



2003 Music Performance Group GA 3: Aural and written examination

GENERAL COMMENTS

The format of the paper matched the 2001 and 2002 examination papers and comprised a total of 118 marks. There was a total of nine questions, eight of which had to be answered; students having the option of responding to either Question 7 (Part-writing) or Question 8 (Improvisation).

The overall results for this examination continue to demonstrate steady improvement from previous years. In Section A (Aural comprehension), many students were not able to achieve equal results across the four areas of focus (melody, harmony, rhythm and characteristics of a pre-recorded work). Music literacy is still an issue in this section of the paper although this area continued to improve. Many students were unable to respond accurately to questions because they were not familiar with and/or confident in writing music notation. Other students used salient terminology very vaguely. Students need to learn and practise the meaning/s of terms using terminology relevant to the key knowledge being examined. In Section A (Aural comprehension), students are strongly advised to use pencil so that they can make corrections and still present a legible response.

Examination technique

Students should plan the amount of time available to complete their responses to questions in Sections B and C. Reading time can be used for this purpose. Given that the structure of these sections is similar from year to year, students can also rehearse responding to particular question types as part of their revision for the examination. Responses to questions worth the most marks were often either not attempted or were incomplete. In addition, some students wrote very little for the 9-, 10- and/or 12-mark questions yet ran out of writing space for the 6 mark questions. Students should use the reading time to plan what they intend to say for each answer, so that their responses do not become highly repetitious. Students with good time management skills tended to use a 'bullet point' approach for most responses, commonly demonstrating the ability to present clear, deliberate and logical comments and arguments. This was a response characteristic of most of the more successful students. Other students did not read the question stems and/or the complete questions thoroughly and consequently presented responses that lacked focus and/or did not address sections of the question.

The most common areas of weakness were:

- lack of basic theoretical knowledge, especially regarding interval names, chord names, and the meaning and significance of the term 'diatonic'; responses where this knowledge was not evident were also characterised by an inability to recognise notated rhythmic figures
- failure to apply consistent musical grammar
- confused and/or inaccurate use of music terminology
- confused nomenclature, particularly intervallic versus and/or intermingled with harmonic labels
- difficulty identifying intervals when in context (both within melodies and as bass or root progressions) and tonalities (scale forms)
- lack of understanding of the requirements for each section of the paper and/or each question.

Other concerns:

- Many students did not attempt to answer some questions, especially in Section A (Aural comprehension), although this practice is becoming less and less evident. Students are advised to attempt every question (except one of the optional questions in Section B) and to practise under examination conditions using papers from previous years.
- While some responses included some highly insightful prose responses for Questions 6 to 9 demonstrating high levels of understanding of specific stylistic differences across a range of music styles, other prose answers were often hard to decipher because students wrote illegibly and/or with blunt pencils.
- Some written questions were answered in the same way two or three times. Students should analyse questions (especially during reading time) in order to understand the nature of each question and to make decisions about how best to approach each task.
- Confusion or lack of awareness about the meanings of terms arose frequently, especially regarding tone colour, texture, articulations, contrast and variation, while rhythmic relationships was sometimes confused with 'rhyming relationships' within the lyrics of a given song. Such terminology needs to be used and discussed regularly in teaching and learning programs.
- Some students referred virtually exclusively to their group/ensemble **performance** instead of tasks undertaken as part of their School-assessed Coursework (SAC) when answering Questions (7 or 8) in Section B (Part-writing or Improvisation, not Performance).

- Although less common than in 2002, some value judgments, particularly about standards or quality of musicianship, were written in responses for some questions, especially Questions 6c and 6d and with respect to students' own performance, improvisatory and/or arranging abilities. Many students wrote responses to questions in Section C that expressed the view that in their opinion they had 'pulled off' perfect performances. Students are reminded that this examination is not an appropriate forum for comments about their love of or disdain for a particular style of music and/or relative quality or standards of performance, part-writing or arranging. Articulating such a perspective in this forum is a waste of time as it has no bearing on the awarding of marks.

General comments regarding written (prose-based) responses

Many students did not know the characteristics/requirements/components of different prose-based response formats, for example the differences between 'identify', 'describe', and 'discuss'. Description essentially requires the demonstration of *knowledge*, especially with respect to salient characteristics, components or elements whereas 'discuss' requires the application of knowledge to demonstrate *understanding*, almost invariably demanding a higher level of insight. The relative marks available for each response type should provide an indication of the level of depth and/or breadth necessary.

Suggestions

- Students should write as clearly as possible, especially when notating on a staff. Notes should be either on a line or in a space – not both – or so large they encompass two spaces. Students should use a pencil (and an eraser) rather than a pen when notating music. Note that students are not allowed to use liquid paper or correction tape during VCE examinations. Most students who complete Section A of the paper using a pen wind up with illegible responses as a result of cross-outs, especially for questions featuring melodic and rhythmic transcription.
- When undertaking transcription questions, students are advised to do their rough work on the blank manuscript paper provided and then transfer a neat, legible, copy of their response to the space provided for the 'final' answer.
- Where possible, students should have access to appropriate aural training software and a computer music 'sequencer', especially to program rhythms and progressions for aural training (and improvisation training) and to realise their harmonisations (part-writing students).

Section A – Aural comprehension

Part 1 – Intervals and melody

Question 1

Recognition of intervals

a

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	27	39	23	7	4	1.20

Identification of interval distance (quality and number)

1. Minor 3rd
2. Minor 6th
3. Tritone (°5/+4; ♯5/#4)
4. Minor 2nd (semitone)

About 80 per cent of students correctly identified the minor 2nd (interval 4), about 60 per cent correct for the minor 3rd (interval 1), about 35 per cent identified the tritone (interval 3) while very few students identified the minor 6th (interval 2) accurately. Many students wrote only 'ascending' or 'descending' (or arrows up and down). No marks are available for recognising the directions of the intervals. Quite a few students were able to identify number but not quality, especially with respect to the 1st and 4th intervals. Almost always, the incorrect answers presented for the tritone were consonant intervals, especially 'Perfect 4th', 'Perfect 5th' and 'Major 3rd'. 'Major 4th', 'Major 5th' and 'Perfect 2nd' appeared on occasions, but less often than in previous years. Very few students confused the nomenclature of intervals, i.e. did not distinguish between Major, minor and Perfect intervals, a significant improvement over previous years. Most students were clear in their labelling of intervals, that is they used Major/Maj and minor/min rather than simply 'M' and 'm'. Nevertheless, a significant number of students wrote 'M's that were deliberately ambiguous. Students are strongly advised to write 'Major'/'Maj'/'Ma' or 'minor'/'min'/'mi' for intervals of 2^{nds}, 3^{rds}, 6^{ths} and 7^{ths}. As has been the case for many years, generally speaking, high standards for this question tended to indicate high standards for much of the remainder of the aural comprehension section of the paper.

b

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	46	0	54	1.07

Tonality of the excerpt

MAJOR

Despite this melody being very clearly major, only slightly more than half of students identified its tonality correctly. Perhaps students decided that since there were two minor tonalities from which to choose, the melody must be based from one of them. Alternatively, perhaps the opening minor 3rd (maybe even the closing minor 2nd) was confusing for many students. It is important that students are very clear about the intervallic patterns and qualities of the scale degrees

for each of the tonalities prescribed for study. Some students did not circle anything. Students are encouraged to provide an answer to all questions especially if only a circle is required for the answer.

