

# **Scholarship**

## **2011 Assessment Report**

### **Art History**

## COMMENTARY

Section A of the 2011 Scholarship Art History paper allowed students to focus on the analytical components of the subject; Section B offered the opportunity for a broader approach to the discipline. The wording of the general instructions, regarding types of art that could appropriately be addressed in an answer, helped students focus on relevant material.

Several particularly positive features characterised responses this year. Students worked hard to adapt their material to the specific question being asked. Very few broad chronological surveys traced the evolution from cave drawings to 21<sup>st</sup> century art. Overall, it was pleasing to see the quality of Art History presented for assessment. Very few candidates showed very little knowledge of the discipline.

In general, most candidates demonstrated that they recognised the need to analyse the questions and to identify the key words in the statements around which questions are focused. This was particularly evident in responses to Questions One, Two and Eight, which included words such as 'always', 'never' and 'all'. Such emphatic statements offer students the opportunity to engage with a broad range of art in order to demonstrate their stance.

If there was one area that differentiated students of Scholarship level from others, it was the ability to integrate visual analysis into a response. Questions Three and Eight are useful examples to cite in this regard. These two questions were particularly popular with candidates, many of whom answered both questions. Although there was the potential to offer similar material in these answers, students clearly paid heed to the instruction not to repeat information. There were, however, some students who had difficulty integrating art works into their context and instead wrote at length on context, at the expense of visual analysis.

With regard to the level of interpretation required to achieve Scholarship Art History, Question Two allowed for a range of approaches. Some answers addressed analytical elements such as colour, composition, and line. Other students considered aspects such as propaganda, focus on gender issues, or a central figure such as Jesus Christ, as the predominant element in examples they discussed.

The value of taking time to plan an answer was evident throughout responses. As an example, students who attempted Question Five generally had a sound idea on which to base their opinion. However, organisation of material in response to this question proved difficult for some.

Overall, the level of commitment to the arts and art history was demonstrated by the impassioned answers to Question Seven. Not a single student argued that art works are objects with no apparent use.

## **SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE**

**Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- chose their questions astutely
- wrote with confidence
- presented with highly developed levels of critical thinking
- maintained a consistent stance in response to the question
- showed evidence of independent thought
- demonstrated depth in their visual analysis of examples.

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

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

- engaged with the question
- analysed the question closely
- chose examples carefully in order to support their argument
- provided detailed visual analysis of specific works
- gave evidence of a broad knowledge of the history of art.

## **OTHER CANDIDATES**

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

- did not focus on the question
- were generalized in their responses
- lacked in-depth knowledge of art works and artists
- did not engage in visual analysis of works
- left an answer unfinished or answered only one question
- wrote short answers that did not demonstrate either depth or breadth of knowledge.