



Cambridge Pre-U

ART HISTORY

9799/04

Paper 4 Personal Investigation

For examination from 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Specimen

This specimen paper has been updated for assessments from 2020. The specimen questions and mark schemes remain the same. The layout and wording of the front covers have been updated to reflect the new Cambridge International branding and to make instructions clearer for candidates.

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **6** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Relative weightings of the assessment objectives:

Personal Investigation	Essay	Total (essay to be scaled from 40 to 60)	
	mark	mark	%
AO1	5	8	13
AO2	5	8	13
AO3	10	14	24
AO4	10	15	25
AO5	10	15	25
Total	40	60	100

Marking should be done holistically, taking into consideration the weighting of marks for each assessment objective as they are reflected in the descriptor.

Use the generic marking scheme levels to find the mark. First find the level which best describes the qualities of the essay, then allocate a point within the level to establish a mark out of 40.

Examiners will look for the best fit, not a perfect fit, when applying the bands. Where there are conflicting strengths, then note should be taken of the **relative weightings** of the different assessment objectives, to determine which band is most suitable and to determine where to place the work within the band. Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the band and then moderate up or down according to individual qualities within the answer.

Generic marking grid (40 marks)

35–40	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent visual analysis of the works of art discussed and a thorough understanding of materials and techniques, where relevant. • Historical concepts and evidence fully understood and contextualised. • Excellent ability to distinguish between fact, theory and personal judgement. • A thoroughly well-argued and penetrating response which consistently focuses on the original question or premise. Excellent organisation with a wide range of appropriate illustrations, suitably captioned. • A thorough bibliography containing carefully selected and wholly relevant items cited in a correct way. Footnotes used extensively. Evidence of sustained personal research and first-hand engagement with many of the works of art discussed. Primary and secondary sources used extensively and in a critical way.
29–34	Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good visual analysis of the works of art discussed and a sound understanding of techniques and materials. • Very good understanding of historical concepts and their contextual use. • Assured ability to distinguish between fact, theory and personal judgement. • A well-argued and relevant response to the question. Clearly organised with a very good range of illustrations, suitably captioned. • An extensive bibliography containing mostly relevant items. Frequent use of footnotes. Evidence of first-hand engagement with several of the works of art discussed. Frequent use of primary and secondary sources.
22–28	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound visual analysis. Good awareness of techniques and materials though not wholly developed. • A sound understanding of historical and contextual concepts. • Good ability to distinguish between fact, theory and personal judgement. • A mainly relevant response to the question with a coherent approach but not as extensively developed. Moderately clear organisation and an adequate number of illustrations. • Good bibliography and footnotes. Evidence of first hand engagement with at least one of the works of art discussed. The occasional use of primary and secondary sources, where relevant.
15–21	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows fair attempt at visual analysis but lacks detail and breadth. Limited awareness of appropriate techniques and materials. • Some understanding of the historical context but there may be some inaccuracies and a limited range of evidence. • Distinguishes between fact, theory and personal judgement. • An attempt is made to address the original question, but the argument is weak and lacks focus. Contains irrelevant material and the approach is descriptive rather than analytical. Organisation lacks clarity and illustrations are limited in number and may lack captions. • Limited bibliography containing several irrelevant items. Inconsistent use of footnotes. Primary and secondary sources used very infrequently and in an uncritical way.

8–14	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of works of art are limited and knowledge of appropriate techniques and materials is limited. • Shows some knowledge and understanding of the context. • Barely distinguishes between fact, theory and personal judgement. • An uneven OR basic response to the question and there is no development of an argument. Contains large amounts of irrelevant material and relies heavily on description. Very poorly organised and contains an inadequate number of illustrations. • Very short bibliography OR one which contains almost wholly irrelevant items. Very little use made of footnotes. No use of primary or secondary sources.
1–7	Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited visual analysis or awareness of materials and techniques. • Poor knowledge and understanding of the subject and historical context. • Little evidence of the ability to distinguish between fact, theory and personal judgement. • Little attempt to answer any question. No coherent organisation and very few or no illustrations. • Minimal bibliography and footnotes. No use of primary or secondary sources.
0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No creditable content.

BLANK PAGE