



CCEA GCSE Music
(Summer Series) 2014

Chief Examiner's and Principal Moderator's Report

music

Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of CCEA's General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) in Music for this series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at www.ccea.org.uk

Contents

Component 1: Composing and Appraising (Controlled Assessment)	3
Component 2: Performing and Appraising (Controlled Assessment)	6
Component 3: Listening and Appraising Paper 1	9
Component 3: Listening and Appraising Paper 2	11
Contact details	15

GCSE MUSIC

Principal Moderator's Report

Component 1: Composing and Appraising (Controlled Assessment)

Overview of the Component

The new specification for Music requires candidates in this component, to create two contrasting compositions, one of which is to be related to the core or an optional Area of Study and maintain a composition log for each. This component is a controlled assessment task governing the setting, taking and marking of the task. It comprises 30% of the total marks available for the subject.

While the trend of continuing high standards in this component were maintained this year, there were less truly outstanding post-GCSE standard folios submitted. There was also a noticeable reduction in the number of folios in the Grade F–G boundary.

It is one of the stated aims of the GCSE Music examination, that it provides a suitable pre-requisite for progress to AS and A2 studies. The high standards exemplified by the highest attaining candidates has given them a strong foundation to develop higher level composing skills.

Congratulations for the time and effort taken by Centre staff in encouraging their candidates to neatly present their folios and provide a generally excellent quality of scores and CD's.

Recordings and scores

The use of notational software programs to provide scores continues with Sibelius (in many versions) used to present candidate work in a professional manner. The vast majority of centres included recordings of their compositions and scores. It is not, however, a requirement to submit recordings but their provision is a definite aid during moderation. In a small number of centres, the failure to adequately edit scores, sometimes led to a notation which confused, rather than clarified the compositional intent. In the weakest examples, candidates continued to choose 'software' instrumentation inappropriate to the acoustic range or timbral effects of acoustic instruments of the same name. The logs in many of these cases gave no indication as to why certain instrumentation had been chosen.

Success Criteria & Standard of Centre assessments

Assessments made by the overwhelming majority of centres continued to be accurate and correctly reflected the calibre of their candidates' work. It was interesting to note that there was a slight reduction in the number of centres reviewed at Post-Moderation. Those which did require adjustment to marks, highlighted major discrepancies in interpretation of agreed standards which, for those centres affected, should result in greater focus on the assessment criteria grids in the specification and attendance at Agreement Trial support events.

Analysis of centres represented at these events confirms that the overwhelming majority are accurately assessing this component.

Once again, Criteria (iii) was least well assessed, where high marks were often awarded for little or no evidence of secondary chords, effective cadences or added colour to the harmonic language as outlined in the criteria. The team are keen to emphasise that the use of a musical form such as, binary or twelve bar blues which have implied harmonic structure, is insufficient to gain full marks in this criteria.

The vast majority of folios presented were assessed by centres under Success Criteria A (where technology is not a core component). A very small number of centres used Success Criteria B, although in many cases this did not benefit candidates as there was insufficient evidence under Criteria (iv) to gain highest marks. A larger number of centres submitted folios where each composition was assessed under a different success criteria.

Overall, a slightly smaller number of centres had marks adjusted and in many cases this resulted from inconsistent marking in the centre, new staff marking for the first time and thus inexperienced in the application of the criteria or centres which had already received advice from previous years showing little improvement in internal standardisation. A number of centres had marks amended upwards this year. A considerable amount of time is spent in ensuring the TAC6s issued to centres are as affirming and positive as possible, celebrating good work, well assessed, authenticated and presented. Any constructive comments noted by the moderating team are designed to affect future in-centre planning and should not be ignored.

The quality of recordings submitted remains high and supports the knowledgeable use of in-house equipment, which is to be applauded. The moderation team must be sure that the candidate composition log **fully** explains the processes involved in these recordings. Recordings, however, must **not** give an added sophistication to the candidates' work, which has not been fully explained in accompanying logs or on the reverse of the Candidate Record Sheets.

The overwhelming majority of centres and candidates are to be congratulated on the manner in which they have managed the time constraints, authentication procedures and controlled assessment guidelines. Any centres who had submitted work which was not correctly authenticated had the work returned for this to be completed. This naturally delays the process of moderation. Centres submitting controlled assessments as part of consortium arrangements are on the increase and the internal standardisation protocols assume added significance.

