward dissertation on the chosen title. At times, it loses clarity through structure and choice of material. The candidate gives basic reflective and evaluative comments in their own voice, leading to a simplistic conclusion.

### **Total marks**

The candidate was awarded **10 marks**.

## Candidate 6

Does the length of a theatre performance affect its power to create dramatic meaning and impact?

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because some examples of features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory and practitioner context are used in an attempt to develop an argument and present the issue. There are some relevant, straightforward analyses that fall short of drawing out implications. There are some misunderstandings and contradictions in the argument, which is often repetitive.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the dissertation shows some understanding of the issue by the selection of materials. The candidate draws out some contrasts and comparisons through a very broad range of examples, leading to a sound argument. Some interesting examples were selected, but the consideration of contrasts was inconsistent.

### **Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** as this was a focused dissertation on the chosen title. Analysed material applied to develop a mainly relevant argument. The candidate's voice remains clear on the chosen area however, the conclusion is more basic than sound.

#### **Total marks**

The candidate was awarded **14 marks**.

## Candidate 7

Does Clint Dyer and Roy Williams' Trilogy reflect the demise of "Britishness"?

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because detailed examples of features of performance, theatre practice and aspects of theory are effectively used to develop a relevant argument. Detailed analysis explains and mostly draws out implications. The candidate gives accurate references.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because the dissertation shows a good understanding of the issue by the selection and organisation of materials – the programming of these productions assisted with this. The candidate draws out contrasts and comparisons through a relevant range of examples, leading to a convincing argument. Practitioner work is considered, company work needed further creative thinking. There is effective use of primary sources however, secondary sources were limited.

### **Expressing an argument leading up to an evaluative conclusion**

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** as this is a consistently focused dissertation on the chosen title. A clear 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. They create a coherent line of argument, leading to a sound rather than convincing conclusion.

### **Total marks**

The candidate was awarded **21 marks**.

## Candidate 8

How do today's theatre practitioners utilise and give significance to language?

### **Analysing features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory that explore your chosen performance issue**

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because highly detailed examples of features of performance, theatre practice and/or aspects of theory 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 references.

### **Synthesising by comparing and contrasting different ways your performance issue has been explored**

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because the dissertation shows an excellent understanding of the issue 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 and company 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** as this is a coherent and rigorous dissertation focussing 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 **28 marks**.