

# **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2006**

**1919/MS/R/06**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A-level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## **CONTENTS**

### **General Certificate of Secondary Education**

#### **Music (1919)**

#### **REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS**

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	5
1919 01 & 02	Principal Moderator's Report	6
1919/03	Principal Examiner's Report	15
*	Grade Thresholds	20



## **Chief Examiner's Report**

This is now the fourth year of the specification and, in most centres, there is evidence that students are developing good musical understanding through its content. In a small number of centres it appears that the content is still not being taught and this often causes candidates to underachieve in the listening examination and to forgo marks in those aspects of the coursework that depend specifically on the understanding defined in the areas of study.

OCR positively recognises all the hard work and research that teachers have undertaken over the past few years in order to teach the defined styles and techniques and, for this reason, it is not planning to alter the content of the specification prior to the next major qualification review. The only change that is planned is the reduction in the number of performance pieces from three to two, which will now be implemented next year, for the 2007 examination.

There are a number of issues that a small minority of centres are not addressing appropriately year on year. These relate in particular to the administration and content of the coursework and some of them impact significantly on candidates' achievement. Centres should always read thoroughly the Moderator's reports as well as this report **and act on their content**. Year on year, some centres make the same errors in assessment and presentation.

Many issues are referred to in detail later in the report, but for convenience the most frequently occurring problems are summarised here.

- When submitting paperwork to the Moderator, if the centre has ten or more candidates, **all** the assessment forms should be sent with the MS1s.
- Centre Authentication Forms are now mandatory and must be sent to the Moderator with the candidates' work.
- On the rare occasion where a centre has requested **and been granted** an extension from OCR, it is the centre's responsibility to inform the Moderator of this **by 15<sup>th</sup> May**.
- When samples are requested, or amendments to marks required, the timescale on the accompanying letter must be adhered to.
- Whether work is on tape, CD or minidisk, a hand list must be provided to enable the Moderator to identify the pieces.
- Although it is not necessary to justify the marks, centres must use the information box on the assessment form to tell the Moderator anything that is not clearly evident from the recording or score. This could include, in performing, a difficult key, use of presets on the keyboard or, in the composing process, the support provided by technology.
- Candidates must perform different pieces. The same piece cannot be performed twice.
- An ensemble **must** involve two or more performers of music interacting **live**.
- The Terminal Task is a melodic exercise, and very few marks are available if a melody is not produced!

Pupils cannot succeed in the listening examination without being taught the content. Innate or acquired general musical ability is not enough. Knowledge of features of the styles and the language for learning is a prerequisite for being able to apply those features when listening.

## **Principal Moderator's Report**

### **Components 1 and 2: Coursework and Terminal Task**

#### **Administration**

OCR appreciates all the effort and commitment that is involved in presenting and assessing their candidates' work. Whilst the administrative burden has been eased, with an examination whereby 75% of the work is assessed by the centre, there is still much to do.

#### **Late submission of work**

The vast majority of centres submitted their work to the Moderator by OCR's deadline date of 15<sup>th</sup> May. However, it was disappointing that a small number of centres continues to flagrantly disregard this date without any prior arrangement and issues a series of uncorroborated reasons for the late submission. Furthermore, on a few occasions, it was clear to Moderators that the Assessor was working independently from the centre's examinations administration, which meant that efforts to contact the centre with enquiries regarding late work, or other matters that required some clarification, was met with confusion. This further delayed the process unnecessarily.

If centres feel that they have a good reason for delaying the submission of work, initial contact must be made with OCR to seek permission for an extension. If that permission is granted, and a letter sent to the centre to that effect, it is then the centre's responsibility to send a copy of the letter to the Moderator **before 15<sup>th</sup> May**. Much unnecessary time and effort was expended this year because centres had not done this.

#### **Coursework Assessment Forms and MS1s**

It is necessary to reiterate that for GCSE music, all Coursework Assessment Forms must be submitted to the Moderator with the MS1 form. A significant number of centres did not do this. There are two important reasons for this requirement. The first is that, in a subject that accommodates such a wide variety of performance instruments and performing styles, the Moderator needs to be sure that a truly representative sample is selected. The second relates to the complexity of the mathematical processes that are needed to produce the final mark, and the potential for error. Whilst some centres are meticulous in their sums, the majority were found to have some clerical error(s) on the forms. It is important, and often to the candidates' benefit, that the correct total is entered into the system. On this point, Assessors are strongly advised to have someone check the marks before entering them onto the MS1 (or on-line equivalent) form.