Authentication Procedures & Composition Logs

The Composition log is an integral part of the composition process. Logs submitted mainly used the CCEA template (available on the CCEA Music microsite). For those centres who chose to provide their own templates and/or composition diaries, these were detailed, highly informative, well-documented and beautifully presented. There were some excellent examples of good classroom practice in the teaching of composition skills, effective self, peer and teacher evaluation and a refreshing transparency in the quality of teaching and learning in music departments throughout the province.

It is a clear requirement of this component that a Log is submitted for **each** composition, and that they are **authenticated** by teachers and candidates.

The specification states that teacher authentication should occur on **three** occasions during the life of each composition. The majority of staff completed the far right column of the log grid by a short progress update aligned to the pupil comment, along with a date and signature. This was by far the most accepted practice of authentication. It was disappointing to note, that despite guidance offered at Agreement Trials, a growing number of staff simply 'ticked' the box and initialled the pupil comment. While this fulfils the 'letter of the law', the moderation team consider it 'best practice' to include a short qualifying comment with each authentication.

Areas of Study

Repeated Patterns proved the most popular related area of study with *Vocal Music and Musical Traditions of Ireland* closely following behind. On the whole these were artistically handled by the majority of candidates.

Links to *Vocal Music* resulted in many well-structured, stylishly-developed and balanced rock/pop/urban songs with well-established references to the features expected. It was most encouraging to note the attention to detail paid by candidates in writing or researching appropriate texts. The moderation team did not encounter any inappropriate lyrics/subject matter.

There was a less programmatic element in the work of candidates in the *Musical Traditions in Ireland* Area of Study, but those who did choose this option were particularly effective. Traditional suites of Slow Airs, jigs, reels etc., were popular and a large number brought new insight to the often formulaic nature of Traditional Irish/Ulster-Scottish dance forms, adding new rhythmic intricacy and harmonic invention.

There was a marked decrease in the number of compositions submitted in *Incidental Music* option.

Musical Arrangements **no longer** exists as an area of study. The submission of arrangements of pre-existing melodies as compositions is not considered to offer candidates sufficient opportunities to achieve high marks. Such submissions from 2013 onwards will warrant major adjustment to marks awarded under Success Criteria A(i) and A(iii). Candidates are, however, still able to compose their own melodies and create musical arrangements of these.

Centres who use class-based compositional tasks as teaching tools clearly outlined individual outcomes showing differentiation between candidates and allowing creativity and freedom of choice. Larger number of candidates used the 'Free Composition' option. Centre staff are reminded that the specification does require two 'contrasting' compositions to be submitted.

Administration & Compliance with Specification

This year there were fewer arithmetical errors. There were, however, a much larger number of errors associated with transfer of marks from Candidate Record Sheets to the OMR sheets; the most common again being failure to cross the 'hundreds' box! Such errors would have seriously disadvantaged candidates had they gone undiscovered. Centre staff are requested to pay particular attention to totalling across the criteria, transferring marks from Candidate Record sheets to OMR and totalling down for the final folio mark.

Large numbers of unauthenticated work had to be returned to centres to ensure authentication compliance in this respect.

Centres are also reminded that, submissions to CCEA should include the work of the highest and lowest candidate, even if they have not been requested.

There is also a requirement to include the TAC2 form even in one-teacher centres.

Use of Technology

The use of technology in the composition, presentation, notation, editing and recording of work continues to increase year on year. There were fewer examples of work where candidates had not clearly indicated the use of the pre-programmed tracks/loops, downloaded files or material from media-sharing websites (e.g. YouTube).

Teacher assessments accurately reflected the original work of candidates in the vast majority of centres.

A smaller number of centres had submitted CDs which had been correctly formatted for audio playback and this is to be welcomed.

Conclusion

It is commendable that the high standards of last year have been maintained in 2014. Centre staff are further encouraged to continue their good work and focus on the areas of concern noted in this year's report. It is hoped that the fine work evidenced in the majority of centres continues and that candidates will continue to benefit from the high quality guidance and direction of their Music staff.

Chief Examiner's Report

Component 2: Performing and Appraising (Controlled Assessment)

We have, as in previous years, been delighted by the high standards and the exceptional ability of the candidates who enter the examination. This year was no exception. We should be proud to have so many young talented musicians growing up in our midst.

We extend our thanks once again to all the schools who participated in the examinations this year for their hospitality and efficient organisation of the examination within their schools which makes the work of the examiners so much more enjoyable and less stressful. Most schools provide us with a pre-prepared list of candidates and smoothly organise their progress through the examination process.