Question 2

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Average
%	8	16	15	12	9	9	8	7	6	4	3	3	4.06

Melodic transcription

Results for this question were not as good as those for the ‘transcription of a melody’ question from the Aural and written examination of 2002, perhaps due to its harmonic minor tonality. There continued to be many students who had significant difficulty with this task but a large number of students ended their transcription on the tonic (the ‘A’), recognising that the melody began and ended on the same note. Many students did not realise that the example was in *A minor*, even though the chords of the harmonic progression made this absolutely clear. Very few students included any (or else the correct) accidentals. Some students ‘forced’ the melody to end on a ‘C’, perhaps because they felt it ‘must’ be in C major due to the key signature, or maybe because of the minim ‘C’ in the vibraphone part. Students need to understand that there is more than one tonality for every key signature, and learn those required by the study design (from 3 sharps to 3 flats for harmonic and melodic minors and major tonalities). A number of students ended on an ‘F’, presumably because they read the final ‘A’ of the bass part as if it were in treble clef. Students who rated highly on this question effectively used information from the other parts when planning rough work (drafting) their response on the blank manuscript page facing the question.

A large number of students had problems with any intervals greater than a second (see bars 1, 2 and 4), especially descending ones. Where there were ‘leaps’ of a 3rd or greater, only one note in the entire melody was not a member of the given underpinning chord (the ‘G#’ on beat 2 of bar 2) while the melody simultaneously featured the notes of the chord as an arpeggiation. Even the ‘G-natural’ (‘4-and’ of bar 2) was clarified by the F major chord supporting it. Many students had little understanding of the essential relationships between melody, harmony and tonality.

Some students did not make certain that the durational values of the notes in each bar added up to what was required by the ‘four-four’ time signature while others wrote all crotchets, all minims, or notes indicating ‘four-two’ as the time signature. Many students notated only the rhythm of the melody. Some went on to draw its general contour as a simple line graph across the staff, often without note heads.

Most problems demonstrated:

- limited understanding of the characteristics of keys, especially minor keys
- limited awareness of the characteristics of logical melodic structures and/or intervallic function in melodic contexts
- weak intervallic recognition skills, especially when the melody is not moving by step
- limited awareness of the key knowledge relating to rhythm for this question as outlined in the study design (for example, not more than two subdivisions of the unit beat nor durations exceeding 2 unit beats in length are allowable)
- a lack of a systematic approach to the question, for example, first notating the rhythm.

Students need more practise transcribing melodic transcriptions in 4-part contexts. Very few students did not attempt the question at all and most obtained some marks, even if from a transcription of the rhythm, or perhaps the rhythm plus a fairly accurate ‘line graph’ showing the contour of the melody.

Part 2 – Chords and harmony
Recognition of chord progressions

Question 3

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Average
%	14	20	22	15	10	5	5	5	4	2.69

1. *D Major 7* 2. B minor 3. G Major 7 4. E minor 5. A (dominant) 7

OR

1. *D Major 7* 2. vi 3. IV^{Δ7}; Maj 7; (+7); (M7) 4. ii 5. V 7

OR

1. *D Major 7* 2. VI minor 3. IV Major 7 4. II minor 5. V 7

OR

Harmonic Grid

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Bass Note	<i>D</i>	B	G	E	A
Character/ Quality/ Type	<i>Major 7</i>	minor	Major 7 [Δ7; Maj 7; (+7); (M7)]	minor	(dominant) 7

Results for this question were quite disappointing, particularly given that it was a fairly basic progression (I – vi – IV – ii – V) in a major key. The trend tended towards the recognition of two or three bass notes *or* two or three qualities – frequently not in combination. Many students failed to identify the root progression via the bass notes (primarily moving down in 3^{ths}) and a large number either included no 7^{ths} or wrote 7^{ths} for every (or almost every) chord. Some students recognised the 7^{ths} but not the chord’s quality (that is, they simply wrote a ‘7’ in the lower box – which was, of course, acceptable for the ‘A (dominant) 7’, but not for the ‘G Major 7’ chord). Conversely, very often the final chord was identified as an ‘(A) Major 7’. When both of these considerations are viewed, students did not know the difference between a ‘dominant 7’ and a ‘Major 7’ sonority. Many students confused the need to recognise the chord progression with the recognition of chord types, and neither bass notes nor any indication of diatonic position (scale degree) were presented – only chord types, sometimes with chord qualities labelled as augmented and/or full diminished (these chords are not examinable for this question type as they are based upon the mediant and leading note degrees of the harmonic minor scale). Teaching and learning activities focusing on this question type should develop students’ familiarity with common root progressions, structural characteristics of major, minor and diminished chords (with and without 7^{ths}) and as the sound quality (‘feel’) of each of the examinable chords. One method is to teach the relationship between specific chords and chords that are likely to precede or follow them in a progression. Students should develop an awareness of issues regarding voice leading and ‘function’ enjoined with sound quality or ‘feel’ –based considerations. A large percentage of students were unaware of the meaning of a ‘diatonic’ chord progression not to mention the exclusion of sonorities based on the mediant and leading note in chord progression questions on this examination. Students need to be aware of the chord types that are diatonic to the major and the harmonic minor scale forms (the only forms examinable for this question type). Students must enter the examination knowing:

- the *names* of each degree of both the Major and the *harmonic* minor scales between 3 sharps and 3 flats, inclusive (that is, for A Major/F# minor; D Major/B minor; G Major/E minor; C Major/A minor; F Major/D minor; B-flat Major/G minor and E-flat Major/C minor)
- the qualities of the diatonic triads and four-note chords for each degree of Major and harmonic minor scales (apart from those of the mediant and leading note, although knowing these is useful as well). That is:
 - Harmonic minor – the *Tonic* chord is minor and its 7 chord features a minor (not Major) 7th (even though the scale has a raised leading note); the *Supertonic* is diminished and the 7 chord is half-diminished (diminished triad with a minor 7th); the *Subdominant* is minor and the 7 chord has a minor 7th; the *Dominant* is Major and the 7 chord has a minor 7th; the *Sub-mediante* is Major and the 7 chord has a Major 7th.
 - Major - the *Tonic* chord is Major and its 7 chord has a Major 7th; the *Supertonic* is minor and the 7 chord has a minor 7th; the *Subdominant* is Major and its 7 chord has a Major 7th; the *Dominant* is Major and the 7 chord has a minor 7th; the *Sub-mediante* is minor and the 7 chord has a minor 7th
- the sound and construction of all chords prescribed for study (including sus4 and 7/sus4 chords)
- how to recognise ‘cycle of fifth’ progressions.