Centres that complete the MS1 forms by hand are reminded that it is important that they fill in the lozenges as well as the number characters. An increasing number of centres did not complete this task this year.

#### **Presentation of recordings**

Most centres are now using CDs rather than tapes. This makes the job of finding candidates' work much easier, as long as a Track List is provided; there were a few centres that provided no indication of the order of items on the CD. Some mini disks presented difficulties as they did not play correctly; care must be taken to see that they are recorded in standard format.

Where work is submitted on a cassette tape, it is fairer to the candidate if a new, blank cassette is used. There were instances of Centres recycling old cassettes where the previous recording had not been fully erased, causing there to be spillage of the original on to the candidate's coursework submission. It is helpful, during the moderation process, to be able to hear Performance 1 and Composition 1 following each other and centres would assist Moderators greatly by recording these items consecutively.

## *Report on the Components Taken in June 2006*

The recording of the Terminal Task on one separate CD or tape is an increasingly popular option, and centres are encouraged to do this, as it saves themselves and the Moderators time. Centres are asked not to record performances and compositions on separate sides of a CD, nor to submit one candidate's work on several different tapes or CDs. There were centres that provided the same candidate's work on three or four cassettes, and this was not helpful.

It is encouraging to note that Assessors are becoming more aware of the importance of sound quality and ambience. Some recordings were made in spaces with lively acoustics that legitimately enhanced performances. However, it would seem clear that, in making a recording of such importance, every effort should be made to avoid the unnecessary background noise of slamming doors, other candidates rehearsing, or even a loudly ticking clock! An awareness of the timings of the school bell can also help to produce a more successful recording.

### **Packaging**

Most centres are now submitting work in a compact way, although there were a few examples of centres using heavy files and bulky packaging. Centres are reminded that assessment forms should be presented **separately** from the candidates' work as they are dealt with separately, and not returned.

### **Authentication of candidates' work**

The Centre Authentication Form is now a requirement across all examinations involving coursework, and in a number of cases this had to be requested. A small minority of Assessors were reluctant to send this form, or responded negatively to requests. It must be pointed out that candidates cannot be awarded grades if the teacher has not authenticated the work. Centres are asked not to submit the form and annotate it suggesting doubt about a particular candidate's offering. Where such doubt exists, the work should not be submitted and the matter dealt with internally. This is likely to cause less damage to the candidate's chance of success than if it is dealt with through OCR's formal plagiarism procedures.

## **Performing**

Many candidates this year achieved a very good standard of performance with a wide variety of music being selected. Some of the work was excellent and above the standard expected of GCSE.

There was evidence of candidates spending time linking their first performance with their first composition within Area of Study 1 and in doing so there was greater incidence of candidates interpreting the music much more effectively and accurately. This said, there were also some centres in which students made no attempt to study any performance pieces in relation to their own instrument or their first composition. Again, it must be stressed that candidates are not to submit their own composition as Performance 1 and that study of their own compositions as part of Area of Study 1 is not permitted. Performance 1 should be commercially available or arranged by the centre for the candidate. Such cases were few in number but centres should be aware that if all performances consist of own compositions candidates will not be able to fulfil the requirements of Area of Study 1.

Centres are reminded that whilst live versions of rock music are dynamic and impressive to their audience, the assessment of performance is concerned with the quality of the playing and the difficulty of the part. Some Assessors failed to register the fact that a guitarist might be playing a simple three chord riff or that a simple drum rhythm repeated throughout the performance without demonstrating other skills may well be integral to the successful execution of the musical genre but does not necessarily lead to full marks.

There was more evidence of the effective use of ICT as part of some performances. Centres must show and state how the performance has been created. One part must have been recorded live (i.e. in real time), when using sequencer software, and this line must be identified for moderating purposes. The difficulty mark for the piece should be based on this live part. Marks for musicality can be awarded for the way in which the student edits the rest of the piece by using dynamics, velocity, expression, modulation and other controller functions within the sequencing software. DJ decks are **not** permitted as a performance instrument.

In some cases, candidates were awarded higher marks for difficulty than for musicality. A mark of 4 + 5 is not allowed. If the performance only merits 4 marks, then 4 is also the maximum for difficulty. This rule is stated on page 36 of the specification. There are no half marks available.

There were a number of candidates who were disadvantaged by performing a piece that was too difficult for them. A simple piece performed musically can attract up to 2/3 of the marks. However, a number of candidates performed faltering performances of harder pieces which were achieving 4+2, whereas they might have been able to achieve 7+1 or 9+0.

