

CCEA GCSE Music
Summer Series 2017

Chief Examiner's Report 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)	5
Component 3:	Listening and Appraising	8
Contact details		16

GCSE MUSIC

Principal Moderator's Report

Component 1 Composing and Appraising (Controlled Assessment)

Overview of the Component

The GCSE Music specification 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 present 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.

Overall Trend

Once again, the standard of this component has remained high this year. Two particular trends are noticeable:

- considerably fewer exceptional portfolios submitted; and
- further reduction in very weak submissions.

Significantly, this resulted in a large 'bunching' of compositions in the Grade C/D boundary mark range.

It can be confidently stated, given the evidence from this series, that the composition component continues to be a suitable pre-requisite for progress to AS and A2 compositional studies.

Congratulations for the significant amount of time and effort taken by centre staff in continuing to encourage their candidates to neatly present their folios and provide a, generally excellent, quality of scores and CD's.

Recordings and scores

The use of music software programs continues with a very high degree of dexterity. The vast majority of centres included recordings of their compositions, though a significant drop in number of scores was noted.

The weakest examples highlighted candidates' poor choice of 'software' instrumentation which was inappropriate to the acoustic range or timbral effects of acoustic instruments of the same name. In such cases, candidate logs did not clarify the rationale for the choice of instrument. I reiterate that this is an element where a class-based 'research' activity on instrumentation would be beneficial.

Success Criteria & Standard of Centre assessments

Assessments made by the majority of centres were accurate and rewarded the candidates. 18 centres were reviewed this year at Post Moderation. Those which did require adjustment to marks showed major discrepancies in interpretation of agreed standards. Focus on the assessment criteria grids in the specification and attendance at Agreement Trial support events have resulted in greater accuracy in assessments from centres.

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 changes in the assessment of harmonic language in the Revised

Specification is a welcomed opportunity for this component to be more accurately assessed in the future.

Success Criteria A (where technology does is not a core component) were the most common assessment criteria with only a very small number of centres exclusively using Success Criteria B. There were a greater number of folios where each composition was assessed under different success criteria. Strong evidence under Success Criteria B (iv) is required to gain highest marks here.

Half of the centres presented at Post Moderation had marks adjusted. It is important to note that a lot 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 moderator team are designed to affect future in-centre planning and should be taken on board.

A further marked increase in the quality of recordings submitted suggests the frequent and 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. The Summer 2017 series witnessed fewer examples of “unexplained” content.

The overwhelming majority of centres and candidates are to be congratulated on the manner in which time constraints, authentication procedures and controlled assessment guidelines have been managed. **Any centres submitting non-authenticated work had their submissions returned to ensure compliance.**

Centres submitting controlled assessments as part of consortium arrangements continue to increase.

Authentication procedures & Composition Logs

The Composition log is an integral part of the composition process. Logs submitted used the CCEA template in the main (available on the CCEA Music micro site). 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. It has been most encouraging to witness the decline of “sign only” authentication by staff, with the vast majority providing effective feedback for learning during the life of the compositions.

Areas of Study

Repeated Patterns again proved the most popular related area of study with *Vocal Music* and *Musical Traditions in Ireland* closely following behind.

Links to *Vocal Music* resulted in many well-structured, stylishly-developed and balanced rock/pop/urban songs with thought-provoking lyrics.

There was a marked reduction in the number of compositions in the *Incidental Music*.

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,

sub-planting new rhythmic intricacy and harmonic invention. The moderation team would remind centres that larger instrumental participation should not be interpreted or marked as 'developmental' unless it increases the number of independent melodic/rhythmic lines or adds to the textural/timbral complexity of the composition.

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

Administration & Compliance with Specification

This year there were much fewer arithmetic errors and fewer associated with transfer of marks from Candidate Record Sheets to the OMR sheets. 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 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 and the TAC2 form of Internal Standardisation, even in one-teacher centres.

Use of Technology

It is most encouraging to note the further increase in the technical knowledge shown by candidates in handling a wide range of school and home based media.

Candidates, for the most part, clearly indicated the use of the pre-programmed tracks/loops, downloaded files or material from media-sharing websites (e.g. YouTube) and teacher assessments accurately reflected the original work of candidates. A significant number of centres had submitted CD's which had not been correctly formatted for audio playback.

