

**Formal requirements of the task—SL**

- SL students submit 10–15 screens which examine and compare at least three artworks, objects or artifacts, at least two of which need to be by different artists. The works selected for comparison and analysis should come from differing cultural contexts.
- SL students submit a list of sources used.

**Formal requirements of the task—HL**

- HL students submit 10–15 screens which examine and compare at least three artworks, objects or artifacts, at least two of which need to be by different artists. The works selected for comparison and analysis should come from differing cultural contexts.
- HL students submit 3–5 screens which analyse the extent to which their work and practices have been influenced by the art and artists examined.
- HL students submit a list of sources used.

**Submitting assessment work**

The size and format of screens submitted for assessment is not prescribed. Submitted materials are assessed on screen and students must ensure that their work is clear and legible when presented in a digital, on-screen format. Students should not scan multiple pages of work from their journals and submit them as a single screen, for example, as overcrowded or illegible materials may result in examiners being unable to interpret and understand the intentions of the work.

The procedure for submitting work for assessment can be found in the *Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme*. Students are required to indicate the number of screens included when the materials are submitted. Where submitted materials exceed the prescribed screen limits examiners are instructed to base their assessment solely on the materials that appear within the limits.

## External assessment criteria—SL and HL

**Part 1: Comparative study****Summary**

Part 1: Comparative study		Marks	Total
A	Analysis of formal qualities	6	30
B	Interpretation of function and purpose	6	
C	Evaluation of cultural significance	6	
D	Making comparisons and connections	6	
E	Presentation and subject-specific language	6	
F	<b>(HL only)</b> Making connections to own art-making practice	12	42

## Criteria

### A. Analysis of formal qualities

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- effective identification and analysis of the formal qualities of the selected artworks, objects and artifacts?

Candidates who do not examine and compare at least 3 artworks by at least 2 different artists will not be awarded a mark higher than 3 in this criteria.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below
1–2	The work identifies some formal qualities of the selected pieces from at least two cultural origins. There is little or no attempt at analysis.
3–4	The work identifies and describes the formal qualities of the selected pieces from at least two cultural origins. The analysis of these formal qualities is inconsistent.
5–6	The work identifies and analyses the formal qualities of the selected pieces from at least two cultural origins. The analysis of these formal qualities is consistently informed and effective.

### B. Interpretation of function and purpose

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- informed and appropriate interpretation of the function and purpose of the selected artworks, objects and artifacts within the cultural context in which they were created?

Candidates who do not examine and compare at least 3 artworks by at least 2 different artists will not be awarded a mark higher than 3 in this criterion.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below
1–2	The work demonstrates an interpretation of the function and purpose of the selected pieces within the cultural context in which they were created, but this is largely undeveloped, superficial or relies heavily on personal opinion.
3–4	The work demonstrates an interpretation of the function and purpose of the selected pieces within the cultural context in which they were created, although this is not always consistently informed or developed.
5–6	The work demonstrates a consistently informed and appropriate interpretation of the function and purpose of the selected pieces within the cultural context in which they were created.

**C. Evaluation of cultural significance**

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- informed understanding of the cultural significance of the selected artworks, objects and artifacts within the specific context in which they were created?

Candidates who do not examine and compare at least 3 artworks by at least 2 different artists will not be awarded a mark higher than 3 in this criterion.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below
1–2	The work demonstrates an evaluation of the material, conceptual and cultural significance of the selected pieces within the specific context in which they were created, but this is largely undeveloped, superficial or relies heavily on personal opinion.
3–4	The work demonstrates an evaluation of the material, conceptual and cultural significance of the selected pieces within the specific context in which they were created, although this is not always consistently informed or developed.
5–6	The work demonstrates consistently informed and appropriate evaluation of the material, conceptual and cultural significance of the selected pieces within the specific context in which they were created.

**D. Making comparisons and connections**

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- effective identification and critical analysis of the connections, similarities and differences between the selected artworks, objects and artifacts?

Candidates who do not examine and compare at least 3 artworks by at least 2 different artists will not be awarded a mark higher than 3 in this criterion.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below
1–2	The work outlines connections, similarities and differences between the selected pieces, with little critical analysis. These connections are largely superficial or inappropriate and demonstrate a basic understanding of how the pieces compare.
3–4	The work describes the connections, similarities and differences between the selected pieces, with some underdeveloped critical analysis. The connections are logical and coherent and demonstrate a sound understanding of how the pieces compare.
5–6	The work critically analyses the connections, similarities and differences between the selected pieces. These connections are logical and coherent, showing a thorough understanding of how the pieces compare.

**E. Presentation and subject-specific language**

To what extent does the work:

- ensure that information is conveyed clearly and coherently in a visually appropriate and legible manner, supported by the consistent use of appropriate subject-specific language?

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below
1–2	The work makes some attempt to convey information clearly or in a visually appropriate manner; however this may be inconsistent or not always appropriate. There is some attempt to use subject-specific language but this may be infrequent or with inaccuracies.
3–4	The work clearly and coherently conveys information, in a visually appropriate and legible manner, with some consistent use of appropriate subject-specific language.
5–6	The work clearly and coherently conveys information which results in a visually appropriate, legible and engaging study. Subject-specific language is used accurately and appropriately throughout.

**At HL only****F. Making connections to own art-making practice**

To what extent does the work:

- analyse and reflect on the outcomes of the comparative study investigation and on how this has influenced the student's own development as an artist, identifying connections between one or more of the selected works and the student's own art-making processes and practices?

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below
1–3	The work outlines the outcomes of the investigation making few or only superficial connections to their own art-making practice.
4–6	The work describes the outcomes of the investigation but without considering the implications on their own development. The student makes attempts to make connections to their own art-making practice, but these are inconsistent or superficial.
7–9	The work reflects upon the outcomes of the investigation consistently with some attempts at analysis and consideration of their own development, however this lacks depth. The student makes some meaningful connections to their own art-making practice, but these are underdeveloped.
10–12	The work analyses and reflects upon the outcomes of the investigation consistently and appropriately. The student effectively considers their own development, making informed and meaningful connections to their own art-making practice.