

# MUSIC

---

Paper 0410/01

Listening

## Key Messages

- Candidates must relate their answers to what is actually heard in the music, not what they might expect to hear.
- Many candidates need to be much more precise in their answers, explaining clearly what is heard or what the differences between two sections are. Answers also need to be more detailed when answering a question for which two or three marks are available.

## General comments

As in previous sessions, there was a very wide variety of attainment in this paper. The strongest candidates gave precise and detailed answers to the question being asked, rather than vaguely mentioning features such as instruments (though not saying which instruments) or writing about a completely different feature from the one required by the question (e.g. giving a great deal of information about the tempo of the music when the question asked about texture).

Candidates sometimes gave an answer that they might expect to have heard (such as polyphonic for the Baroque C1 question) and did not listen to the music to see if this feature really was present.

It was pleasing to see that candidates were generally attempting all the questions and not leaving answers blank.

Candidates generally seemed to have a good understanding of their chosen area for **Section D**. Some candidates were very familiar with their **Section E** set work, while others appeared to have little knowledge of it.

## Comments on specific questions

### Music A1

#### Question 1

- (a) There was a variety of responses – kettle drum and timpani were both acceptable, but candidates sometimes gave answers such as trombone.
- (b) Just over half the candidates managed to gain the mark for crescendo, though many other Italian words were also given, such as tempo indications.

#### Question 2

- (a) This was fairly well answered, with more than half the candidates selecting that the music began with a repeated note and moved mainly by step.
- (b) Again, over half the candidates noticed and described the fact that the music sung by the voices was the same melody/melodic shape as the music of the introduction. Saying that the instruments, rhythm or mood were the same was not precise enough for a mark.

### Question 3

More candidates were able to correctly describe the texture of the voices in the second line (homophonic/chordal/in harmony) than were able to gain a mark for the texture of the voices in the first line (in octaves/unison/monophonic).

### Question 4

This was the question that the candidates found easiest on the paper, with nearly all Candidates gaining a mark for recognising that the music was sung by a chorus of mixed voices.

### Question 5

The correct answer was twentieth century. Many candidates thought that the music was Romantic.

### Music A2

### Question 6

There were a number of ways to gain credit, e.g. the melody is imitated/in canon/in a round or it is polyphonic, 2 beats later and an octave lower and that there is no harmony. Many candidates were able to gain one mark (for imitation/canon), but very few gained both marks.

### Question 7

There were many good answers, referring to the strong/regular rhythm, the time signature and the prominent brass section.

### Question 8

This was well answered, with most candidates mentioning the fact that the music became quieter, faster, with a melody played by the woodwind/flutes, together with an accompaniment. Some candidates also mentioned the change of key to major, the change of metre/time signature and the constant drum beat.

### Question 9

The correct answer was Bizet. A quarter of the candidates answered this correctly.

### Music B1

### Question 10

As is often the case with questions asking candidates to describe the texture, this was not as well answered. Marks were most often gained for heterophonic with a drum rhythm. Only a very small number of candidates referred to the lower part/basic melody using longer notes and the upper part using shorter notes (or being elaborated). Many candidates wrote that the music was polyphonic.

### Question 11

Just over half the candidates gained credit (for Gamelan).

### Question 12

More candidates answered this correctly than Question 11 (credit was given for Indonesia/Java/Bali).

### Question 13

No credit was given here for names of instruments, since the question specifically asked for musical characteristics. Candidates who gained marks for this question most often referred to the variations in tempo, with a few writing about the repeated patterns or use of the pentatonic scale. Credit was given for heterophonic if a mark had not already been gained for this in Question 10.

## Music B2

### Question 14

Drone was the correct answer, but pedal note or any description of a single repeated sound was given credit. Over half the candidates were able to gain a mark.

### Question 15

This was reasonably well answered (sitar).

### Question 16

Far fewer candidates were able to gain a mark here (sarangi) than for Question 15.