Conclusion

As the current specification comes to its end, it is hoped that the high standard of the composition component will be maintained and centre staff will continue their good work and focus on the areas of concern noted in this year's report. It is our hope that candidates will continue to benefit from the high quality guidance and direction of their Music staff.

I am encouraged by the positive response to the assessment criteria for the new specification and hope that centre staff will avail of support events during the Autumn term.

Centres are encouraged to avail of the Portfolio Clinic service to ensure they are on the right track.

Chief Examiner's Report

Component 2 Performing and Appraising

Throughout the past year we have been tremendously encouraged by the wealth and variety of musical talent being nurtured by motivated, caring and inspiring teachers. We extend our thanks to all schools who participated in the examinations, urging their students to attain their highest standards not only in their musicianship but in their organization, presentation and friendly hospitality which was evident to the team of examiners who visited the centres across the country.

By gathering together all the efforts of the students we have distilled some information and suggestions, which we urge all teachers to read carefully and to correct any problems that might still reoccur in their centre.

Examiners contact their schools early to arrange dates and times of arrival. It would be appreciated that only in a genuine emergency should a centre seek to change these arrangements. There were a significant number of examinations that had to be rescheduled this year, and we pay tribute to our colleagues who were able to accommodate these for the candidates concerned.

There is quite a variety of expectations between centres for the speed at which an examiner is expected to carry out their work. Some examiners reported feeling rushed without sufficient time to consider and carefully complete the Candidate Assessment Form (ExA4), while others were left waiting for lengthy periods of time either upon arrival at a centre or between candidates. Examiners should not normally be asked to examine more than 18 candidates in one day, spread over the day with an appropriate break for lunch. In many cases an examiner will have to visit two schools on the same day, so it is vital that the first school be well organised. Any centres who are in any doubt are encouraged to check their proposed schedule of times and candidates with the examiner prior to their arrival. Examiners will usually plan to arrive in time to greet pupils and after about 10 minutes begin their examinations. It is most important then that the session begins promptly.

There were very few performances offered below a grade 3 standard but there was, once again this year, a significant number of candidates who opted to perform at a higher level. This opened the way for more errors to be made with the demands on the performer being greater; therefore, the assessment criteria was not reaching the level it could have if a less demanding piece been performed.

It is best practice for those preparing candidates for the examination to be fully aware of the assessment criteria at an early stage in order to help them choose an appropriate piece to perform which will allow them to access all the marks. If a candidate makes a “false start” to their performance it is quite acceptable for them to start again. However, once the performance is over, the candidate will not be allowed to repeat the piece again.

Although a circular (*Cir.S/IF/18/17 : March 2017*) was distributed in the months prior to the examination season, there were a number of centres that did not fully comply with the guidelines on the use of technology. The use of mobile phones, pen drives or other devices connected to the internet are strictly prohibited and may result in the candidate being investigated for malpractice. This includes the playing of backing tracks or reading music and lyrics from such devices.

There was an excellent standard of accompaniment provided by teachers and other musicians but a significant number of these were too dominant in the performance, often drowning out a singer, altering the balance of an ensemble or, by default, leading the ensemble.

Solo Performance

There were many well-prepared, outstanding solo performances this year on a wide variety of musical instruments.

The duration of some performances was less than one minute as is often the case with some grade examination pieces. Although the overall duration is considered as a combination of both performances, please note that there must be enough content to enable examiners to make an accurate assessment and for candidates to access the maximum number of marks available to them. There were also several individual performances that lasted over seven minutes. It is expected that after a two-year preparation period, performances should last at least one and a half minutes minimum but not over five minutes.

Some centres encouraged candidates to present two pieces for solo performance. This was unnecessary and sometimes a variance in degree of difficulty or level of performance led to a lower mark being achieved as well as lengthening the examination day.

