

**UNIVERSITY OF MALTA**  
**THE MATRICULATION CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION**  
**INTERMEDIATE LEVEL**

**ART**

**MAY 2008**

**EXAMINERS' REPORT**

**MATRICULATION AND SECONDARY EDUCATION CERTIFICATE  
EXAMINATIONS BOARD**

**IM ART  
MAY 2008 SESSION  
EXAMINERS' REPORT**

The markers' panel for May 2008 Intermediate Level in Art submits the following report on the general performance of the candidates who sat for this examination.

**1.0. Statistical Information**

41 candidates registered for the examination. The breakdown of the grades obtained by the candidates was as follows:

| Grade      | A   | B   | C    | D    | E    | F    | Abs | Total |
|------------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|-------|
| Number     | 1   | 3   | 15   | 6    | 9    | 7    | 0   | 41    |
| % of Total | 2.4 | 7.3 | 36.6 | 14.6 | 22.0 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

**2.0. Comments on Candidates Performance**

**2.1. Paper I (i) – Coursework**

The Coursework portfolios were generally satisfactory. Candidates have shown that the aims and objectives of the Paper have been understood and that the works presented are a selection of what they produced during the course of their studies. A few candidates, none the less, presented the portfolio as a full and indiscriminate compendium of their work. The latter is obviously not desirable and such work was penalised. Some concerns over excessive mounting remain. A small number of candidates tampered with the size of the portfolio provided by MATSEC. These candidates were penalised.

**2.2. Paper I (ii) – Project**

The themes for the Project generally engaged the candidates in creative exercises of research. The main difficulty with this Paper, as repeatedly noted in earlier reports, is that some candidates did not show enough evidence of their research work and of how their work evolved. A small number of candidates presented only a Final Piece as their Project, whilst a few others did not identify their Final Piece.

**2.3. Paper II - History of Art**

The general level was satisfactory and it seems that Candidates have prepared themselves well for the new format of this paper. Candidates should discuss two works synoptically and place them within their appropriate art historical context. Candidates who simply use the work of art as an excuse to discuss the general biography of the artists sway away from the answer expected from them. Some candidates do not show proper evidence of wider reading.

**2.4. Paper II – Work from Observation**

This paper offers two work from observation options a) Still-Life and Natural Forms and b) Human Figure. Option (a) was, as in the previous years, the most popular choice. Option (a) candidates produced work which was generally satisfactory, showing evidence of proper research and training in Still-Life. On the other hand, work produced for Option (b) showed that the approach to the human figure needs to be properly refined. This has been noted in a number of earlier reports.

Chairperson  
Board of Examiners

October 2008