

# Scholarship 2012 Assessment Report Art History

## **COMMENTARY**

As in previous years, Section A of the 2012 Scholarship Art History paper focused on analysis of the elements of the subject while Section B offered a broader approach to the discipline.

The questions gave candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their skills in a range of contexts and there were very few who did not complete two responses.

In Section A the most commonly attempted questions in 2012 were 2 & 4, and these also elicited many of the strongest responses. Some responses did not address the qualifying 'always' in Q2 however, and many responses failed to address both form **and** subject matter in Question 4. It was clear also that the term 'form' was often misunderstood.

In Section B, Question 8 was the most commonly attempted. Candidates often chose a chronological approach, however, and this frequently led to a broad superficial survey which lacked visual analysis or critical response to the works selected.

Question 1, which focused clearly on key elements of the discipline, was the least commonly attempted - this could be in part because there was a choice of two elements to be made, but could also indicate a lack of confidence with art elements and the use of key terminology. This was also indicated by many responses to Question 3 which did not recognise that 'arrangement of objects in space' was to do with composition.

Question 6 attracted many responses that did not address the question asked 'change is the only constant' while several responses to Question 7 dealt solely with Feminist art rather than the much broader approaches which were possible.

### SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

# Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- were astute in their selection of questions
- demonstrated comprehensive depth and breadth of knowledge of works, artists and contexts
- wrote with confidence and maturity
- · demonstrated highly developed levels of critical thinking
- utilised detailed, in-depth visual analysis of art works to support their arguments
- maintained a focused stance in response to the question
- maintained the quality of response across both questions
- showed evidence of independent thought.

### **SCHOLARSHIP**

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

- selected questions which enabled them to display their knowledge and skill
- engaged with the question
- paid attention to qualifying words/phrases in the questions eg 'always', 'only', 'with detailed reference'

- displayed well-developed critical responses to art works and contexts
- selected art works carefully to support their argument
- provided detailed high-level visual analysis of art works
- demonstrated comprehensive depth and breadth of knowledge of the relevant history of art
- were accurate in the information provided
- avoided superficial surveys of the history of art type responses.

### **OTHER CANDIDATES**

## Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship typically:

- did not provide specific visual analysis of art works to support their discussion
- did not focus on the question
- did not address qualifying words in the question such as 'always', 'only' etc
- lacked in-depth knowledge of art works, artists and contexts
- wrote short answers that did not demonstrate either depth or breadth of knowledge
- · selected art works which were not useful for the question being answered
- were inaccurate in information provided.

### OTHER COMMENTS

The single biggest barrier to success in this examination was the failure to provide detailed critical analysis of the specific art works and contexts discussed.

It was also essential that candidates were confident in the terminology of art history and able to use this accurately. It was clear from some answers that candidates did not understand what was meant by 'form', for example. Others selected works which did not allow them a detailed discussion of the element or aspect under discussion. It was apparent that this was often because they had a small range of works to draw from.

Students who come to the examination with prepared essays continue to have difficulty convincingly applying their material to the questions offered.