Assessment

Criterion A B C D E Total

Marks available 3 6 6 5 5 25

Marks awarded 3 5 4 5 5 22

Criterion A

This is a thoughtful and engaged reflective statement that truly grapples with how knowledge acquired as a result of the interactive oral has enriched the candidate’s reading of the work. The discussion of paganism and the cult of Dionysus is neatly linked to the text and opens up a level of understanding that goes beyond the obvious.

Criterion B

The topic offers the candidate an opportunity to explore a relatively untrodden aspect of a popular text. The chosen aspect is specifically focused enough for a discussion to be feasible within the word limit while at the same time offering an opportunity for the candidate to range widely through the work in selecting supporting examples. Knowledge and understanding of the text are evident in the essay, although some examples, such as those in the section on Tesman (page 2), are not always given adequate context. There is some assertion, but overall knowledge and understanding are detailed enough to justify the mark awarded.

Criterion C

The chosen area is very strongly directed to appreciation of the writer’s choices, but discussion and analysis of supporting examples are not all that probing as, for example, in the section on the mocking of Tesman’s research subject (pages 1–2) and that on comedy of situation (pages 2–3). Thus it is an adequate response in relation to this criterion; to show an excellent level of appreciation, the analysis of features needs more depth.

Criterion D

The essay is structurally clear and effective, with neatly embedded supporting examples and elegant paragraph transitions. The ideas in the introduction are logically developed and the argument is neatly pulled together in the conclusion.

Criterion E

While there are a few lapses in diction and register, language use in this essay is clear and confident, and appropriate technical or academic terms are deployed with ease. The candidate’s style is a touch verbose, so the problem of limited analysis identified in the notes on criterion C could have been overcome with some careful editing, to enable scope for further discussion within the word limit to be released.