It is once again important to emphasise that examiners should not be examining more than 20 candidates in one day. Where an examiner has another school to visit on the same day every effort needs to be made to ensure their timetable in their first school allows them enough time to complete their first session and then move on to the next one.

After the arrangements for a visit have been finalised with the school by the visiting examiner and CCEA it cannot be altered.

It is important for schools to adhere to the starting time of examinations. Usually the approximate time of arrival given by the examiner is about ten minutes before they expect the examination to begin. These ten minutes give examiners time to meet the candidates, have a brief chat and get the necessary candidate forms completed.

It is not acceptable for an examiner to be kept waiting in the reception area or in a classroom while the candidates rehearse or the teacher is occupied with other business.

It should be noted that occasionally a candidate makes a false start to their performance and examiners are sympathetic to this and will allow a restart. However, once the performance has been completed no candidate may be permitted to replay their piece(s) as this would amount to a re-examination which is not allowed.

Teachers should note that the instruments side drum or Lambeg drum are not accepted as solo instruments in any part of the examination.

We noted again this year that some candidates choose to play pieces of a higher grade than the examination requires. This can often lead to mistakes being made in performance and as a result candidates losing valuable marks. Much better to use a slightly easier piece and play it perfectly.

We need to emphasise once again that teachers may not remain within the classroom during any part of the examination unless they are taking part as an accompanist.

On no account should any ensemble be conducted.

The Solo Performance

There were many outstanding performances again this year with a wide range of different instruments offered, both orchestral, traditional and Djing.

The number of singers continues to grow, many offering “songs from the shows” as their solo pieces. Care needs to be taken here as some such material often contains many pitfalls for vocalists, especially in vocal range and in tuning.

It was good to see most singers being able to sing without the aid of music, or behind a music stand, and after the two year period of the examination this should be so. It does enable to convey the “thoughts behind the words” of their songs to be communicated.

Backing tracks continue to be used and are effective if used carefully.

Piano accompaniments should be sympathetic and supportive and not too loud so that the candidate’s performance is not obscured.

We found again this year that too many candidates are presenting pieces which are too short. If the piece has not enough content it is impossible for an examiner to assess it properly and therefore the range of marks may be reduced. Performances less than 1 minute 30 seconds are not acceptable – as are those which last for more than 5 minutes.

Some candidates are still presenting more than one piece and this is fine provided the total length does not exceed five minutes. There is however a danger that one piece might be performed very well and the second one not quite as proficient, resulting in a lower mark than the candidate might have gained with one good piece.

We would ask that where teachers recommend a particular grade for a piece that they are sure that their grading is accurate. There were occasions this year where pieces were graded more highly than they warranted.

The Ensemble Performance

As in the Practical area of the examination, there was a wide range of fascinating ensembles offered. In many cases the standard was exceptionally high.

In most cases groups took time to set up the ensembles, though it should be noted that time to do this is not unlimited and if unchecked can prolong the examination session unduly.

Sound checks and balances are essential before performances begin and in general they are quickly and expertly done. However, it must be emphasised that there can be no manipulation of sound levels etc. during a performance except by the players themselves. It is *not* permitted for a sound engineer or teacher to do this in any way during a performance. Only the pupils who are performing should be in the room during the performance.

There are still too many ensembles which are a repeat of the solo performance – i.e.: soloist and accompanist. The ensemble element of the examination was introduced to encourage

candidates to work together in a musical situation, all contributing to a whole performance. It was always hoped that pupils would be encouraged to set up these ensembles themselves, and it is the pupil leading the ensemble who is assessed. Too often the “duo” is the candidate and the teacher accompanying and in these cases the teacher tends to lead so marking the candidate for this aspect of the ensemble is impossible.

It must be clear within an ensemble which pupil or pupils are being assessed, and what instrument or vocal part they are playing. It is vital that this information is correctly entered on the candidate’s examination sheet (ExA4) in case a re-mark is requested at a later date. An ensemble group should be at least two, three or four players but not so big that it is impossible for the examiner to assess the candidate(s) involved. Using a full band or orchestra is not acceptable for this reason.

Teachers must be careful that the part a candidate is taking within an ensemble is not being doubled by any other player. If this is discovered by the examiner the person doubling the candidate will be asked to leave the ensemble. If two or more candidates are being examined on the same instrument playing the same part then the ensemble will have to be repeated for each individual candidate to be examined.

It is recommended that backing tracks are not used in ensembles if possible as this tends to take the “lead” element away from the candidate being examined.