There was an increase in the number of vocal performances being presented particularly in the Musical Theatre and Pop genres. It is essential that the technical requirements of these songs over the classical and folk styles should not be underestimated as was particularly evident in the lower range of the voice. It was also notable that a number of candidates discussed the use of 'belting' and alluding to loss of voice and nodules as being challenges to learning the repertoire. There were many excellent performances achieved, but there were also performances that focused on imitating a performer rather than giving consideration to phrasing, tone and articulation.

It is important that singers do not use music or text copies, or hide behind a music stand when presenting their songs as it detracts from the important communication between soloist and listener.

The candidates should be able to enjoy a significantly different experience from performing a solo to being part of an ensemble, but some centres presented solo performances in a similar way to ensemble performances and vice versa. The accompaniment for solos should be minimum without a focus on ensemble and within an ensemble the focus should be on the performance achieved by working together with others.

We expect teachers to indicate the grade level of the pieces presented by their candidates.

Ensemble Performance

Similarly to the solo performances, there was a wide variety of interesting and enjoyable ensembles presented from vocal quartets, jazz and swing ensembles, traditional groups, rock groups and duetting instrumentalists. Teachers are reminded that ensembles must consist of at least two live musicians performing undoubled, independent parts that are played simultaneously (*Cir.S/IF/50/11 : March 2011*). While there will be occasions in a performance where a part may be doubled, particularly in Irish Traditional Groups, it should be ensured that the candidate being assessed has opportunity to take a solo part exemplifying the level of performance they are capable of during any given performance (*Cir.S/IF/15/15 : March 2015*). Should an examiner discover that another player is doubling a candidate's part, that player will not be permitted to remain in the ensemble during the examination. Under no circumstances should the ensemble be conducted.

It is hoped that candidates themselves will set these ensembles up, with teacher guidance, and then practise together in preparation for the examination. A repeat of the solo style performance with candidate and accompanist is not a true ensemble in the spirit of the specification and it is often the case that when a pupil performs with a teacher accompanist as an ensemble, the teacher invariably "leads". The candidate will find it difficult to be awarded marks if they are not "in charge" of the performance. If a soloist performs with an accompanist (eg. Guitar or Piano), it is permissible for the accompanist to use this performance for their ensemble performance assessment, but not for the soloist.

We must stress that setting up ensembles should be as quick and easy affair, well rehearsed beforehand with all necessary instruments tuned and all equipment to hand. Checking of sound levels is expected before starting and time can be allowed for this. The teacher or sound technician is allowed to stay in the room during the performance, but there must be no manipulating of sound levels by them during the performance. This was done very efficiently in many centres with everything prepared in advance of the examiner's arrival, however in some centres this resulted in lengthy delays while groups were set up from scratch.

It is vital that teachers and pupils check that on their Exa4 form that the instrument being examined is clearly defined and easily distinguished from the other members of the group if played back in recording. If this is not done then it impossible for that part of the examination to be remarked at a later date should a remark be requested.

Most ensembles tended to have small numbers meaning that a candidate's contribution was easily identifiable and candidates also realised that they didn't need to be the prominent instrument to be examined successfully. Occasionally a centre would produce a large ensemble and this makes it more difficult to fairly assess the candidate's contribution to the overall ensemble and also to ensure that their part is independent.

The Discussion (Viva)

No two discussions are ever the same, but they do follow a recognizable structure and as the series and sequence of questions has been established for many years, teachers and candidates should all be aware of what will be asked. The conversation on the learning process demonstrated that often pupils seem to be unaware of either what they have done to get to their performance or what and why their teachers are teaching them the way they do. It was not always clear that candidates understood what was expected from this question.

The piece being discussed must be connected to one of the Areas of Study. These tended to be well recognized, but often lacked the necessary detail to access the top marks. Some links were rather tenuous or superficial, particularly with Repeated Patterns, and Vocal Music was often not developed more than recognizing that "it is a song".

The discussion should take place immediately after the relevant performance and, although it should be a conversation without any notes, the candidate is encouraged to use a score or their instrument to aid their discussion and point out details. If possible the music used by the candidate should be given to the examiner before the discussion begins so that it can be a focus for the initial questioning.

All the examiners report how much they enjoy the experience of visiting schools, meeting fellow teacher-musicians and comment on the very high standards of professionalism and passion for the subject. We thank the schools once again for this.