The standard of piano accompanying remains good, but there is sometimes a need for a more sensitive placement of microphones in order to obtain a balanced recording. This is especially necessary in larger ensemble recordings, enabling Moderators to hear the whole performance as well as that of the candidate. This also applies when recording an instrumental ensemble. Numerous ensemble performances were submitted where the Moderator was not given sufficient information to identify the part throughout. This became problematic when moderating vocal performances. If the part cannot be clearly identified, then a score must be sent. It is not always sufficient just to say that the candidate is the first or second voice to enter. This may give the listener a starting point, but it is often the case that as the piece develops, it is not possible to aurally track the individual voice of the candidate.



Candidates cannot perform against backing tracks where their own part is being played on the recording. This includes singing along to the original CD version of the song. Such performances do not fulfil the requirements set out on page 30 of the specification. Some song accompaniments double the vocal line and in these instances the accompaniment may need to be re-arranged in order to avoid this. In such circumstances the difficulty mark may be altered.

A solo performance can be any instrument accompanied by, for example, piano, drum kit or indeed any other instrument playing in a supportive role. In some cases performances were unaccompanied and these candidates may have fared better by having had the support of an accompaniment.

The number of candidates who do not perform in an ensemble is now very small and tends to be an issue in a few isolated centres. In such cases the best two solo marks are taken. Unfortunately it can have a significant impact on the candidate's total marks when it happens, since one performance is 10% of the examination. Centres are therefore once again reminded that where candidates perform with a backing track and there is no other live performer, then this can only be entered as a solo. The impact will be even greater next year when only two performances are required.

**An ensemble performance** therefore must contain at least **two live performers**. In order to demonstrate ensemble skills, the parts must be performed simultaneously for a substantial amount of the piece. A few pieces were submitted as ensembles where the live parts were performed one after the other. Such performances do not engage the candidate in performing a significant individual part **in an ensemble** as stated on page 12 of the specification.

**Centres are reminded that, as from 2007, candidates should submit one solo performance and one ensemble performance.**

### **Quality of Assessment**

The assessment of performing was, on the whole, quite fair, with some Centres being a little lenient with the marks awarded for musicality. Assessors need to read the criteria carefully when assessing work. Often performances that had noticeable mistakes were awarded marks in the top bracket, when they would have been better placed in the bracket below. It is worth reiterating that a performance must be accurate in both rhythm and pitch and be **musical** for it to be placed in the top band of marks.

Although not mandatory, in one or two cases a helpful comment on the reverse of the assessment form explaining why a mark was given for the difficulty of the piece would have been useful. Where a part appears to be quite repetitive in nature or uses a small range of resources, a difficulty mark of 0 is available. In many instances drummers and guitarists were given high difficulty marks for very simple patterns. For example, in a piano duet it is not always clear whether the candidate is using one hand or two and in keyboard performances the use of presets and chord functions must be made clear on the assessment form.

Less able keyboard players were often over-marked. The instrument specific indicators for difficulty for Electronic Keyboards are found on page 58 of the specification. They assume that even for the lowest band of difficulty marks, candidates are performing using both hands simultaneously. This does not rule out credit being given for demanding one-handed parts but it does mean that very simple pieces, using a limited range of notes and rhythms, played by the right hand only, are below the minimum difficulty level expected for the examination. In cases where such pieces are submitted, the marks need to be adjusted downwards to reflect this.

## Composing

When considering the best work, Moderators were delighted to read and listen to some extremely imaginative and original compositions, which, in the case of the Integrated Coursework, drew close links and parallels with their performance and related repertoire both in style and timbre. Overall the quality of Composition 1 exceeded the quality of Composition 2 and this testified to the value of Area of Study 1, enabling candidates to develop the musical understanding of their instrument and the genre in order to enable them to compose successfully for it. However there were still a few cases where the first composition lacked sufficient use of the chosen instrument, or even didn't use it at all.

At times it was clear that the basis of an original work had been developed by the teacher, mostly with the candidate's input, but producing a finished piece that contained elements that were beyond the candidate's experience. In such cases, Moderators sought clarification from centres but were only able to support marks for the work the candidate actually did themselves. A candidate who writes in their appraisal that the composition sounded completely different when the teacher performed it is raising a question about whose work the submission is.

There was a noticeable increase in the number of compositions for various combinations of rock ensemble. Whilst this is welcomed, it is necessary for candidates and their Assessor to give some indication of the extent to which the parts have been composed as opposed to being extemporised by skilful performers. A copy of the lyrics for an original song does not assist the process of moderation; equally, the marked omission of supporting documents that would clarify the intentions of candidates was disappointing and unhelpful.