Knowledge and understanding about the specific nature of diatonic chord progressions is essential for success with recognition of chord progression questions. Without these fundamentals (the first two issues in particular), students are disadvantaged as they cannot approach the task systematically.

In contrast to previous years, hardly any students identified chords in inversion. Most students used one method or the other (lines or harmonic grid) to answer the question. Nevertheless, some students wrote responses on the lines *and* the harmonic grid, and very often they were contradictory. Generally, students who used the harmonic grid achieved scores averaging 2 marks higher than those who used the lines.

Part 3 – Rhythm

Question 4

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Average
%	9	14	11	12	12	9	7	7	19	4.11

Transcription of rhythms

The image displays two systems of musical notation for transcription. Each system consists of four staves: Flute, Trumpet, Bass, and Hi-hats. The first system shows a 4/4 rhythm with various note values and rests. The second system shows a similar rhythm but with different note values and rests, illustrating the complexity of the task.

Results for this question were rather better than those in previous years, with its mean score above 50 per cent. In contrast to previous years, almost all students attempted at least some part of the question at some level.

Nevertheless, a series of problems were consistently evident where students:

- had other than a total of four crotchet beats in one or the other or both of the relevant two bars
- did not attempt to divide their response into two bars of four beats each
- lost track of the pulse (usually in the first bar) which resulted in the crotchet of beat 3 being misplaced and frequently the remainder of the transcription being shifted (sometimes accordingly, sometimes not)
- were unable to notate the syncopations accurately (beat 1 and 2 and 4 of bar 1 and beat 2 of bar 2). They heard the syncopated figure but had no idea how to write it
- beats 1 and 2 of the second bar (the ‘ti-tika’ [quaver/two semi-quavers] followed by the ‘tim-ka’ [dotted quaver/semi-quaver]) were often notated incorrectly
- did not recognise that every rhythmic figure appeared elsewhere in some other part; interestingly some students who did not accurately transcribe the two figures of the trumpet part were in rhythmic unison with the flute part (beat 4 of bar 1 and beat 4 of bar 2)
- augmented the rhythm (and sometimes not consistently) such that their transcription was (primarily) in four-two time ([mostly] minims, [sometimes dotted minims] and crotchets entirely)

- although marks are not affected, ‘common practice’ groupings were often not evident. Generally, students who aligned their answers vertically (to the rhythms of the other parts) achieved higher marks. Although certainly not imperative, this approach helps students overcome several of the problems identified above, especially pulse-related issues. It was clear that some students needed more practise with rhythms presented in four-part contexts.

Question 5

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Average
%	8	10	10	9	15	14	15	14	5	4.19

Recognition and transcription of rhythms

Notate altered rhythms on this staff.

Results for this question were improved from previous years. This is especially commendable as the excerpt was in a compound time signature (12–8). Most students were able to identify correctly the bars with the rhythmic differences. Nevertheless, although a fair number of students did very well, many others experienced considerable difficulty. This was the question from Section A mostly commonly not attempted by the weaker students.

Issues common to many responses included:

- students who neglected to circle the rhythms that were different, as per the instructions. Even though their transcriptions usually made it clear to which parts they were referring, this was not always the case
- many students who noted that a rhythmic alteration occurred in the correct bar, but circled the wrong figure. The best plan is to circle the entire bar and indicate the alteration in the transcription. This approach results in full marks for part a, even if part b has inaccuracies
- students who did not notice that every rhythmic figure to be transcribed except one appeared somewhere else within the printed notation. The only notated rhythmic figure that did not appear elsewhere was the quaver/crotchet (‘ti-ta’) rhythm of the altered kick drum part (on dotted crotchet beat four of bar 2).
- a strange array of very unusual groupings, especially given that (virtually) every rhythmic figure appeared elsewhere on the page. For example, it was common for students to join four quavers together under one bar – see end of bar 1 and end of bar 4. (Although marks were not deducted for groupings, students should be made aware of ‘standard practice’ in this regard for all time signatures/metric orientations.)
- students who notated their rhythms as if in four-four
- students who were unfamiliar with the layout and details of this question type and the few who did not attempt the question at all.

Part 4 – Characteristics of a pre-recorded work

Question 6

Excerpt from: ‘Too Long in the Wasteland’ performed by Kasey Chambers on the CD Not Pretty Enough.

Note: The *italicised* entries following each segment of the question are a guide only to possible responses and the various aspects/issues presented are certainly not exhaustive. The list of possible responses or characteristics is an example of salient points and/or aspects of the question's components. A brief discussion about student responses follows each segment.

a

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	0	1	99	1.99

Identify two instruments heard in the excerpt.

Electric bass guitar

(Vibrato) guitar

Rhythm/Riff guitar

Solo guitar (uses various effects) (Some students may hear this as a slide guitar. Although it isn't- the combination of effects used results in a slide guitar type of sound. As such, 'slide guitar' was accepted as a correct answer.)

Drum kit

Vocals

Some students identified more than two instruments, which was fine but no extra marks were available. However, sometimes the third (or fourth) instrument identified was not present (trumpet, for example – perhaps for the slide guitar). The different *types* of guitars, barring the bass guitar, were not often recognised, perhaps except by student guitarists.

b

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average
%	1	1	6	16	23	28	26	4.47

Describe the role of each of the instruments identified in part a.