Component 3 Listening and Appraising

General Overview

The papers contained a wide range of questions which discriminated over the whole range of ability, providing easily accessible questions throughout and also some more testing questions which effectively differentiated between candidates. The questions within the papers, reflected the depth and breadth of the Areas of Study, as well as providing some on unknown pieces of music which tested candidate's abilities to apply their knowledge and analytical skills gained throughout the course. The examining teams agreed that the questions discriminated well and all were within the scope of the specification.

A great deal of planning and thought goes into the wording of the rubrics in each question to ensure their accessibility to all. Therefore the candidates need to learn how to read these carefully and work out exactly what answers are being expected. There is no attempt to "trick" candidates with confusing rubric.

The following characteristics of this series' Listening and Appraising papers were evident:

- 1 There were many instances where candidates demonstrated their ability to listen and analyse what they heard. However, there were still too many who relied on vague general comments such as *imitation, sequence, walking bass, harmony, word painting* etc., and continuing to use the phrase "*the use of*" without indicating the part of the music they are referring to. This was particularly frustrating when text/lyrics with line numbers were included as 'signposts' for candidates to refer to.

- 2 The identification of instruments continues to be problematic again this year. Candidates find difficulty in distinguishing between the four main instruments of the brass family and often wrote “strings” when asked to identify specific instruments from this family.
- 3 The term “drum” is still unacceptable – this *must* be qualified as to which type of drum is being mentioned. Within a drum kit there are several instruments, the collective title will not do, candidates must specify which piece of equipment they mean.
- 4 The legibility of answers was much better in this series with candidates taking more care to ensure their answers are readable. This was especially so in Paper 2, Questions 3, 6 and 9. Regrettably valuable QWC marks were lost with the incorrect spelling of key musical terms.
- 5 As mentioned above, it is important in these longer questions that candidates link their comments to specific points/lines/words in the text or music.
- 6 Lists of unconnected words or phrases will not gain marks. E.g. “a string instrument plays” will not high marks. Conversely, “the violin plays arpeggios at the end of line 6” clearly identifies the instrument playing as well as what and where it is playing it.

Readability

The papers presented no problems in this area and were accessible to candidates.

Mark Schemes

The mark schemes were extremely comprehensive and accessible, covering all possibilities with an appropriate range and allocation of marks.

The Papers

Paper 1: Repeated Patterns in Music

There were five questions again this year, two based on the set works and two on unfamiliar music. The last question was one requiring more extended answers based on the Music Industry.

Q1 Beethoven: Symphony No 7 Allegretto 3.57–5.11 – Set Work

The opening question was an accessible one focusing on the later part of the work. The mix of memory recall, contextual detail and more in depth aural analysis ensured accessibility for all candidates, and allowed sufficient differentiation .

- (a) (i) This was well answered as the majority of candidates accurately noting flute, oboe or bassoon. It was disappointing, however, that too many mentioned the use of clarinet.
- (ii) The rubric clearly focused candidates’ attention to describe the staccato downward triplet quavers and not the legato melody as a whole. The addition of the score of the melody line appears to have offered the majority of candidates a visual and aural prompt.
- (b) (i) Well identified as the woodwind section played the melody in octaves.
- (ii) Again well answered as cello and bass.
- (c) This was a more challenging question which gained at least half of the marks for the majority of candidates. The examining team collectively felt that the tonal ambiguity of the extract and misleading guidance notes could have posed problematic for some candidates. Trumpet and timpani were the only two possible answers for the pedal, but the mark scheme allowed for A minor, D minor or A major.

- (d) Most knew the source of the music, although the contextual information required for the location of the first performance was frequently wrong. The correct answer was Vienna.

Q2 Haydn: Symphony No. 94 in G minor, second movement opening.

The first of the “unfamiliar music” questions.