Some candidates submitted their Composition 1 as one of their performances. This practice is to be encouraged as it often facilitates higher marks as the candidate as the composer can engage in the performance effectively. It is not appropriate however to submit such a piece as Performance 1, as stated earlier in this report.

In Areas of Study 3 and 4, Moderators noted that the Waltz remained the most popular choice for submission. There were some highly imaginative, well crafted pieces, with melodic shapes, counter melodies, ornamentation and chromaticism, alongside appropriate changes in tempo and dynamics that produced the flavour of the Waltz. On the other hand, many Waltz compositions were written to a formula, often using the preset functions of the keyboard to generate the waltz style. Such pieces tended to show only a very basic understanding of melodic writing, using notes of the underlying chord, with an outcome that lacked musical creativity.

In the same way, some Disco pieces were very stylish, whereas others were over reliant on the keyboard backing to generate the style.

Moderators noted increasingly inventive Minimalist pieces this year, especially those that used technology. Imaginative choice of timbre, structure, intervals and rhythmic motives, alongside carefully judged layering combined together to create very original pieces, which had musical impact. Here some candidates, who were not able performers, were achieving very highly. The worst compositions submitted this year however were also in this genre. Such offerings consisted of the submission of written scores with no indication of anything other than pitch and rhythm, either written laboriously or created mechanically using notation software. Such pieces are totally alien to the spirit of what GCSE is designed to develop and must be demoralising for candidates to have to produce.

There were fewer imaginative PAVANES and GALLIARDS and many consisted of minim-crotchet-crotchet *ostinati* revealing little of the generic elements of the style and giving no sense of period.

The number of Salsa and Bhangra compositions has not increased this year, and indeed some Moderators commented that they had not heard or seen any. This may reflect the fact that these areas are proving still to be a challenge for teachers.

In general, briefs were clearly planned out on the Candidate Information Form GCW761. Some candidates submitted their briefs for Composition 2 alongside their brief for Composition 1 within their appraisal portfolio. The brief for Composition 2, whilst important in determining how the composition is assessed, is not of itself assessed and should therefore be submitted separately from the integrated coursework.

### **Quality of Assessment**

On the whole most compositions in Area of Study 1 were accurately marked. In cases where the candidate had not provided a brief, or where the composition was not written for the instrument studied, the mark out of five could not be upheld.

Composition 2 on the other hand was generally too highly marked. Most often the Assessor's generosity resulted from the application of the Area of Study mark. There were frequent cases where only basic features of the style were employed yet the Assessor had given four or even five marks. Large numbers of Waltz compositions where the only waltz feature was an unchanging oom pah pah accompaniment played throughout, using a keyboard preset, were worthy of one mark only in this section, but were awarded three or four marks.

## **Appraising**

Each year Moderators have been pleased to note an improvement in the quality of the appraising work that candidates have undertaken. This year once again, appraisals seemed stronger and more focused. There were many instances of candidates obviously gaining from the experience of analysing instrumental techniques. Only a handful of appraisals are submitted as recorded discussions with candidates; the vast majority are presented in writing, many being very competently word processed.

The better prepared centres provided all candidates with clearly structured questions to guide their work and this was of particular benefit to middle and lower ability pupils. Guidance on this has been provided by OCR personnel at training sessions and it was pleasing to see a number of centres adopting and adapting the formats that have been offered, to the benefit of their candidates.

The Performance Appraisal was often the strongest area, with candidates offering insights into the way their instrument is used in the three pieces studied and a critique of the performance. Some candidates lost marks because they did not say much about the second and third piece studied and this was a pity. There were fewer instances of candidates providing historical information, and illustrated projects about the instrument and its development were pleasingly rare. Some candidates missed obvious opportunities to write about instrumental techniques, focusing more on structural and technical features of the music.

There were a few excellent examples of Composition Briefs where candidates had obviously considered a range of techniques that they had learned of through their study of the three pieces, and from this had been able to make musical decisions as to which to employ. The majority of Composition Briefs simply contained lists of between four and six techniques, and whilst creditable, these candidates might have achieved higher marks if they had been encouraged to indicate why they had selected the particular techniques. A few briefs were still written in the past tense, and some were presented intertwined with the Composition Appraisal making it difficult to identify and extract the information to justify the mark awarded.