Bass guitar – *Underpins harmonies; highly sustained; basically quavers used under verse 3 and the guitar solo.*

(Vibrato) guitar – *sustained chords; adds colour*

Rhythm/riff guitar – *interjects melodic/riff fragments; thickening of rhythmic and harmonic texture*

Solo (pseudo-slide) guitar – *improvised solo; interjects melodic responses (short riffs and melodic statements)*

Drum kit – *Basis of the rhythmic 'groove'; some punctuation; 'fills' between sections*

Vocals – *delivers the melody and lyrics; register of 3rd verse changes; vocal intensity and changes in timbre and inflection related directly to the mood/meaning of the text.*

Many students commented about or listed what the instruments played (chords, licks, notes, riffs, 'grooves') rather than identifying the roles they were performing. In addition, they did not present a description of the given instrument's role as required by the question, rather they described and/or labelled the instrument or effect (for example, six-string Fender *Telecaster*, overdrive pedal, tremolo pedal, vibrato switch 'on'). Some commented about how the particular instrument/s contributed to or even defined the style of the music (better suited to the next part of this question). This type of observation is acceptable in providing ancillary information to demonstrate advanced understanding, provided the role of the instrument is addressed with respect to the song itself (which commonly was not the case). Students are required to learn about the roles of instruments and instrumental parts in musical ensembles. Some wrote answers that were obviously prepared beforehand; these did not listen carefully (if at all) to what was being played by the instruments that they had identified, often to the degree that they made comments about their roles that could not be supported from within the excerpt presented – it simply was not present in the music. Such an approach involves trying to 'second guess' what will be asked on the paper and then preparing accordingly. Students are strongly advised to write about what they hear, not what they think they should hear and/or what they believe particular instrument/s should be doing in a given musical style.

c

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average
%	6	3	8	17	23	22	21	3.99

Describe two stylistic influences upon the excerpt. In your description refer to two musical characteristics that are present in the recorded arrangement for each stylistic influence you describe (that is, a total of four musical characteristics).

Stylistic influences in the excerpt could include:

- *strongly country-blues/country-rock; (to a lesser extent, rhythm and blues; funk; jazz)*
- *12-bar structure*
- *straight-ahead rock feel from drums (although 'funky' hi-hat figure under verses 1 and 2)*
- *country-rock guitar solo featuring common picking techniques (some clearly rock-based improvisatory figures but closing with 'standard' country guitar solo clichés)*
- *riffs and solos based for the most part upon the 'standard' blues scale plus some pentatonic figures*
- *simple, sustained bass line consistent with much country playing (bass virtuosity not desirable)*
- *vocals frequently responded to by instruments - call and response relationships (blues lineage)*

- *vocal texture features slight 'whine'/'twang' consistent with many country singers (closed nasal passage).*

Most students demonstrated a musical understanding of what constitutes particular styles and genres. Many responses displayed impressive amounts of knowledge about popular music styles, implying wide listening experiences. Most students were able to identify two stylistic influences (that is, country, rock, funk, disco, jazz) and generally could comment appropriately about relevant characteristics as evidence for stylistic influences. Nevertheless, students described (or only identified) one stylistic influence while others identified two stylistic influences but did not describe them. Some responses were very vague in describing the style of the excerpt. For instance, some students wrote that the music was 'country' because of the singing, or the words of the song, or because of the way the guitars were used, but without explaining why or how. Some students who tried to describe the stylistic influences by analysing the lyrics often tended towards mood-based comments rather than descriptions of stylistic influences. Some labelled the excerpt as essentially 'disco', some labelled it as 'reggae', some as 'latin', and some as 'pop', but almost never did they present any musical characteristics within their description (if a description was indeed presented) to support such viewpoints. Such responses invariably contributed nothing to the answer as the question did not call for critical commentary. It was disconcerting that most of the (fair number of) students who referred to a different Kasey Chambers song in their response to Section C of this examination were unable to identify musical characteristics that were indicative of stylistic influences in their response for this question (6c).

d

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average
%	5	7	19	26	21	13	9	3.25

Discuss the relationship between the guitar solo and the preceding sections of the excerpt.

- *the guitar solo is 'over' the changes of the verse/chorus vocal section*
- *the scale basis is primarily 'blues', although some pentatonic figures are presented*
- *the solo guitar increases in intensity from verses 2 and 3, heralding parts of the figures that appear in the solo*
- *same texture and timbral effect is used by solo guitar in verses and in solo*
- *range of solo is significantly larger than that of the vocals*
- *some slight motivic relationship with the previous vocal lines – but primarily extensions of its own material, especially the response lines in verses 2 and 3*
- *although intending to sound improvised, much of the solo features 'standard' country solo guitar phrases*
- *bass becomes more prominent and rhythmically significant as the rhythm/riff guitar is removed and the vibrato guitar creates harmonies by playing individual notes (arpeggiation)*
- *the solo furnishes contrast to/relief from the vocals*
- *the 'feel' of the solo remains consistent with the preceding sections (especially the third verse)*
- *although the note selection and phrasing are in a country style, the effects used (distortion, overdrive and 'metaliser') are from the rock genre*
- *perhaps a conscious decision has been made to imitate the timbre of the voice via the selection of specific effects (some 'whiny' and 'twangy' characteristics).*

Sometimes this question was done very well with those students having a very clear idea of how to relate back to earlier sections of the music. Some discussions were very articulate and insightful. These students contextualised their response, often by referring to what the guitar was doing in previous sections with relation to other instruments while many commented about the sometimes imitative relationship between the voice and guitar. Most of these students also mentioned textural build-up/density within their discussion. Some even specified particulars such as scales and modes, and various playing techniques. Some responses only described the 'solo' itself, however, and therefore did not in fact answer the question. A few students misinterpreted this question as they did not understand that the reference to the 'guitar solo' meant the section of the music wherein the 'lead', 'featured', 'prominent' or 'melody' instrument was a guitar, this despite direct reference in the question to '... the preceding sections of the excerpt'. Many students referred to the guitar solo as being the climax of the song but struggled to articulate why or how. Many students merely *described* what happened in the guitar solo (as an account) rather than *discussing* its relationship to the preceding sections of the excerpt (as the question required).

Section A

Question 7

Part-writing

a. (Average mark 5.46/available marks 9)

During Unit 3 you harmonised a melodic excerpt to create an arrangement.

Describe decisions you made at any stage/s of your harmonising a melodic excerpt to create an arrangement. Your response **must** include reference to:

- instrumental/vocal registers
- instrument/s and/or voice/s in combination
- treatment of rhythm, for example rhythmic imitation.

It was expected that students demonstrate a high degree of awareness of issues related to harmonisation, especially regarding the three bullet points, with respect to their impact upon and/or relevance to the student's own arrangement. That is, prepared and/or generic responses were not viewed favourably.

A large number of responses for this question were obviously prepared (and perhaps memorised) beforehand. Most of these responses lacked detail and/or failed to describe or present the student's own work clearly. Although sometimes highly sophisticated (arrangement 'by the book'), the prepared responses were very generic and, as such, could be applied to the harmonisation of virtually any melody. Many students did not understand that when a question asks them to describe their own work, they must describe what they did, not what they might have done, think they should have done, or what somebody else once did.