- (a) (i) There was a very wide range of possible answers here and the majority of Candidates who remembered the repeated patterns focus of this paper, did answer well.
Answers noting the rising arpeggio, tonic/triadic or broken chord, the upper strings/violin melody and the quiet dynamic gained the marks.
- (ii) This was a musical theory question which was well answered. (2/4 time)
- (iii) C major.
- (b) (i) It was surprising to the team that the andante tempo was not better identified. Most common error was adagio.
- (ii) This was poorly answered. Too many candidates who spotted the repeated patterns failed to identify **what** they were – melodic/rhythmic/harmonic. The phrase ‘repeated patterns’ by itself, was insufficient.
- (iii) Marks were lost here by not reading the rubric which required an **italian** term.
- (c) (i) Good answers here. Majority recognising G or dominant major modulation
- (ii) Fortissimo only accepted answer
- (iii) It was encouraging how many candidates correctly identified the Classical era. This is the first time for a number of years that this era formed part of an unknown extract question.

Q3 Jenkins: Requiem, “Dies Irae”; 0.00–0.48; Set Work

Another question on a set work and the best answered question of the whole paper.

- (a) (i) This ‘prose-style’ sequential question seems to work well for the majority of candidates especially if it gives clear aural signposts. ‘Ostinato’ was well identified, but it was highly frustrating that the majority of candidates failed to hear that the bass drum plays- not timpani. As the most clearly identifiable ostinato of all the set works, misidentification was most disappointing. The tam tam or Gong was also frequently missed. The ostinato playings (4) were well identified.
- (ii) Although a more demanding aural perception question, it was not difficult to identify only 2 different pitches in the Soprano line.
- (iii) Identification of texture, whether instrumental, vocal or choral is a serious shortcoming which has been noted in previous reports. Little has changed this year to suggest there is any improvement in candidates being able to correctly the major differences. This is all the more significant when the question refers to a set work studied for two years!
- (iv) Vocal texture changing to unison or one note were both acceptable answers.
- (b) (i) Best answered part of this question. 4/4 or Common time.
- (ii) Again well answered. D minor.
- (iii) SATB or four part choir acceptable. “Mixed” is insufficient.

- (c) Most knew who the composer was though missed out on gaining the full 2 marks by not giving the name of the **work** from which the “Dies Irae” comes. Jenkin’s “Requiem” were only acceptable answers.

Q4 Yestan: Titanic: A New Musical; “Hymn and Doing the latest Rag”; 0.00–2.00

The choice of this song from a relatively new musical, appears at the outset, a strange choice for an unseen question in a Repeated Patterns-focused question paper. Its strophic form, repeating melodic motifs combined with interesting and contrasting textures and timbres, offered wide opportunity for differentiation. The layout and rubric of the question was also significant. Numbered responses allowed for the majority of candidates to gain marks.

The large amount of text was required to signpost candidates to the repeating melodic figures.

Some candidates, however, misapplied their answers to the wrong line numbers.

As the mark scheme was extensive for each part of this question, comments which related to time signature or tonality were only rewarded **once**.

Valuable marks were thrown away by candidates who made sweeping or generalised statements which were not related to words or lines of text. Much work needs to be done to ensure candidates have the analytical skills to maximise their potential for marks in this type of question.

- (a) (i) Answers which focused on the homophonic choral texture, major tonality, string accompaniment, instrumental doubling of the melodic line, original tempo and subsequent changes, plus any interesting vocal or instrumental additions which were signposted to the relevant line numbers.
- (ii) The change of tempo and style were the most obvious factors in lines 6–8, and marks were awarded for correctly noting the syncopated rhythms, additional woodblock percussion, male soloists and how the word “Yes” was sung/shouted in unison by everyone.
- (b) (i) A myriad of correct answers were valid for these later lines 27–30. These included the contrapuntal texture with contrasting vocal male/female lines, examples of sequence, repeated musical lines, changes on the word “dare” and the higher pitch of lines 29–30.
- (ii) Many opportunities were missed in this section of the question by non-specific generalities. The jazz style trumpet melody with closed-hit-hat off beat accompaniment, pizzicato bass, tonic/dominant bass line, sequential repetition and repeated melodic fragments were all rewarded.

Q5 The question on the Music Industry – this year focusing on the multi-million pound musical theatre business. This question traditionally gives opportunities for all candidates to score well and this was the case again this year.

That being said the number of candidates scoring full marks here was lower than expected. Continuing a move away from what might turn into an English Comprehension test, the initial questions required a greater depth of understanding. The questions produced many and varying correct answers.