### Question 17

- (a) This was well answered (India).
- (b) The most common feature to receive credit was pitch bending/sliding. Some candidates also referred to the lack of regular pulse and the improvisation. Credit was given for drone if a mark for this had not been given in Question 14.

## Music C1

### Question 18

The correct answer was minor sixth; there was a wide range of responses, with about one third correct.

### Question 19

There was a very wide range of responses, with some candidates note-perfect, and others not using the given rhythm. Candidates who gained one mark did so most often for writing the last two notes correctly.

### Question 20

Less than half the candidates correctly identified the oboe, with a wide variety of other instruments given.

### Question 21

- (a) The answer was F major / Perfect. Candidates seemed to find identifying the cadence easier than naming the key.
- (b) The answer was dominant. More candidates gained a mark here than in 21(a).

### Question 22

Less than half the candidates chose concerto, with all the other options also being chosen.

### Question 23

- (a) This was well answered (Baroque).
- (b) There were a number of ways to gain the two marks here. Candidates most often mentioned the presence of the harpsichord, the small orchestra and the use of ornaments. A few candidates also referred to the terraced dynamics. The use of sequences and ritornello form were not mentioned. A significant number of candidates said that the music was polyphonic, suggesting that they were writing what they might expect to hear in Baroque music, not what was actually heard.

## Music D1

### Question 24

This was reasonably well answered (triple).

### Question 25

Again, as a question asking candidates to describe the texture of the music, this was not answered well. A few candidates mentioned the heterophonic texture and/or the presence of the drum and a very small number wrote about the melodic instruments playing in octaves.

### Question 26

A number of instruments were mentioned. Credit was given only for Ud.

### Question 27

Despite the large number of ways to gain the two marks for this question, many candidates did not gain any credit. Some candidates did refer to the narrow melodic range, short repeated phrases, use of quarter tones or a maqam.

## Music D2

### Question 28

- (a) Many candidates correctly identified the kora, though a number of candidates named (and then described) the mbira.
- (b) Even if candidates had incorrectly identified the instrument in part (a), they were still able to gain credit for the strings being plucked.

### Question 29

This was not well answered, with candidates usually gaining one mark at most, for descending sequence or ostinato. Better answers mentioned the fact that the melody contained three notes, was harmonised in parallel motion, that the note lengths got shorter as the sequence continued or that the singer hummed the melody. This is an example of where some candidates needed to be more precise and detailed in their answers.

### Question 30

Many candidates recognised that the melody began with the same notes / shape.

## Music D3

### Question 31

- (a) This was well answered (erh-hu).
- (b) This was also well answered (the strings are bowed).

### Question 32

Many candidates wrote that the music was faster, which was not given credit. More able candidates were able to recognise that it was the same melody with decoration/added notes as a variation.

### Question 33

This was generally well answered (pentatonic), though a few candidates gave answers such as F major.

### Question 34

This was usually well answered (monophonic), but a few candidates gave the answer heterophonic, which again suggests they indicated what they might expect to hear, rather than what was heard.

#### Music D4

##### Question 35

- (a) There were many ways to gain credit, with candidates often gaining marks for mentioning the descending notes, the rising scale/shape, the repeated notes and the gradual increase in speed. Candidates were better at giving their answers in the order heard in the music than has been the case in previous sessions.
- (b) Candidates did not answer this question well. Many simply repeated the information given in the question, that the music played by the first instrument was used when the two instruments played together. A mark was most often gained for the ostinato being used as an accompaniment. Candidates needed full detail to gain all 3 marks.

##### Question 36

This was well answered (dizi / hsaio / xiao / ti-tzu).

#### Music E1

##### Question 37

This was not well answered, with very few candidates recognising that it was the recapitulation. Disappointingly, a few candidates who were answering questions on Mendelssohn left this blank.

##### Question 38

- (a) Approximately half the answers correctly gave the workmen/artisans/mechanicals.
- (b) Candidates often did not give enough detail for this answer, given that there were two marks available. Most often the falling 'hee-haw' was mentioned, with only the best candidates referring to the simple theme, use of repetition or drones.