Generally, students identified decisions made at various stages of the process but the descriptions often lacked depth. The term 'register' was not always understood and sometimes not commented upon. Students discussed the instruments they used, and therefore identified 'instrument/s and/or voice/s in combination' but seldom dealt with the result/s of the combination or reasons for it. When discussing matters regarding 'the treatment of rhythm ...' most students referred to meter/time signature and tempo. Some students commented that they 'used rhythmic imitation', but the rhythmic patterns, note values, characteristics (for example, overlap), etc. were not described.

A significant number of students for some reason attempted to answer all three parts of Question 7 within their response for Question 7a. Such responses tended to lack clarity and were often highly verbose and circuitous. In addition, responses for 7b and 7c were forced into repetitiveness or sometimes trivialities.

Many students dealt with only one or two of the points listed. A significant number of them added points they wished to cover (which was acceptable) but failed to make reference at all to any of the three bullet points as per the requirements of the question. Conversely, some students focused the whole of their response on the three bullet points, often despite the fact that there was almost certainly a fair amount more that they would have liked to say. This latter point perhaps indicates that they did not read the question thoroughly, hence assuming that '... must include ...' meant '... can *only* include ...'.

Many responses only briefly addressed the question and did not include detailed information. Some students wrote comments such as, 'I made the melody a soft melody – something that was easy to listen to because I thought it reflected on myself'. This is perhaps acceptable as an aside, but the question did not ask for decisions made when composing the melody (which is not a requirement of the key knowledge or skills). Some responses lacked depth, for example 'I used different rhythms, starting with a simple rhythm and building on it'. This is fine as an opening statement, but it was all one student wrote with reference to issues regarding his/her 'treatment of rhythm ...'.

More successful responses to this question focused on decisions that were clearly demonstrated as being relevant to the arrangement as completed by the student. Less successful responses commonly included a general description of one of the bullet points; for example, 'treatment of rhythm ...', without any reference at all to the melody itself. Indeed, it was often not possible to gauge clearly how the melody had been treated with respect to any of the three points. This may indicate that although some students were furnished with melodic excerpts to harmonise, they were perhaps not expected to analyse and understand them within the range of broader musical contexts and harmonisation/arranging procedures.

Some students focused their response upon the performance of their piece, rather than on the arrangement and harmonisation processes used. Many did not present any contextualisation (for example, the precise nature of their melody, the stylistic attributes of their arrangement), hence it was very difficult for them to describe their harmonisation with an appropriate level of insight or awareness of relevant approaches and techniques. Some students did, however, notate their melody and then addressed relevant contextual issues quite well indeed. (Students who include notation as part of their response to questions in this section should remember to include a clef or a time signature.)

b (3.81/9)

Describe three arrangement and/or orchestration techniques used by recognised music arranger/s and/or orchestrator/s that you used in **your** harmonisation and arrangement of a melodic excerpt. You may wish to identify particular arranger/s and/or orchestrator/s in your response.

Relevant arrangement and/or orchestration techniques include:

Chord selection – Issues related to implied harmonies. Selection of the given harmony via placement of the note as a member of the triad (as the root, 3rd or 5th) or as an extension of the harmony (as the 7th, 9th or 11th, for example).

Voicing – A description based upon the logic behind placement of pitches in relation to one another. Descriptions could refer to register, range and tessitura (how ever these may be described – the use of exact terminology is not a requirement of the answer.)

Voice-leading – for example the use of 'non-traditional' consecutive intervals (particularly 5^{ths} and octaves). To achieve a particular stylistic effect or voice-leading within the accompaniment, for example, use of consecutive intervals in 'rhythm' parts, especially piano/keyboards and guitars.

Basic arrangement/orchestration techniques:

- *instrumental combinations to create different tone colours, densities and/or sonic effects*
- *issues related to instrumental 'doubling'*

- *contrary versus parallel motion between parts, both in the same register and in different registers; harmonic density (e.g. how many instruments should deliver the chords ... is there a point that might be reached where there are too many chording instruments involved?)*
- *the use of different inversions in the chording instruments in order to 'spread' the sonority across registers*
- *the 'groove', the role of rhythm and the 'rhythm section' (if used)*
- *the general (and specific) interrelationships between melody, harmony and rhythm.*

Relationship/s between parts:

- *parallel harmonisation*
- *contrary motion*
- *conjunct versus disjunct motion*
- *polyphony*
- *direct imitation*
- *call and response*
- *homophony*
- *'free-part' style*
- *heterophony (e.g. simultaneous variation).*

Harmonic rhythm:

- *consistent/regular changes of harmonies*
- *chordal ostinati*
- *harmonic cycles created via the use of additive rhythms*
- *extended segments (phrases) with regular or irregular subdivisions*
- *multiple rhythmic strata aligned to harmonic 'macro events.'*

Most students handled the question well if they could articulate the components and/or procedures of basic arrangement techniques. A large number had been taught the relevant terminology and could use it appropriately. The most successful responses were presented by students who had been taught part-writing in some clearly systematic fashion (e.g. Baroque, Classical, Romantic, Contemporary/popular).

Often students did not possess the background information, knowledge or relevant listening and pragmatic experience to really address this question well. Some who were not familiar with common arranging or orchestration techniques and others with only limited knowledge and/or limited levels of music literacy could not describe them in relation to their own harmonisation and arrangement. Often there was little or no description of what had been done, whether or not reference was made to techniques used by arrangers and/or orchestrators. Many students could describe arranging and/or orchestration techniques and often identify an individual or a studio that is famous for the given technique, but failed to demonstrate how (or even if) any of them were used in their own harmonisation and arrangement.

Others did not display much understanding of what constitutes an arrangement and/or orchestration technique. Many failed to display any familiarity with techniques used in other arrangements/orchestrations that they could refer to, or with the work of professional arrangers or orchestrators, given the lack of names cited in responses. Students and teachers should refer to the key knowledge for this outcome. Teaching and learning programs that include listening and analysis of techniques used will assist students to be aware of ways they can incorporate similar approaches in their own work.

Students struggled to describe three techniques and did not genuinely understand the essence/s of the techniques when they did. Many were unable to articulate an understanding of how their arrangement evolved. Some commented on a basic relationship between parts and maybe the chords they used, but the techniques used and the arrangers that have been of influence, were not referred to. Students frequently described their use of elements such as dynamics and meter and then almost invariably included them again in their response for Question 7c.

c (6.13/12)

Discuss the process/es you used to complete your harmonisation and arrangement of a melodic excerpt. Refer to any **three** of the following.

