

Scholarship

2010 Assessment Report

Art History

COMMENTARY

The biggest barrier for candidates remains the lack of developed critical analysis of specific works to support their arguments. Many still provide a sweeping overview of Art History since the cave paintings with a lack of depth.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- demonstrated all the skills shown by candidates awarded Scholarship

PLUS

- demonstrated a highly developed level of intellectual engagement with the discipline of Art History and with the question
- demonstrated an extensive knowledge base through answers that were strong in depth and breadth of knowledge
- presented clear evidence of independent thought
- presented evidence of highly developed critical thinking
- demonstrated originality of approach and outstanding communication skills
- maintained the quality of response across both questions.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- selected questions which displayed their knowledge and skills
- selected works, relevant for an art history response, which enabled them to illustrate the different facets of their argument
- analysed those art works specifically and in detail to support their argument
- paid particular attention to key words in the question e.g. ‘more than’, ‘needs’, ‘justify or refute’
- planned carefully so that answers were logically structured and developed, sustained and kept to their stance on the question
- demonstrated comprehensive depth and breadth of knowledge of the specific areas of content referenced.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- lacked detailed analysis of specific and appropriate art works
- did not address the question asked so that responses were poorly structured or drifted from the question
- paid insufficient attention to key words e.g. ‘always’, ‘needs to’
- made generalised, unsupported statements
- did not develop points made or provide specific detail to support them
- presented prepared responses which did not address the question asked
- presented broad ‘art through the ages’ survey responses which were therefore superficial and could not score highly
- included material inappropriate for an art history response

- included errors/inaccuracies in their responses
- did not sustain the quality of response across both responses
- repeated material over the two responses.

OTHER COMMENTS

The biggest handicap stopping candidates from being awarded Scholarship continues to be the lack of specific and detailed analysis of selected art works. Drilling down into the selected works to show how and why they support the argument is essential. Referencing a large number of works without analysis is of little use. Candidates also need to ensure that the material/examples they reference is appropriate for an art history discussion. Some responses contained material relating to drama or film which was irrelevant in this context.