##### Question 39

Again, candidates did not give enough information for the three marks on offer. The different interval of the falling 'hee-haw' was often mentioned and, less often, the fact that the music was in the tonic. Only a very small number of candidates referred to the richer orchestration.

##### Question 40

Reasonably well answered (Perfect and E major).

#### Music E2

##### Question 41

This was well answered (Theseus/Duke of Athens).

##### Question 42

Some candidates did not answer this question, and those that did often found it difficult. Candidates occasionally transposed up instead of down (giving their answer an octave higher), and were given one mark out of the possible two.

##### Question 43

Again, many candidates did not give enough information, given the three marks available. One mark was most often gained for describing the use of the full orchestra.

**Question 44**

Some candidates ticked one rather than two boxes, but this was reasonably well answered (imitation and tonic pedal).

**Question 45**

A wide variety of responses was seen, with the Lovers' theme often being suggested. The Fairy Theme was the correct answer.

**Music E3**

**Question 46**

Candidates most often wrote A major, suggesting that they had looked at the key signature, but not the printed music. The correct answer was E major.

**Question 47**

This was fairly well answered. Candidates were able to refer to the fact that the theme was originally played by the orchestra, in A major and it has now been decorated/semiquavers have been added.

**Question 48**

(a) Candidates were often able to correctly name one instrument, but only a small number of candidates correctly gave both flute and bassoon.

(b) About a third of candidates correctly identified that the piano played broken octaves.

**Question 49**

Only a small number of candidates correctly gave the cadence as interrupted (many thought that it was an imperfect cadence).

**Question 50**

Candidates often gave answers such as 'the violins accompany the piano'. A few candidates mentioned the dialogue and a very small number wrote that the music was in a minor key. Really good answers would have given the detail about the rising violin pattern and the falling piano pattern.

**Music E4**

**Question 51**

Candidates often referred to the music as being the development section, rather than a recapitulation of the new development theme; therefore only a few candidates gained marks for this question.

**Question 52**

This was well answered – passage-work.

**Question 53**

Many candidates were able to transpose these notes (E-D).

**Question 54**

Most candidates correctly identified trill.

**Question 55**

This was reasonably well answered (transition/bridge/ritornello).

**Question 56**

- (a) Although many candidates were able to identify that this was a tonic/A major chord, very few candidates gained a mark for this question as they did not state that it was in second inversion, despite the question asking for the precise name of the chord.
- (b) A wide variety of answers was given. Cadenza was correct.

# MUSIC

---

**Paper 0410/02**  
**Performing**

## **General Comments**

Centres are thanked for their careful preparation of the Performing Coursework submission.

Most candidates presented a suitable programme consisting of a solo and an ensemble performance lasting between four and ten minutes in total. However, sometimes performances are too short. Occasionally candidates submit a number of solo and/or ensemble performances lasting more than ten minutes. This is not necessary and sometimes results in the candidate gaining fewer marks, as, almost always, there is often one piece which is not as well prepared as the others.

Sheet music is often not provided, yet is required.

## **Solos**

Candidates presented a wide range of solos on a variety of instruments. Usually the music chosen is well within the candidate's technical ability. Occasionally a candidate attempts to perform a piece which is clearly too difficult for them and this then unfortunately leads to them losing marks in several categories. They would be better served by performing an easier piece more competently.

Centres are reminded that candidates should consider carefully any markings in the printed music, such as tempo indications and dynamics. If these are not observed, then high marks in the categories of 'Choice and Control of Tempo' and 'Sensitivity to Phrasing and Expression' should not be awarded.

Please note, that if a candidate performs on two instruments simultaneously (e.g. voice and guitar), they can only be marked on one instrument.