- tone colour
- harmonic basis
- rhythmic relationships
- dynamics
- articulations
- transposition
- use of digital technology.

Responses for this question were highly context specific and therefore prepared and/or generic responses were not viewed favourably.

Students were expected to select three points relevant to their harmonisation and arrangement. More successful answers exhibited a fair understanding of issues relevant to the selected elements with respect to their impact upon and relevance to the student's harmonisation. Some responses were truly outstanding, featuring discussions that were able to convey the more creative processes of the harmonisation and arrangement, for instance, reasons for placing specific dynamics at certain points in the music as well as sophisticated and informed comments regarding choices of particular rhythms, rhythmic relationships and/or chords. Most responses were lacking in detail, however, and genuine discussions were relatively rare.

Some students did little editing or reflection during the development of their harmonisation. The terms 'tone colour', 'texture', 'rhythmic relationships', and 'articulations' were not well-understood by many students. Students are advised that if they are uncertain of the meaning/s of the term/s, they should probably avoid discussing it within their answer – especially in this instance where a discussion of only three of seven elements was required. Often it was not possible to establish which three points were being addressed. Students could consider underlining such features if their response is not in a point-based style. Very limited skills were shown when students attempted to communicate features of their arrangement. For instance, when referring to 'tone colour', one student wrote: 'to achieve a bright swing style, I used happy sounding instruments, major chords, and a light rhythm section' and another student commented: 'to create a bright vibrant tone colour I used instruments that would be appropriate to the happy sound'. In both instances, the instruments used were not identified and process/es were not discussed at all.

A large percentage of students did not understand the musical terms, even though they were all taken directly from the study design and have featured in this examination since 2001. Most students who wrote about 'tone colour' confused it with 'tone'. Students who dealt with 'dynamics' consistently confused the term with pitch and 'rhythmic relationships'. With reference to 'dynamics', examples of common responses included: 'I started softly, then built up to the end with a crescendo' or 'I made the melody louder than the other parts'. These comments might be a start, but, unfortunately, they were everything written by these two students about process/es used regarding 'dynamics' for their harmonisations and arrangements. Students who dealt with the 'harmonic basis' of their harmonisation and arrangement frequently did not go much further than mentioning that all of the chords used were in root position and often without identifying what they were.

Students who dealt with the 'use of digital technology' usually gave detailed descriptions of the capabilities and sometimes the procedures of the technology but commonly did not 'discuss the process/es used ...' with respect to *their* '... harmonisation and arrangement of a melodic excerpt'. An example of a comment about process/es was: 'we used Sibelius/Micrologic to find our mistakes and print out the parts'. Many students who dealt with 'transposition' simply wrote that the software took care of this and often wrote most about the keyboard (computer) commands used to create transpositions within the software package they used. Such comments are perhaps worthwhile as starting points, but in both instances they were the entire response to the given bullet point, and certainly do not constitute a discussion, indeed not a description, either. Many students are not aware that the 'process/es' used deal with musical issues, not simply what one does to get the computer to do it. When a 'discussion' is required, students must present their knowledge about the topic (not the machine) in order to demonstrate understanding (in this instance, of the musical process[es] involved with given bullet point).

Question 8 Improvisation

During Unit 3 you prepared and performed an improvisation.

a (5.06/9)

Describe at least **three** decisions **you** made whilst preparing your improvisation. Your response **must** include reference to

- form
- rhythmic features
- the style/s of the backing track or accompaniment parts.

There were some outstanding responses to this question. Overall, students displayed good knowledge of their chosen musical style and many were able to refer enthusiastically to musicians of note who had influenced them and whose techniques they had adopted and/or adapted. More successful students were obviously both language literate and musically literate in their improvisatory genre. These students could articulate that they knew what is involved, how to approach issues of preparation from a variety of perspectives and domains (note selection, substitutions, scale forms), and indeed that it is probably important to make knowledgeable preparatory decisions about improvising in the first place. (Of note is the one student who wrote: 'preparing an improvisation is an oxymoron'. Although this may be true in a few genres and/or contexts it most certainly is not the case for most and the study design directs the teaching and learning of a range of processes, knowledge and understanding, all of which lend themselves to differentiated selection in preparational settings.)

Many students dealt with only one or two of the bullet points. Most students dealt with their own points but failed to refer to the three bullet points as instructed. Many students did not read the question correctly and presented responses that failed to describe decisions that *they* made regarding *their* preparation of *their* improvisation. As such, some students wrote about chord extensions, for example, without any reference to the chords of the song itself. Many students commented about the tonality and/or harmonic progressions of the piece but did not go on to address what they decided to do when preparing their improvisation, that is, they described the framework but did not then answer the question.

A high percentage of students were unaware of or very confused about the meaning/s of ‘form’. Indeed, ‘form’ was rarely addressed, except by those improvising to a 12-bar blues format or (sometimes) to a 32-bar song format. Some responses were almost entirely descriptions of the backing track without any focus upon issues regarding decisions *or* preparation.

In general, responses to this question were often vague with virtually no references to decisions made by students and that many give little thought to the preparation of their improvisations. A large number of prepared responses were presented for this question, most of which were better suited to Question 8a of the 2002 examination.

Note: Although not a requirement of the question, almost all of the outstanding responses included the name and key of the song and the instrument used, and frequently outlined the harmonic progression as well. Students then referred to this information in describing decisions they had made.

b (4.86/9)

Describe at least three improvisation techniques used by musician/s that **you** used when performing **your** improvisation. You may wish to identify particular musician/s in your response.

Responses for this question were highly context specific. It was expected that students exhibit understanding of issues relevant to the selected techniques with respect to their impact upon and relevance to their own improvisation.

A short list of relevant techniques might include:

- *call/response*
- *scale-based approaches (pentatonics, blues scale/s, be-bop scales, modes, directly diatonic, non-western, hybrid)*
- *imitation/variation*
- *long tones*
- *chromaticism*
- *rhythmic variation*
- *contour imitation*
- *thematic transformation*
- *dynamics*
- *instrument-specific techniques (‘growls’, ‘pull-offs’, ‘tapping’, vocalised ‘interjection’, slides and bends, etc.*
- *textural issues (cymbal roles, playing drums with hands, using instrument out of ‘standard’ context – e.g. buzzing mouthpiece without trumpet)*
- *augmentation*
- *diminution.*

This question required students to describe improvisation techniques that *they* used. However, only a few responses focused on techniques actually explored. Students should include details of the context they were working in as part of their response. For example, a statement regarding how and/or why should accompany comments such as ‘I varied the rhythm’.

