

HISTORY OF ART

Paper 8285/02

Modern Art

General comments

The marking by Examiners and preparation of candidates by Centres was again thorough and the examination as a whole has a strong academic foundation. The paper was fair and offered plenty of opportunities for candidates to engage with the different options within the syllabus structure. The overall standard of papers was generally an improvement on last year. As the options are narrowly defined in terms of content and time span it is fair for the Examiner to expect some knowledge and understanding which shows depth of analysis and good use of appropriate language and terminology. There was a tendency for rote learnt answers and it is difficult to award high marks for this kind of pre-learned response. The strongest papers were where candidates could engage with the question by responding with a clear structure, gave accurate information and justified points of view with evidence.

Marking was accurate and fair and gave good differentiation of the different levels of achievement. A number of candidates gave uneven answers in papers which may be the result of running out of time and poor examination management.

Modern Art

There was a very narrow range of questions attempted. Option 1 (Towards Abstraction) was the most popular in **Section A** with 47 attempts at **Question 1**. This was answered quite well by most candidates although detailed linear progression through Cubism and good critical analysis was weak in the lower levels of achievement. There were 20 attempts at **Question 2**. There were some responses in Option 3 (American Art) but no answers for Options 2 or 4.

Answers in **Section A** were more complete and detailed than the general level of answers in **Section B** (Image comparison questions). Candidates were not always fully prepared in how to use visual analysis by looking at the image instead of trying to write a pre-learned response. The answers needed to fully engage with the image itself and relate it to specific contexts. A number of candidates seemed unable to manage two full answers in the time limit which hampered their overall mark. There was a muddle with the Pollock image but this was taken into account and the resulting levels of achievement accurately reflected answer content. The images in **Option 1** were compared and analysed by the majority of the cohort. Whilst general descriptive elements were sound the underlying theories behind Mondrian's and Kandinsky's work were often misunderstood or poorly outlined and these are vital to a strong answer. Marking was thorough and accurate and a clear reflection of levels of achievement.

There is clear evidence that candidates achieved more marks in **Section 1**.

On the evidence of moderated examination papers and marking levels awarded there are no changes of mark levels in Centres as the process was an accurate reflection of this cohort of candidates and their levels of achievement in response to the question papers.