- (a) Too many tried to lift their answer word for word out of the opening statement about the cost of staging musicals in London without explaining why. This was a pity as we expected answers, brief and to the point in the candidates’ own words focusing on the costs of venue hire, performers’ fees, staging, lighting, sound, props costumes, merchandising and publicity/marketing.

- (b) This was well answered and showed a good insight into career opportunities related to musical theatre in technical, administration and production areas.
- (c) This was surprisingly poorly answered as too many candidates failed to indicate that performing rights gave permission, usually upon payment of a fee, to perform the work. So many suggested that these were the rights of the performers when on stage.
- (d) Well answered; the person who writes the words to songs used.
- (e) A good finishing question which gained well for almost all candidates. Odyseye/SSE Arena and Grand Opera House were most common answers.

Paper 2

Section 1: Musical Traditions of Ireland

Q1 The Chieftains: “Carrickfergus”, 0.00–2.43

There were good answers in this question with majority of candidates gaining well. Section (c) was least well answered.

- (a) (i)& Most candidates correctly the (Irish) harp and the slow air melody.
(ii)
- (b) (i)& Since the start of this specification we have emphasised the need to specify
(ii) **which** pipes play in traditional music extracts. Thus “pipes” by itself was insufficient. Only Uilleann acceptable, joined by fiddle and tin whistle. All in the key of D Major.
- (c) This was a good opportunity to gain 5 marks. It was disappointing, however, to see how many marks were squandered by using “buzz words” and phrases without aligning them to the instrument playing or the musical technique being employed. The rubric “describe” insufficient. Comments on the structure, unison melody, arpeggio harp accompaniment, ornamentation, changes happening in the repeats of the melody and recognising cadences were all rewarded.
- (d) Universally recognised as “The Chieftains”.

Q2 Miller’s Hill Accordion Band: “Steadfast and true”: 0.00–1.43

- (a) (i) A significant number of candidates failed to read the rubric which focused their attention to the **introduction** and also the need to fully **describe** what they heard rather than give lists. The examining team recognised that the very loud dynamic was quite a distinguishing factor. The C major arpeggio played by accordions with snare drum accompaniment with changing articulation in the first four notes were all valid points.
(ii)& Well identified as a March in 4/4 (Common) time.
(iii)
- (b) Failure to fully describe or contextualise comments lost marks. Candidates who noted the new melody with similar rhythmic accompaniment, accordians echoing each other, a steady bass drum beat in each bar with side drum off beat accompaniment including rolls, were all rewarded.
- (c) This was disappointingly with too many candidates incorrectly or not completely identifying the extract and/or the performers. “Steadfast & True” by the Miller’s Hill Accordion (Band) were the only permissible answers.

Q3 “Spanish Lady” from “Celtic Women”: 0.00–1.13

The very extensive mark scheme allowed all candidates to achieve. The best responses correctly noted the themes, structure, and instrumentation in a clearly structured manner. Other responses were more haphazard in their organisation, mixing up comments on verses, choruses and interlude, but candidates were rewarded nonetheless. The identification of the correct instruments continues to be a key weakness in these more extended writing-style questions.

Candidates should not think that unconnected comments about ‘loud’, ‘fast’ etc., will be credited.

Twelve valid points were sought as QWC accounted for a further three.

Section 2: Incidental Music for Stage, Screen and Television**Q4 Mendelssohn: ‘Overture’ from “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”; 10.09–11.58**

- (a) (i) Only a minority failed to recognise this section from the coda.
- (ii) Well answered. The inclusion of oboes was most common error.
- (b) (i) Surprisingly, the “Court” theme was frequently misidentified. For those who correctly identified it, the remainder of marks appeared to follow. The team felt that candidates should also be rewarded for identifying that not only was the theme played in octaves or augmentation but also was in E major.
- (ii) Once again, valuable marks were lost with musical terminology poorly signposted. This concluding section allowed for effective differentiation in responses, but the best answers focused on the dynamic, instrumentation, repeat of the four chords, timpani roll and sustained last chord.