## **Ensembles**

Candidates sometimes choose to present a different instrument for their ensemble performance. Whilst this is perfectly acceptable, and often works well, Moderators are sometimes left wondering why the candidate did not perform an ensemble piece on the instrument used for the solo performance, if the ensemble instrument is significantly weaker than the solo instrument.

There is still a problem with candidates sometimes submitting performances in this category which are not true ensembles. Candidates often present 'solos with accompaniment' e.g. trombone accompanied by piano. This is not acceptable as an ensemble performance. Alternatively, candidates sometimes present pieces (particularly songs) which consist of alternation between two soloists with accompaniment. Again, this is not a suitable piece as it does not demonstrate ensemble performing. It is also important to note that, in an ensemble performance, the candidate's part should not be consistently doubled by another performer.

In an ensemble performance, it is crucial that the Moderators know which part is being performed by the candidate. Where there is more than one of the same instrument in an ensemble (e.g. 3 violins), please indicate which part the candidate is playing. Similarly, please write on the Performing Working Marksheet which part the candidate is playing in a piano duet performance.

Backing tracks should not be used in an ensemble performance.

## **Administration**

Many Centres submitted Performing and Composing Coursework (or elements of both) together in one envelope. Please send composing and performing coursework in separate envelopes, with the correct labels, as they are moderated by different individuals.



This session there were many arithmetical and transcription errors. Centres are reminded to ensure that the addition of marks is correct and that they are transferred accurately to the MS1 form.

Recordings should be submitted on audio CD, not DVD. The sound quality of DVDs is significantly poorer than that of CDs. Submitting a DVD also reduces the number of devices on which it can be played. All performances can be submitted on one CD, provided that the tracks are clearly labelled. Please provide a track listing for the CD and announce at the start of each track what it is. Please also package the CD in some kind of plastic or cardboard case, so that it does not arrive broken.

Sheet music should be provided for all pieces which are not improvised. If a performer is playing a different version of a piece of music (e.g. a simplified cello part) then please send the part they are actually playing, not the original music.

Marks should not usually be internally moderated. This is only necessary when there are large numbers of candidates, who have been taught in different classes and marked separately by different teachers.

# MUSIC

---

**Paper 0410/03**  
**Composing**

## **General Comments**

Many interesting and quite original works were observed. The link made through the candidate's instrument, often with a specific genre which the candidate understood through performance, provided a secure starting point for imaginative and assured work. There were also some less musical offerings which contained technical devices which did not come together to create a stylish, or even sometimes coherent, piece of music. Teachers are reminded that the use of compositional devices, on their own, will not automatically generate high marks.

Whilst some compositions were inspired and totally engaging, many opportunities to reach the high mark bands were missed. This was mainly due to the fact that strong initial material was not sufficiently shaped or extended to deliver a result that displayed a candidate's individual style.

In relation to the use of technology to assist the composition process, some Centres provided full and helpful details. However, more often just the software was named, or there was a brief and ambiguous statement which did not provide the precise clarification of the candidate's input. In order to aid the moderation process comprehensive notes, detailing the compositional processes used, are essential. Further, it is vital that musical ideas are the candidate's own and, if a piece includes material borrowed from a pre-existing source, this should be kept to an absolute minimum, as these are not, by definition, original ideas. This includes ideas taken from websites such as 'Fruity Loops'.

Administration by Centres was in most cases completed well. However, there continued to be a small number of examples where teachers' signatures, candidate details and missing scores were absent from the Centre's submission. Further, there were a few examples where the CD supplied was wrongly formatted and the '*Internal Assessment Mark Sheet*' (MS1) had not been supplied, either electronically or in paper version.

## **Assessment**

There were a number of examples where internal marking of compositions was quite lenient, but such examples did place the candidate in the correct band. It was often the case that marks at the upper end of the range were more generous than those lower down. A degree of caution must be exercised when assessing pieces at the upper end of the mark range which rely heavily on repetition, without meaningful manipulation/development of the initial ideas. Further, there were a few cases where the marks bore little relation to the descriptors given in the Assessment Criteria; the rank order of merit was demonstrably incorrect and there were examples of incorrect transfer of marks from the working mark sheets to the MS1. Centres are reminded to check the final sample marks prior to submission, as incorrect mathematics has been noted again this year.