Some responses described improvisational techniques used by musicians (and/or identified relevant musicians), but rarely were the components or characteristics of the techniques identified described in any level of detail. Quite often the three techniques described were in fact different aspects of the same technique. Most students based their description around improvisation in a blues style but presented very vague responses as if simply writing ‘blues style’ required no further level of elaboration or detail. Some students presented superficial rules such as, ‘the scales used must complement and highlight the melody’, but with no description about improvisational technique, how one might achieve what this ‘rule’ implies, how the particular improvisational technique operated – whether for the student or when used by (other) musicians, etc. Some students did not have read the question appropriately as they presented a detailed description of what other members of their group were doing while they improvised. Some students simply referred to playing techniques (for example, ‘hammer-ons’, ‘pull offs’, ‘bends’) without relating or explaining how they applied them in their improvisation. Many students did not know what constitutes an ‘improvisation technique’.

Nevertheless, some outstanding and very imaginative responses, often featuring very sophisticated and highly appropriate terminology, demonstrated considerable understanding and obvious experience in the use and development of various improvisational techniques and skills.

c (5.35/12)

With respect to any **three** of the following, **discuss** musical issues that were important when **performing** your improvisation.

- scale forms/tonality
- harmonic progression/s
- influences
- articulations
- variation
- use of the instrument/s
- contrast.

This question was frequently answered with palpable enthusiasm. Clearly as they undertook activities associated with this outcome, some students made excellent progress in developing their improvisational skills and understanding of salient considerations. Scales and modes were sometimes discussed with considerable insight, as were ‘influences’ - many waxed lyrical about the jazz greats (sometimes at the expense of the other two issues that were to be discussed). Outstanding responses dealt with ‘scale forms/tonality’ and ‘harmonic progression/s’, linking these to the extemporaneous logic of their improvisations and the general musicality of their performance, while displaying substantial familiarity with their material.

Nevertheless, many responses lacked depth and discernment. Some students listed components of and/or presented definitions for three (or more) of the bullet points from the list but failed to relate them to the music and/or the performance of an improvisation specific to that piece of music (whether as performed by them or anyone else). As such, many responses were not ‘discussions’ but rather simply definitions or broad elemental descriptions of the bullet points selected.

The bullet points, ‘contrast’, ‘variation’, and ‘articulation’ were most often discussed with respect to their impact on the performance of the improvisation. Many students who dealt with ‘scale forms/tonality’ made comments like: ‘it is important to know the scales so you don’t play a wrong note’. (Certainly true, but commonly such was all that was written about this highly significant issue.) Some students confused personal interpretation with issues and elements related to the performance of an improvisation. (Most displayed similar kinds of misunderstanding with respect to Questions 8a. and 8b. as well.) A significant percentage of students presented a lengthy description of their performance examination (sometimes including every song in their programme) the focus of which was the fact that the role of featured soloist had been passed from one performer to another which, it was claimed, was an example of ‘variation’. Many students misunderstood the meanings of the bullet points, for example, regarding ‘tonality’, one student wrote ‘I needed to play in the same key as the accompaniment’; regarding ‘influences’, a common response was along the lines of simply: ‘I like Grunge’ (as if there exists an archetypal Grunge solo); and, regarding ‘contrast’: ‘my solo needed to sound different to the backing track’. Some students who wrote about ‘variation’ and ‘contrast’ said almost precisely the same thing about both of them.

Section C – Aspects of performance

As part of their response students were asked to provide information about two works they had prepared for performance and/or performed; the line-up of their group or ensemble, the style of the group or ensemble; and to identify one venue at which their group had presented a performance. A number of students did not provide this information. A significant number of students named the members of their group (often providing full names and instruments played) as well as the school’s hall (by name) or the name and location of the performance venue. Instructions on page 23 asked students to ‘list the ‘line up’ (instrumentation including voice/s) ...’ – not the names of members – and instructions regarding the venue stated specifically ‘do not name the school, suburb, city or town where the venue was located’. Many students did not know what ‘line up’ referred to so either listed their entire repertoire (a set list) or wrote nothing. Several students identified the venue, themselves and members of their ensembles by their full names and instruments and wrote short biographies about each member. This is not appropriate and it is a significant waste of time. Students are asked to furnish this information simply to provide context to the responses that follow. (Of concern were the few students who indicated they did not get the chance to perform, especially since the first of the ‘key skills’ of Outcome 1 Unit 4 of this study design requires that ‘... the student should demonstrate the ability to present a program of music from a range of styles’. In addition, the Performance Examination itself was, of course, a performance so it could have been used for answering this question).

It was observed that, although there were some terrific answers for the three parts of Question 9, rarely did one student present excellent responses to all three. Generally, responses to the three parts of Question 9 lacked detail. While there were some interesting songs dealt with, including original compositions, frequently students did not actually answer the questions. Students are advised to select songs about which they can write optimal responses. Many described what they like about the songs rather than responding to the question.

Question 9

a

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Average
%	9	2	7	12	17	13	19	11	10	4.56

The way the sound is produced is important when presenting a performance of a music work. Select one of the works you identified on page 23 and explain **two technical considerations** relating to sound production that contributed to the way your group performed the work in the performance venue you identified on page 23.

A short list of technical considerations includes:

- *issues of acoustics*
- *placement of the instruments/players relative to each other (issues of being able to hear one another)*
- *structural materials*
- *seating capacity*
- *'fly-space' above a proscenium stage*
- *placement of monitors ('foldback speakers')*
- *use of graphic (or parametric) equalisation*
- *seating arrangements*
- *balance*
- *use and/or selection of microphones*
- *intonation and tuning*
- *instrument maintenance*
- *placement of the mixing desk*
- *use of acoustic baffles*
- *use of sound enhancement/effects/alteration devices (e.g. digital delay, reverb, echo, distortion, overdrive)*
- *placement of amplifiers.*

High level responses demonstrated excellent understanding of the technical considerations relevant to a successful performance in a certain type of venue. A few responses were somewhat vague and insignificant comments of a dubiously 'technical' nature. Top responses dealt with issues such as the acoustic characteristics of the venue, the positioning of microphones/speakers/performers, the addition of sound enhancing and/or 'damping' materials either to the stage, the performance space, or both (including an explanation of why this was necessary), the seating capacity of the venue, maintaining balance throughout the venue (for the audience). Most importantly, excellent responses were focused directly upon contributions made by two technical considerations relating to sound production with respect to the performance of the work by *their* ensemble. The most successful responses included highly effective diagrams.