Q5 Extract A: Zimmer: ‘Davy Jones Theme’ from “Pirates of the Caribbean: Dead Man’s Chest”; 0.00–1.11

This was the best answered question of this section of the paper.

- (a) (i) A very accessible opening to the question allowing most candidates to gain 2 marks. Still surprisingly that a small number do not know the full title of one of their set works after two years study.
- (ii) Davy Jones or Music box theme were accepted.

Extract B: Grieg: ‘Morning’ from Peer Gynt Suite, 0.00–0.51

- (b) (i)& Composer and flute and oboe were identified by majority.
- (ii)
- (iii) This was poorly answered. The specification indicates the need for candidates to be aware of the context and historical background to their set works. This is nowhere more important than in this Area of Study relating to music inspired by literature, stage, screen and television.

Extract C: Grieg: ‘In the Hall of the Mountain King’ from Peer Gynt Suite; 0.00–1.10

- (c) (i)– Name of extract and instrumentation/articulation well answered.
- (iii)

Q6 Newley/Bricusse/Barry: “Goldfinger”, 0.00–1.32

Again the very extensive mark scheme allowed all candidates to achieve. The best responses correctly noted the main thematic, instrumental and rhythmic motifs of the introduction and together with the many idiomatic vocal techniques employed by

the iconic Shirley Bassey. The inclusion of the text was given to enable candidates to signpost their comments to lines or words within lines. Weaker answers with unqualified, unspecific instrumentation or general comments about tempo and dynamics ‘wasted’ vital marks. There was greater analytical detail evident in this question. The alignment of the song to the Bond movie franchise was not lost on many candidates and it was particularly pleasing when candidates gave a musical analysis of the memorable “Bond” chromatic motif.

Twelve valid points were sought as QWC accounted for a further three.

Section 3: Vocal Music

Q7 Handel: “There were shepherds” from Messiah, 0.00–0.32

- (a) (i) Very few incorrect answers here. Soprano voice only acceptable answer.
- (ii) Continuo was the expected answer but it was felt that candidates who mentioned the sparse or sustained accompaniment should be rewarded.
- (b) (i) The rubric asked for a description of the upper part of the accompaniment which related only to the rising semiquaver arpeggio figures in the violins/ upper strings.
- (ii) Well answered as andante.
- (c) (i) It was most pleasing to see how well this had been answered with equal numbers of English and Italian terms used. Additionally *accompagnato* was permitted for Lines 3–5.
- (ii) Universally correctly identified as a perfect cadence.
- (d) Good answers here for the last two questions. Less good identification of Part 1 of the oratorio.

Q8 Schwartz: “One short day” from Wicked, 0.00–1.35

- (a) (i) An accessible opener to this question. Both lines 1 & 3 were required to gain the mark.
- (ii) Some interesting alternatives here. Harp was the only correct answer.
- (b) (i) The signposting in the question rubric was missed by many as they focused on the music of line 4 or line 5 and avoided describing the music between them. The *accelerando*, *crescendo*, added instrumentation and repeat of “One short day” motif, were the most recognised elements. Once again the extensive mark scheme rewarded variants of these key features.
- (ii) The female voices alternating the text in an antiphonal or call and response style was often missed.
- (c) (i) Singing in 3rds was recognised by majority.
- (ii) The non-specific nature of the rubric in naming two ‘things’ was another way of asking candidates to look carefully for specific features of the music after line 21—in more accessible language. It did not limit the scope of more able candidates. The homophonic style, change of key, rising chord sequence, rising chord sequence and the treatment of the word “joy” were frequently noted.
- (d) (i)& (ii) The question finished with 4 accessible questions for all with the name of the musical and its creator gaining well. The ensemble singing in harmony was less successful.

Q9 Anderson/Ulvaeus/Rice: “Anthem” from Chess, 0.00–3.21

More than the other two longer type questions, this one suffered from lack of focus. Too many candidates lost valuable marks in unrelated comments, which could have so easily been related to the lyrics or line numbers. A very extensive mark scheme rewarded the vast number of vocal, choral and orchestral points of interest.

Twelve valid points were sought as QWC accounted for a further three.

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: John Trueman
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2609, email: jtrueman@ccea.org.uk)