Additionally, it is not always clear which marks belong to which composition especially when the compositions are entitled 'Composition 1' and 'Composition 2'. Centres are reminded to make clear all administrative procedures and label candidate's work appropriately.

## **Compositions**

Some very good work was submitted, with candidates in the top bands displaying mature creativity. These candidates showed good understanding of harmony and structure, and manipulated the texture in many interesting ways. Further, there were examples where the top end candidates used complex harmonic progressions, modulations and structures that demonstrated confidence to move away from the security of standard conventions.

With the mid- and lower-band pieces, good initial ideas with imaginative stimuli were unfortunately not exploited. Examples of good melodic ideas simply did not fit in with the harmonic structures/accompaniment.

This is due to lack of refinement and imaginative/creative development. Much of the work was simplistic, repetitive or under-developed. Some mid-range pieces would benefit from further research into the styles and genres that candidates attempt to emulate. Others still rely on the simple repetition of chords and build up of layers to 'construct' their compositions. However, the best pieces throughout the entire mark range came from candidates who matched the length and scope of their compositions to their technical ability and had researched the style and genre well. It should be noted that, if a piece is dissonant in style, it needs to be consistently so. The Moderator needs to be convinced that the dissonance is intended and is part of the thematic and harmonic development of the piece.

The use of ICT was applied to good effect in many Centres in producing not only the composition but the musical score. In many compositions, the candidates demonstrated their understanding of the technology they were using. However, there were examples where instruments were chosen for their sound in *Sibelius* with no apparent understanding of the capabilities of the instruments in reality. Furthermore, the use of loops in Garage Band or whatever source using borrowed ideas cannot be given any credit.

### **Notation and Presentation**

Electronic scores were generally very accurate with few mistakes and ambiguities.

However, Centres are reminded that scores should *always* be submitted in *hard copy*, irrespective of the programme used to create them. This applies for all scores, including those produced using *Sibelius* or other software programs. A data disc containing the score is not acceptable. Please also note that separate parts are not a substitute for the full score.

As in previous years, a few Centres submitted graphic scores. Generally, these were well documented, giving a full explanation of the signs and symbols. This detailed commentary is good practice and significantly helps the moderation process.

Centres are reminded that candidates who compose songs should always notate the voice part, at the very least. If they cannot also notate the accompaniment in full, they could write chord symbols, so that there is at least a guide to the intended nature of the accompaniment. It must be stressed, however, that a song presented with just the words and a few chord symbols does not constitute an adequate form of notation.

### **CDs**

The audio recording of a candidate's work was on the whole very good. Sometimes there was a lack of balance between the recording of the piece and the announcement of the candidate, and so the information regarding the candidate was lost. A recording of both pieces should be provided; whenever possible the recording should be of a live performance.

Most Centres followed the advice given in the syllabus to include a track list and announcements on the CD/cassette. However, as in previous years, some Centres submitted CDs that relied on specific computer software (e.g. Windows Media Player or iTunes) and are reminded that these must not be submitted. Only CDs that can be played on the type of CD player found in a normal domestic hi-fi system should be sent to the Moderator.

### **Packaging of Work**

Several CD cases were damaged due to inadequate packaging. Care should be taken to ensure that CDs are wrapped well so they survive the journey in the post.

The majority of Centres now present work in a plastic folder or wallet, which helps to organise the compositions of each candidate to the numbering on the Working Mark Sheet.

### **Final Comment**

Candidates from all ranges of ability are able to produce compositions of some merit, and, in many cases, candidates are producing compositions over and above the designated standards for top grades in IGCSE. All credit should be given to Centres that good practice is taking place and the many opportunities they are giving these young musicians to be creative, confident and consistent in the way they handle the 'raw materials' of music.