



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

MUSIC (PRINCIPAL)

9800/42

Paper 4 Advanced Recital

May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 100

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

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

This document consists of **6** printed pages.

Recital (70 marks)/Written Project (30 marks)

The syllabus requires all candidates to perform a recital of not more than 30 minutes' duration, which should demonstrate aural attentiveness, technical competence and interpretative understanding. Performances should show an awareness, where appropriate, of relevant performance practice. None of the repertoire played in the advanced recital should duplicate that performed in Component 2.

To achieve the highest marks, the music performed should be equivalent to Grade 8 of one of the recognised examining bodies and extend the range of technical skills and interpretative understanding.

Recital

Marks will be given under each of the following headings, applied to the performance as a whole:

1 Fluency and accuracy (of pitch and rhythm) [15 marks]

Descriptors	Marks
Wholly accurate in notes and rhythm and completely fluent [this range may still be used if a few insignificant slips do not impede fluency, but to achieve a mark in this band, the performance must have no significant inaccuracies at all].	13–15
Almost wholly accurate and mainly secure; some mistakes, but not enough to disturb the basic fluency of the performance.	10–12
Accurate in most respects, but with a number of mistakes which disturb the fluency of some parts of the performance.	7–9
Basically accurate but hesitant, sometimes seriously enough to impair the fluency of more than one item in the performance.	4–6
Accurate only in parts, with persistent hesitancy, showing little fluency throughout most of the performance.	1–3
All items marred by inaccuracies and significant rhythmical hesitancy, with no sense of the fluency required for a coherent performance.	0

2 Technical control across a range of techniques**[20 marks]**

Assessed under this heading, for example:

- quality, variety and evenness of tone
- specific factors as they apply to the instrument concerned (e.g. co-ordination of RH/LH, bow/fingers, tongue/fingers; intonation; breath control; balance; diction; pedalling; registration)
- the range of technical skills displayed.

Descriptors	Marks
The candidate demonstrates very secure technical control in every respect, across a wide range of advanced techniques, which considerably extend those being demonstrated in Component 2.	17–20
The candidate demonstrates mainly secure technical control in all significant respects, across a range of fairly advanced techniques, which generally extend those being demonstrated in Component 2.	13–16
The candidate demonstrates moderate technical control, with problems in some areas, across a limited range of moderately advanced techniques, which partly extend those being demonstrated in Component 2.	9–12
The candidate demonstrates erratic technical control, with significant problems in some areas, across a narrow range of techniques, which barely extend those being demonstrated in Component 2.	5–8
The candidate demonstrates poor technical control, with significant problems in several areas, across a limited range of techniques, which do not extend those being demonstrated in Component 2.	1–4
The candidate is not in technical control of the instrument.	0

3 Realisation of performance markings and/or performing conventions [15 marks]

Assessed under this heading, for example:

- the realisation of markings written into the score by the composer and/or the observance of appropriate performance conventions (e.g. ornamentation; *notes inégales* and other baroque rhythmical alterations; swung quavers and other jazz conventions).

Descriptors	Marks
Markings of tempo, expression, phrasing and articulation are convincingly realised throughout the performance and/or appropriate performing conventions are effectively observed.	13–15
Markings of tempo, expression, articulation and phrasing are realised throughout most of the performance and/or some appropriate performing conventions are observed.	10–12
Markings of tempo, expression, articulation and phrasing are realised in some passages in the performance and/or some appropriate performing conventions are erratically observed.	7–9
Markings of tempo, expression, articulation and phrasing are inconsistently realised in few passages in the performance and/or few appropriate performing conventions are observed.	4–6
Markings of tempo, dynamics, articulation and phrasing are seldom realised throughout most of the performance and/or performing conventions are largely ignored.	1–3
Markings of tempo, expression, articulation and phrasing are ignored throughout the performance and/or no appropriate performing conventions are observed.	0

4 Aural and stylistic awareness [20 marks]

Assessed under this heading, for example:

- sense of ensemble, interpretative understanding.

Descriptors	Marks
The candidate demonstrates acute aural awareness and a well developed sense of style, throughout a performance which communicates a coherent understanding of all items presented.	17–20
The candidate demonstrates good aural awareness and a fairly well developed sense of style, throughout a performance which communicates a mainly coherent understanding of all items presented.	13–16
The candidate demonstrates fairly good aural awareness and a moderate sense of style, through most of a performance which communicates a general understanding of most items presented.	9–12
The candidate demonstrates some aural awareness and some sense of style, through part of a performance which communicates a limited understanding of the items presented.	5–8
The candidate demonstrates little aural awareness or sense of style, throughout a performance which communicates very little understanding of the items presented.	1–4
The candidate demonstrates no aural awareness, sense of style or understanding in any of the items presented.	0

Written Project

The candidate will present a written project of not more than 1750 words which compares and contrasts two recordings of one of the pieces contained in the recital, and indicates to what extent this study has informed the approach to his/her performance. This should be presented as a written project, accompanied by a CD of short extracts from the two recordings chosen to illustrate the points made in the text.

The project will be assessed on three criteria:

1 Aural perception**[10 marks]**

i.e. the recognition of significant similarities and/or differences in the two performances studied

Descriptors	Marks
A high level of aural perception allows all significant features of the performances to be identified.	8–10
A good level of aural perception allows most significant features of the performances to be identified.	5–7
Some aural perception allows a limited number of significant features of the performances to be identified.	3–4
A few relevant features of the performances are recognised.	1–2
No evidence of any appropriate listening.	0

2 Link between judgements and intentions**[10 marks]**

i.e. the relationship between the findings (indicated above) and the candidate's own expressive performing intentions

Descriptors	Marks
A wholly convincing link is made between entirely appropriate judgements about the performances studied and the candidate's own expressive intentions.	8–10
A mostly convincing link is made between generally appropriate judgements about the performances studied and the candidate's own expressive intentions.	5–7
Some attempt is made to link relevant judgements about the performances studied to the candidate's own expressive intentions.	3–4
One or two limited connections are made between observations about the performances and the candidate's performing intentions.	1–2
No links are made between the recorded performances and the candidate's own intentions.	0

3 Substantiation of judgements**[10 marks]**

i.e. the relevance of the accompanying recorded extracts

Descriptors	Marks
All judgements are supported by entirely relevant examples from the recorded performances.	8–10
Most judgements are supported by generally relevant examples from the recorded performances.	5–7
Some judgements are supported by partly relevant examples from the recorded performances.	3–4
A few judgements are supported by examples from the recorded performances which have limited relevance.	1–2
No recorded extracts are provided to support the text.	0