Most responses focused upon an array of issues related to only one technical consideration. A lot of responses were very short with virtually no explanation, for example: 'we had to use a PA and foldback wedges so that we could hear ourselves' (the full extent of the response). Many students described sound production and/or sound reinforcement as a stand-alone issue, failing to focus upon two technical considerations and/or overlooking the need to place the description within the context of their own group or ensemble. Such answers were clear indicators of responses prepared beforehand. Some responses indicated that the students were not at all familiar with technical considerations relating to sound production and/or sound reinforcement. Some students believed that 'technical considerations' related exclusively to technological devices. A significant number of answers (especially from players of heavy metal music) did not focus upon genuinely technical considerations beyond reference to the viewpoint that performers had to play as loudly possible when there was an audience because the sound would be absorbed and the music would not 'sound good'.

b

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Average
%	13	4	8	14	16	15	14	9	4	3	4.11

With reference to the **other work** you identified on page 23, **describe three rehearsal strategies** used by your group to prepare and/or perform the work. In your response do not refer to individual practise on/with your instrument or voice. Responses to this question were expected to be focused upon a specific work rather than generalised comments about rehearsing for an entire presentation/performance.

Rehearsal strategies include:

- *analytical considerations*
- *memorisation (as applicable)*
- *alterations to the comparative role/prominence of instruments/voice/s at given times*
- *formal strategies to identify balance problems and address perceived difficulties*
- *experimentation with different interpretative emphases*
- *formalise the arrangement, especially labelling of sections and the nature of musical elements (e.g. density, variation, dynamics)*
- *assigning of leadership roles (as applicable)*

- sectional rehearsals, e.g. 'rhythm section', 'horn section' (as applicable)
- isolation of technical challenges and potential problems with a view to reducing, eliminating or at least dealing with them in performance
- exploring ways of achieving flexibility to respond to improvised solos
- listening to different recordings of the work and/or discussion regarding various ways to present original composition
- positioning of instruments and/or performers, particularly regarding visual contact and ease of interaction
- use of mutes and other sound reduction devices (if appropriate balance cannot be attained)
- use of risers or similar devices
- alterations to the sonic focus of acoustic (especially wind) instruments
- placement of sound reinforcement equipment (e.g. PA, foldback monitors).

Although there were some outstanding answers, many students failed to relate their responses to *rehearsal strategies* used by *their* group to prepare and/or perform the work. Many students listed three strategies but could not describe how these strategies were used by their group, while others described (or mentioned) only one or two. Many students did not know what rehearsal strategies are and/or did not understand the difference between practice and rehearsal. A common statement was: 'we played it over and over until it was right'. Although this approach can perhaps be viewed as a strategy, it is almost certainly not an effective one and its efficiency is questionable as well. This kind of response mentioned how they rehearsed, but almost never dealt with 'strategic' (problem solving) issues. A large number of students focused upon personal or individual practice matters, despite the question stating: 'in your response do not refer to individual practise on/with your instrument or voice'. Many students listed 'tuning up' as a rehearsal strategy and went on to describe the process.

Many students included a comment such as: practice the song over and over (even, '1) practise, 2) practise, 3) practise' as the entire response to this 9-mark question).

Other 'strategies' referred to included:

- stage presentation (wearing the same outfits)
- listening to and/or playing along with the CD and/or other music of a similar style
- using a metronome
- jumping up and down at the same time; for example, after the bridge or solo section, when the verse (or chorus) returns, to demonstrate that everyone knows where they are
- getting in 'the zone'
- having spare strings and sticks/spare instruments
- 'project your voice to the mountains'.

With respect to some of these factors, it might be possible to use them as part of a rehearsal strategy, but others such as having spare equipment are not rehearsal strategies for a specific work. Many students were not sufficiently familiar with the characteristics or components of the works they had prepared for performance and/or performed in order to be able to present and/or describe (worthwhile) rehearsal strategies.

Most top answers demonstrated keen awareness of the importance of staying focused on the end result as part of the preparation process, even though this view was commonly mentioned as an important adjunct consideration, that is, not as a rehearsal strategy per se. Generally, students from acoustic/chamber music groups were better able to describe/discuss rehearsal strategies, probably because of the nature of their 'traditions' and their participation in school-based (or community based) ensembles, as well as their ensemble for this subject.

c

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Average
%	28	9	14	13	11	9	9	4	3	0	0	2.74

In relation to the work you referred to in part **9b**, **discuss** one rehearsal strategy used by your group to realise the style of that work. The rehearsal strategy you discuss may be one of the strategies you identified in part **9b** or it may be a different strategy.

Strong responses needed to establish a link between the style of the work and the rehearsal strategy used to make it somehow 'authentic', appropriate or consistent with the style identified.

Discussions may incorporate some of the following considerations:

- *rhythmic interpretation*
- *articulations, ornaments and embellishments*
- *pitch and intonation issues*
- *phrasing*
- *dynamics and contrast*
- *bends, multi-phonic*s

- *use of improvisation (if appropriate)*
- *use of effects (sound enhancement/alteration devices such digital delay, reverb, echo, distortion, overdrive, etc.)*
- *(planned) interaction with the audience ('working' the crowd)*
- *historical and/or conventional and personal interpretation of works within the context of the performance style/s*
- *extra-musical elements (e.g. choreography, acrobatics).*

Although there were some outstanding answers, many students failed to relate their responses to a rehearsal strategy that *they* used to make *their* performance representative of the music style of the selected work. Often students did not refer to the realisation of the characteristics of the style of the work. Because students did not always detail what style they were trying to create/emulate (whether on page 23 or within their responses to any parts of Question 9), answers were often general and did not really deal with (the highly significant) '... realise the style ...' aspect of the question. Most often highlighted was the notion of playing along with recordings and/or listening to other music in the same style rather than a discussion of a genuine rehearsal strategy. Characteristics of the style were rarely discussed, however, and the making of the necessary link between realising the style through rehearsal was rarely made. Many students were not sufficiently familiar with a range of stylistic elements, characteristics and/or components of the work in order to approach this question effectively/efficiently.

Many students did not genuinely *discuss* a rehearsal strategy (see comments regarding the differences between 'identify/list', 'explain', 'describe' and 'discuss'). Some listed an array of random ideas with no discussion of strategic process, especially regarding ways their group realised the style of the work. A high proportion basically re-presented their answer for Question 9b.

Clearly many students ran out of time to provide a detailed response to this question. It is strongly recommended that students identify those questions that are worth the most marks during the 15 minutes of 'reading time' prior to the commencement of the examination and that they seek to complete those questions fully, for example, attempting such questions straight after the compact disc recording of Section A has finished.

© VCAA 2003

Published by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority
41 St Andrews Place, East Melbourne 3002

Photocopying: This publication can only be photocopied for the use of students and teachers in Victorian Schools.