It is important that a candidate performing in an ensemble should make a substantial contribution to it, not just a few bars of solo music, or a few bars in duet within a mostly unison piece.

The Discussion

At this stage of the specification teachers should now be aware of the series of questions which examiners will ask during the discussion.

The discussion takes place immediately after the piece has been performed. This will be selected by the candidate and must be connected with one of the areas of study which the candidate has been following in class.

The discussion will be as relaxed as possible and start with a series of questions on the piece which the candidate has just performed. If possible the music of the piece should be available to the examiner to assist in the questioning. They must be able to link the piece to one of the areas of study and then briefly outline which other areas they studied and name a piece that appealed particularly to them. No two discussions are ever exactly the same but the basic outline above is at its core, and it is on the candidates responses, musical knowledge and technical detail that the assessments are made.

It is important that candidates know the correct titles of the Areas of Study – Repeated patterns/Musical Traditions in Ireland/Incidental Music and Vocal Music.

Care should be taken in linking pieces to these areas, in particular to “Incidental Music”. This is *not* “Programme Music” or “Music which tells a story”. It is music written specifically for Stage, Screen or Television and not orchestral or vocal pieces from Musicals or from other sources that may have been used as background music in films or Television drama.

We emphasise this point each year, and continue to do so as there is still a misconception in some schools as to the content of this area of study.

Examiners were full of praise for the high standards of music making they saw in our schools. We congratulate schools on the preparation for the examination and on the great work being done to further the musical and social education of pupils within our society.

Chief Examiner's Report

Component 3: Listening and Appraising

General Overview

Once again this year the two papers covered a selection of the Set Works and other pieces which gave opportunity for candidates to score well at different levels.

There was, as expected, a wide range of responses where candidates showed their aural and analytical skills. Too many are still relying on vague generalisations using 'buzz words' such as *sequence, homophonic, imitation, word painting, walking bass* etc., or the continual use of the phrase "the use of....." where in all cases the part of the text or music to which the word or phrase refers is not specified.

In the second paper where there are two questions in which the candidate is given a mark for the "Quality of written communication" (QWC), standards varied considerably, from some instances where it was almost impossible to decipher what the candidate was writing to clear well written, well-structured paragraphs with musical terms and composers names etc. with correct spelling. It is particularly important in this subject that any notation or figures are clear.

The identifying of instruments still remains a major stumbling block for many candidates and examiners felt this was a major factor when it came to losing marks on both papers.

Much time is devoted during the preparation of papers to make the rubric of each question as specific as possible. It is imperative, therefore, that candidates are taught to read each question carefully so that their answer can be focussed on what the examiners require.

Occasionally some candidates opted for a series of *bullet points* in these longer questions. This worked well when the points were well structured and referred to a specific part of the text or music. However, providing a list of musical terms or instruments with no reference to the text or music, is not acceptable.

Due to the allotted time allowed for Paper 2, it is always difficult to structure the paper in such a way as to give each candidate enough listening time and writing time.

This is a matter which is given particular attention during the writing of the paper each year, and the examiners reported that they found no evidence during the marking process that candidates were unable to write at length in any of the longer questions.

Too many candidates were unable to spell key words, including the names of the composers of the "set" works and the works themselves.

Examiners felt that in each paper all questions differentiated well, was accessible to all candidates and tested the whole range of ability.

Paper 1

Four questions tested candidates on two of their "set" pieces and two other pieces from different sources. The last question was once again based on the "Music Industry" and had no aural stimulus.

Q1 Jenkins: "Dies Irae" from "Requiem" – 1.04–2.17

The opening question was based on what seems to be one of the most popular and accessible of the set works.

- (a) (i) Based on a section of the piece which would have been very familiar to most candidates, it proved a good differentiation question. Most candidates gained at least two marks here and only the weaker candidates losing out on all four.
- (ii) The tonality was invariably correct but a large number missed out on the choice of key (**D** minor). This was disappointing as it was the tonic key of the work.
- (b) (i) An easier question where the majority of candidates scored full marks.
- (ii) This differentiated well though some candidates failed to concentrate on how the *relentless* effects were achieved. There was a generous mark scheme and those who read the question carefully gained full marks.
- (iii) The composers name was invariably correct.

Q2 Ravel: “Bolero” – 0.00–1.44

The first of the “unfamiliar music” questions.

