Assessment

Criterion A B C D E Total

Marks available 3 6 6 5 5 25

Marks awarded 3 4 4 3 4 18

Criterion A

The reflective statement covers good ground, firmly setting the play within the context of many aspects of late nineteenth-century Norwegian society; there is also some useful focus on a relevant aspect of cultural context in the discussion of theatrical realism. It is clear that the ideas discussed in the interactive oral have enriched the candidate’s reading of the play.

Criterion B

The topic has a good focus on the mechanics of the play and allows the candidate to range widely throughout it. The inclusion of “in the stage directions” in the title could be unnecessarily limiting, or rather redundant. The candidate makes some assertions about the function and role of some of the doors that do not receive persuasive support: Why is the garden door “not a respectable door” (page 1)? There is evident knowledge and understanding, but too much assertion and lack of development of a compelling thesis justify the mark awarded.

Criterion C

With a focus on stage directions as well as dialogue and using examples taken from various sections of the play, there is potential for much to credit here. However, analysis is adequate at best and supporting examples are sometimes used as running narrative rather than to show appreciation of the writer’s choices: the exploration of Oswald’s running out “through the garden door” is scant. The discussion of the half-open door to the dining room is useful, but not all examples are so well handled.

Criterion D

The organization of ideas is clear and methodical; supporting examples are neatly embedded. The introduction lays out a clear line of structure but the overall impression given by the essay is somewhat of “one thing after another” in a series of often rather short, undeveloped paragraphs instead of the building of a persuasive line of argument.

Criterion E

Language use is clear, register is generally appropriate and the degree of mechanical accuracy is good. However, some lack of precision in diction and some slightly awkward phrasing at times justify the mark awarded.