



---

A-LEVEL

**Music**

MUS5A

Mark scheme

---

2270

June 2016

---

Version 1.0: Final Mark Scheme

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk).

## Assessment Criteria for Unit 5 (max 60 marks)

Brief A (for each question)

The marks for compositional techniques for Unit 5 will be awarded to show achievement in a more complex task than is required by the same mark band of Unit 2 assessment criteria. There are 30 marks for each question.

30–26 marks:

- The piece will be stimulating, inventive and imaginative.
- The candidate will demonstrate a firm grasp of, and secure handling of, compositional techniques with a clear understanding of the chosen style.
- The writing for the chosen instruments/voices/ electronic sound sources will be highly idiomatic.
- The expressive features of the music will be immediately apparent to the listener.
- Notation will be accurate in relation to pitch and rhythm and contain detailed performance directions appropriate to the music.
- The review provides a detailed and accurate evaluation of the process with an extensive use of technical language.

25–21 marks:

- The piece will be musically interesting and satisfying.
- The candidate will demonstrate an understanding of most of the compositional techniques within the context of the style of the music.
- The writing for instruments/voices/electronic sound sources will be appropriate in relation to the expressive qualities of the music.
- Notation will be mostly accurate in relation to pitch and rhythm and contain performance directions appropriate to the music.
- The review provides an evaluation of the process which is mostly detailed and accurate with a good use of technical language.

20–16 marks:

- The piece will be effective.
- The candidate will demonstrate an understanding of some of the compositional techniques in relation to the selected task.
- The writing for instruments/voices/electronic sound sources will be mostly competent, and there will be an attempt to convey some of the expressive features of the music.
- There may be some inaccuracies in the notation in relation to pitch and rhythm, but the intentions will be largely clear with some attempt to include appropriate performance detail.
- The review provides an evaluation of the process with some detail and accuracy, with a sound use of technical language.

15–11 marks:

- The piece will be partially effective and complete but will demonstrate limited understanding in relation to the compositional techniques.
- The writing for instruments/voices/electronic sound sources will be partially successful and the expressive qualities of the music will be unconvincing and tend to be contrived.
- There will be some inaccuracies in the notation in relation to pitch and rhythm, and performance detail, though present, may not be wholly appropriate.
- The review provides an evaluation of the process which lacks detail and is not always accurate, with some use of technical language.

10–6 marks:

- The piece will lack effectiveness and will demonstrate a basic understanding of some of the more rudimentary aspects of the compositional techniques leading to sections of incoherence.
- There will be some areas that are incomplete and the writing for instruments/voices/electronic sound sources will demonstrate a lack of understanding in relation to the expressive qualities of the music.
- Frequent miscalculations in notation will be evident in relation to pitch and rhythm, and performance detail will be sparse and often inappropriate to the music.
- The review provides a limited evaluation of the process which is mainly descriptive, with some use of technical language.

5–1 marks:

- The piece will demonstrate a very limited and rudimentary understanding of the compositional techniques.
- There will be significant areas that are incomplete and much of the piece will lack coherence.
- The writing for instruments/voices/electronic sound sources will demonstrate significant weaknesses that will inhibit the expressive qualities of the music.
- Substantial miscalculations in notation will be evident in relation to pitch and rhythm and performance detail will be lacking, or, if present, wholly inappropriate to the music.
- The review is a description of the process with a limited use of technical language.

**MUSC5 Brief A Question 1 – Chorale marking grid**

| <b>Mark bands</b>        | <b>1-5</b>   | <b>6-10</b>  | <b>11-15</b>   | <b>16-20</b>   | <b>21-25</b>   | <b>26-30</b>  |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Bass line</b>         | The bass line is very unsuitable or incomplete                         | The bass line is sometimes suitable but there are frequent errors and little sense of line       | The bass line is generally suitable but will have errors and may lack direction                        | The bass line has few errors and has a sense of direction at times       | The bass line is interesting and often purposeful but may have occasional misjudgements  | The bass line is interesting, purposeful and in places adventurous              |
| <b>Cadences and keys</b> | Important keys have not been grasped and cadences are inaccurate       | Some cadences are understood but important implications are missed and the key is often insecure | Keys and cadences are mostly understood but will contain errors. The selection of keys used is limited | Keys and cadences are largely effective but may lack variety or interest | Main keys and cadences are well-chosen but there is scope for more interest and variety eg in passing modulation                       | Cadences are varied and there is an inventive exploration of keys               |
| <b>Chord choice</b>      | The chords are often incomplete, inaccurate or unvaried                | Chord choice is weak and progressions often ineffective  | Chord choice is often suitable but will have errors and lack variety                                   | Chord choice is largely accurate but may lack variety or interest        | Chord choice is secure and varied with some adventurous moments  | A wide variety of chords is used fluently and with few significant errors       |
| <b>Part-writing</b>      | Errors are very frequent and there is little awareness of part-writing | Errors are significant but a few passages have successful part-writing                           | There is some awareness of part-writing but parts are ungrateful or uninteresting in places            | Grammatical errors occur but most of the part-writing is effective       | Some grammatical errors occur but they have little effect on the aural result. Part-writing has melodic direction and few difficulties | Grammatical errors are insignificant and part-writing is fluent and interesting |