- (a) (i) Most candidates did choose the correct time signature, but some failed to read the rubric correctly and circled it on the question rather than writing it on the score opposite. No candidate was penalised for this.
- (ii) Many correct answers here though some misinterpreted the rubric and added two extra bars of their own on the score. Some had an incorrect time signature but the bar lines in the correct places. There were however many correct responses here.
- (b) (i)&(ii) Some problems here, not all instruments were correctly identified.
- (c) (i) Many correct answers but some did not read the rubric correctly and wrote “plucked” instead of the Italian term which was requested.
- (ii) Again, the answer was “Legato” and some lost marks by giving English terms.
- (d) (i)&(ii) As in Part (b) marks were lost where candidates were unable to recognise instruments.

Q3 Beethoven: “Symphony No 7 – Allegretto” – 6.44–7.38

The second “Set work” question which produced a wide variety of responses.

- (a) (i)&(ii) Few candidates had full marks in both parts of this question. Some missing out by incorrectly naming the sections of the orchestra, the cadence or the keys involved.
- (b) (i)&(ii) It was surprising in a set work for so many not to know that the piece is “in 2” and not “in 4”. Many lost marks here on this question. In Part (ii) few knew the names of the two brass instruments in the score, many naming instruments from other sections of the orchestra. Trombone was the brass instrument most often suggested.
- (c) Marks lost here by those who described the music leading up to the chord rather than the chord itself. There was a generous mark scheme and many candidates did well here.

- (d) For most this was a chance to pick up four marks – though not all managed to do this. Identifying the coda/end of the piece was a stumbling block for many.

Q4 Lloyd Webber: “Potipher's Song” from “Joseph and the Amazing Technicolour Dreamcoat” – 0.00–1.58

Another “unfamiliar” piece although many candidates may have heard it before or performed in the musical.

- (a) (i)&(ii) A good discriminating question and a large majority managed to pick the correct answer here – there were a variety of responses for the instrument at Part (ii) and both tuba and euphonium were accepted.
- (b) (i) Not all recognised the wood block; cow bell was quite often suggested.
(ii) As pointed out already the weakness in recognising instruments was apparent here as fewer than expected named the instruments correctly.
- (c) Both parts were fairly well answered.

- Q5** In general, all candidates scored well, particularly those who had found other questions difficult managed to pick up marks here. All questions were well answered and the mark scheme gave a wide scope for candidates to score highly.

Paper 2

This section of the examination contains three optional topics from which candidates must choose two, answering six questions in all. Two questions in each section are on the set works for that area and the third, a longer question which has extended writing, is based on a piece of unseen music. There are 15 marks for the third question, 3 of which are given for the Quality of Written Communication.

Option 1 Musical Traditions in Ireland

Q1 De Danaan: “Teetotaller/St Anne” – 0.00–1.05

- (a) (i) Mostly correct answers here, though there were many other possible titles offered.
(ii) The fiddle/violin was invariably correct.
(iii) The bouzouki was not always the answer selected.
- (b) (i) A variety of answers again, but a majority were correct, though many candidates confused “spoons” with “bones”.
(ii) Good answers here. The time signature was usually correct.

Miller's Hill Accordion Band: “Steadfast and True” – 2.20-3.26

- (c) (i)–(ii) Not everyone named the group correctly and there were incorrect answers when naming the piece.
(iii) Mostly correct but too often “drum” was given as an answer, which always needs to be qualified to receive a mark.
- (d) Both parts were well answered.

Q2 Wheelan: “Riverdance” from “Riverdance – the show” – 0.00–1.40

- (a) (i) A generous mark scheme here but not all gained the two marks. Many failed to recognise the synthesised string sound.
- (ii) Not everyone recognised the soprano voice – too often referred to as alto, or occasionally tenor.
- (b) (i) Too many gave “choir” as the answer which was non-specific.
- (ii) Homophonic was invariably correct.
- (c) (i) Too many different answers here - not all getting a mark.
- (ii) A generous mark scheme here and scope for candidates to score highly. Too many failed to concentrate on the vocal part, a case for emphasising how important it is to read the rubric. However the most able candidates scored highly and the question did discriminate well.
- (d) Well answered, occasionally some candidates failed to name the singing group correctly.

Q3 Shaun Davey: “Granuale” – 1.47–4.00

There was a lot to write about here, and most candidates had little difficulty filling the page with information.

Very many scored highly in this question which had a generous mark scheme.

Quite a few misnamed the glockenspiel as a xylophone in Part (a) and the tin whistle was frequently mistaken for the flute in Part (a) and vice versa in Part (b).

There is always an opportunity in these final questions for weaker candidates to score when they may have found the other questions too difficult. Many did so.

