Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of candidates</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>VLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General comments

The concept for the 2014 examination was Hybrid. Candidates demonstrated well-considered responses to the visual stimulus presented in Paper One and used visual language to analyse and justify ideas in response to artworks in Paper Two.

Both candidates designed and created resolved artworks in response to the concept, compositional and technical skills were of a high standard and candidates used visual language to effectively communicate their understanding of art elements. Candidates described and interpreted artworks to give an opinion of the artworks presented. Both candidates demonstrated a high use of appropriate language to analyse and validate interpretations when evaluating meanings and justifying positions.

Paper One: Making (Practical response)

Candidates were required to respond to one or more of the three focus areas by completing and ‘resolving’ an artwork or artworks in any predominantly two-dimensional medium (e.g. painting, drawing, collage, assemblage). Candidates were required to visually communicate their understanding of Hybrid (literally, representatively or conceptually) based on their interpretation of one or more of the focuses developed from the concept.

The stimulus provided consisted of a range of artworks reflecting various interpretations of the concept. This allowed for responses such as:
- literal representations of fusion (Focus 1)
- symbolic or metaphorical interpretations that identified and depicted representations of form and function (Focus 2)
- abstract or non-representational interpretations that dealt with highly personalised responses to social connections (Focus 3).

The visual responses to Paper One were highly imaginative interpretations that used one of the stimulus items suggested. Candidates were allowed to use materials (e.g. preliminary sketches,
painting, collage/assemblage items) that they had collected or developed and brought into the examination room as the basis of their response to the concept. The candidates appeared to have carefully planned source materials for use in the examination. Candidates developed ideas, compositional plans and used materials that resulted in responses of a high standard. The most common stimulus used by candidates was ‘Form and Function’ (Focus 2). There was a correlation between achievement in the Application criterion and the Visual Literacy criterion, with candidates using excellent drawing and construction skills, with visual problem-solving and compositional skills to communicate ideas and intentions.

Prospective candidates should ensure that they understand how work developed during the year can be used to relate to examination stimulus material. Use of past examination papers would foster this understanding.

Tutors could also develop practice examination papers, enabling candidates to gain more experience in developing a response under examination conditions based on previous work. Strategies for candidates to complete a resolved artwork in the time allocated would assist in the development of compositional and technical skills.

**Paper Two: Appraising (Written response)**

Candidates generally responded at a high standard to Part A, demonstrating strong links to *Hybrid* and interpretation of the meaning of both works. Both candidates used visual language to demonstrate a high level analysis, although they did not clearly link to the cultural and historical context of the stimulus artwork. Candidates effectively considered the information provided with each artwork when justifying artworks or validating interpretations of each artwork in their responses.

**Part A Question 1**

Candidates responded at A or B standard to Question 1. The stimulus artworks representing the focus concept displayed contrasting sculptural artworks by two artists. The subquestions required candidates to analyse the subject matter, media and context of each sculpture in a short response to each artwork. Both candidates were able to provide insightful interpretations of the artist’s depiction of the concept in context. Candidates attempted to analyse the symbolic meaning of each artwork but were not always able to clearly articulate the meaning created by the artwork in their written responses.

**Part B Questions 2, 3 and 4**

Candidates were required to write an extended essay of 400–600 words in response to one of three questions. One candidate responded to Question 2 and one to Question 3. To achieve highly in this part, candidates were required to analyse each artwork using a high level of language to communicate their interpretations of the compositional arrangement and meaning depicted.

Question 2 consisted of three artworks that drew candidates’ attention to human and animal anatomy. Each artwork uses different media to fuse ideas and form to represent selected media. The question required candidates to analyse and interpret the compositional arrangements of each artwork.

In Question 3, candidates were required to describe the common elements in three sculptural works that challenge traditional forms and the function of objects, exploring media and
creating new meanings for the viewer. Each work was conceptual in nature but provided visual cues in each of the low relief, installation and sculptural works. The challenge in this question is that the candidate must show evidence of their understanding of how meaning can be interpreted using scale and media selected by each artist.