**MUSC5 Brief A Question 1 – Chorale marking grid**

|                           |   |                                     |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Stylistic features</b> | There is no evidence of stylistic awareness | Stylistic awareness is very limited | Stylistic awareness is evident at times with some audible Bachian features | Stylistic detail is evident in the majority of the setting | There is interesting stylistic detail but the result is secure rather than imaginative | Stylistic detail is evident throughout, using interesting and imaginative features |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|

| <b>Mark bands</b> | <b>1-5</b>  | <b>6-10</b>   | <b>11-15</b>  | <b>16-20</b>  | <b>21-25</b>  | <b>26-30</b>   |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Review</b>     | A description of the process with limited use of technical language | A limited evaluation of the process, mainly descriptive, with some technical language | An evaluation which lacks detail and is not always accurate. Some use of technical language | An evaluation of the process with some detail and accuracy. Sound use of technical language | An evaluation which is mostly detailed and accurate. Good use of technical language | A detailed and accurate evaluation of the process. Extensive use of technical language |

### MUSC5 Brief A Question 2 – String quartet marking grid

| Mark bands                             | 1-5   | 6-10  | 11-15  | 16-20   | 21-25  | 26-30   |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Harmonic understanding</b>          | Little awareness of harmonic implications. Some sections incomplete | Harmonic implications are only occasionally followed            | Some grasp of the harmonies but significant errors and a limited vocabulary. The key is sometimes insecure | Harmony and tonality are largely understood but with errors, or an accurate setting which relies on simple chords | A good grasp of harmony and tonality but opportunities for more adventurous chord choices are not always taken | Interesting and imaginative use of harmony with a sure sense of tonality and modulation |
| <b>Part-writing</b>                    | Little awareness of suitable part-writing                           | Many errors in part-writing                                     | Some suitable part-writing but significant errors  | Much of the part-writing is accurate but with some misjudgements  | Secure part-writing with few significant errors  | Effective part-writing with minimal errors  |
| <b>Rhythm</b>                          | Little understanding of rhythms                                     | Understanding of rhythms occasionally evident                   | Rhythmic sense appropriate at times  | Some interest and variety of rhythms  | A good sense of rhythmic style   | Effective and interesting rhythmic style  |
| <b>Texture and use of instruments</b>  | Little understanding of texture or instruments                      | Use of instruments and texture is only occasionally suitable    | Some awareness of texture but some weak passages   | Textures are largely successful but with occasional misjudgements   | A good understanding of the instruments and varied textures  | Inventive and interesting textures; stylish use of instruments                          |
| <b>Style and use of given material</b> | Little understanding of style and given material                    | Difficulty in using given material; style occasionally suitable | Given material used in a basic way; style partly understood  | Given material used well; style mostly understood   | Given material developed effectively; a good sense of style  | Imaginative use of given material; a clear grasp of classical style                     |

**MUSC5 Brief A Question 2 – String quartet marking grid**

| <b>Mark bands</b>               | <b>1-5</b>  | <b>6-10</b>   | <b>11-15</b>  | <b>16-20</b>  | <b>21-25</b>  | <b>26-30</b>   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Presentation and editing</b> | Presentation poor; editing absent or unsuitable                     | Presentation weak; editing sparse   | A satisfactory score but with some omissions or errors in editing                           | Score largely clear with mostly appropriate editing   | A clear score with appropriate editing  | An accurate score with careful and detailed editing                                    |
| <b>Review</b>                   | A description of the process with limited use of technical language | A limited evaluation of the process, mainly descriptive, with some technical language | An evaluation which lacks detail and is not always accurate. Some use of technical language | An evaluation of the process with some detail and accuracy. Sound use of technical language | An evaluation which is mostly detailed and accurate. Good use of technical language | A detailed and accurate evaluation of the process. Extensive use of technical language |