Option 2 Option 2 Incidental Music for Stage, Screen and Television

Q4 Zimmer: “Davy Jones Theme” from “Pirates of the Caribbean” – 1.14–2.28

- (a) (i)& (ii) Well answered opening questions.
- (b) (i) This was much more testing and it differentiated well giving the candidates an opportunity to show their knowledge of this popular set work. Many missed the point having been asked how the feeling of excitement is portrayed in the orchestra giving too many vague references to instruments without actually saying how they were contributing to the excitement and suspense which was at the heart of the question.
- (ii) Too many missed out on the three marks by not looking carefully at how the answer was structured on the paper. The two parts of the title were required.

Q5 Grieg: “Peer Gynt” suite – “In the Hall of the Mountain King” – 0.00–2.04

Another of the popular set pieces, but unfortunately did not produce many full mark answers.

- (a) (i) The first bar contained only one note. There were six available comments in the mark scheme yet a large percentage of candidates failed to mention two correct answers.
- (ii)& (iii) The bassoon was frequently missed but most made the correct choice at Part (iii).
- (b) (i)& (ii) Most candidates managed to score well here.
- (c) Disappointing answers here with a very generous mark scheme, many candidates seemed to have difficulty focussing on the sequence of events in the final moments of the piece often writing in a vague mix of unrelated comments. This is a set work and a popular one too – so it was very disappointing to see how some candidates seemed to struggle to cope with describing the final bars of the piece.

Q6 Bizet: Overture - “L'Arlesienne Suite No. 1”

Theme: 0.00–0.32, Variation 1: 1.12–1.36, Variation 2: 1.37–2.21

Answers to this question were disappointing with many candidates describing the theme and not concentrating on the two variations which were clearly marked on the question paper with space for each description. Each variation was very different to the original theme – the first very fast with a pronounced side drum part, the second very slow and quiet in a major key with cello solo, horn accompaniment and a quick staccato counter melody on the bassoon.

There was a lot to write about and it was disappointing that many candidates failed to score high marks here.

The inability to recognise instruments was again obvious here. So few were able to name the horns, cello melody and bassoon accompaniment in the second variation; most relying on calling it strings and brass accompaniment. As mentioned earlier in this report, the recognition of instruments is an area in which candidates need a great deal of practice.

As in the other extended questions most were scoring two out of three for QWC.

Option 3 Vocal Music

Q7 Handel: Aria – “Why Do the Nations” from “Messiah” 2.03–2.43

- (a) (i) A majority of candidates referred to this singer as a Tenor despite the fact that this is a set work.
- (ii) Most however chose the correct term (Allegro) here.
- (b) (i) Misreading of the rubric lost candidates marks here – they were asked for “words” not “word” and too many wrote down the word “rise” or just the word “up” rather than giving both words.
- (c) (i)& (ii) Both quite often received exactly the same incorrect answer with few mentioning that in Part (ii) the word was “decorated” – a traditional trait in arias of the period.
- (iii) The final cadence was invariably correct.

- (d) Most answers were correct, the venue (Dublin) not always so – many English and continental cities were named as well as the “City of David” many times.

Q8 Schwartz: “One Short Day” from “Wicked” – 2.09–3.02

- (a) This question which asked candidates to match a musical phrase to part of the given text, proved, as expected, to be a good discriminator. It produced a good spread of marks covering the whole spectrum of ability.
- (b) (i) This was not well answered, there was a generous mark scheme but many failed to identify the men's counter melody – “Wizomania” theme – and which lines were in harmony and which in unison.
- (ii) This was well answered, most recognising the repetition of the singers music by the orchestra.
- (iii) An easier question which almost all answered correctly.
- (c) The spoken line was identified by most though some had difficulty locating it between “short” and “day”.
- (d) It was surprising how many failed to identify this as a “Musical”. Many referred to this as a “Play” and some an “Opera”,

Q9 Westlife: “Fly Me to the Moon” – 0.00–1.47

This question was well answered and many received full marks for identifying the content of the vocal sections and accompaniment, and the instrumental section too. There was a lot to write about here and there was no sense that candidates did not have enough time to complete the question satisfactorily.

Once again the QWC element produced a variety of marks as the standard of written communication varied within the candidature.

Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- Specification Support Officer: Nola Fitzsimons
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension 2235, email: nfitzsimons@ccea.org.uk)
- Officer with Subject Responsibility: Teresa Livingstone
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension 2296, email: tlivingstone@ccea.org.uk)