The Composition Appraisal was the weakest of the three areas. Centres need to spend more time giving guidance to candidates on how to complete this section. Many candidates either repeated the brief, focused on the composition process, or evaluated the performance of the composition. An effective Composition Appraisal needs to identify specific aspects of the composition which contribute to its success (or otherwise) and relate that to what has been learned in the study. It should go without saying that what the candidate says should tie up with what they have submitted as a composition; in a few cases Moderators were unable to identify the features to which the candidate had referred.

## **Quality of assessment**

Many centres are now assessing appraising accurately.

Where assessment was generous it was either where insufficient emphasis had been placed on this element of the examination, and all candidates presented appraisals that were short and lacking in detail, or where candidates had made insufficient reference to instrument specific techniques.

Where assessment was severe, it tended to be where lower ability candidates had written a few basic points and Assessors had not given them the credit for it. The lowest mark for each section is 1, and every candidate who writes something, however generalised, should at least achieve a mark in the 1-2 bracket. To achieve 3, a few simple and relevant points need to be made. There were some instances where candidates had written something and been awarded 0, or where they had made a few simple points and were awarded 1 or 2 where 3 would have been appropriate.

### **Terminal Task**

This section of the examination is proving to be an excellent opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their acquired musical understanding through a short simple task. It rightly has a significant weighting, at 15% of the total marks, and it is pleasing to see that most centres are now preparing candidates for it throughout the course.

The quality of work in this area is improving; this year there was more evidence of candidates effectively using the stimulus to construct, develop and extend an original composition within the given time frame. The many candidates who have been taught well were aware that melodic techniques are required. However this awareness sometimes lead them to try too hard to put as many ideas as they could into their end product, and as a result the piece became congested and lost some of its musical impact. The compositional outcome is not expected to be as high as the main coursework composition components (although in some cases both at the top and bottom of the range, it was!).

A few centres are teaching this aspect in a way that is too formulaic, and this results in pieces that are not sufficiently musical to gain high marks. There were fewer examples this year of non-melodic instruments being used, although there are still a few strumming guitarists who play the chords (and a few others) optimistically hoping that they are being melodic!

The most contentious area, which sometimes sparked lively debate between Moderator and Assessor, related to the use of the stimulus. It is important that the stimulus is heard in some way within the piece otherwise pre-prepared ideas could be entered that really do not warrant the marks, as the task is to compose in the 30 minutes allocated. Therefore, whilst the stimulus does not have to be developed to achieve high marks, it is a starting point and there must be evidence of this in the candidate's product. The best candidates therefore carefully repeated the stimulus at the outset before moving seamlessly into an extemporisation that showed structural development in the key elements of melody, harmony, and rhythm.

Overall the written submissions were less successfully undertaken than those that were performed or recorded through ICT. Many candidates presented scores that made no reference to instrumentation, articulation, tempo or dynamics, and some that attempted the latter did so in an arbitrary way which could not be given any credit.

### **Quality of assessment**

Most centres' marks were adjusted slightly downwards in the Terminal Task, although there were a few cases of less able candidates being severely assessed.

The mark for responding was often leniently applied higher in the range, with many Assessors giving 9 or 10 for melodies that really only deserved the bracket below.

The communication mark was sometimes generously awarded where performances had hesitations or did not use all of the musical elements appropriately. Essentially, if it is to

*Report on the Components Taken in June 2006*

reach the highest range of marks, a performance of the Terminal Task should have few flaws, make good musical sense and be communicated with a convincing and musical performance.

In the written submissions, marks were sometimes awarded generously where the range of musical elements were employed but without sufficient musical understanding of their impact to enable a successful rendition to be achieved.

1919/03

### General Comments

The paper was of a similar standard to previous years, although there was not quite as large a spread of marks as last year. Fewer candidates than last year gained marks above 85; there were several reasons for this:

- 1) There were one or two places where 'pre – learned' answers were apparent. Some candidates did not apply their answers carefully enough to the music that they heard but rather listed information that they had learnt.
- 2) Some candidates lost marks because they did not address their answers to the correct area of study – this was particularly apparent in Question 3.
- 3) Some candidates were not familiar with the terms that appear in the language for learning. This was evident in Questions 2 and 4, where candidates appeared to have a limited understanding of words like texture and harmony.

The 2006 paper had a similar format to that of previous years. While it is likely that the format of the paper will remain basically the same, it is important to note that detail changes may occur in future years. For example, it is possible that the comparison question may not always be based around Area of Study 3 and that Questions 5 and 6 may not always be restricted to Area of Study 4.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Question 1

This question is often based on the starting points of the Areas of Study and some candidates appeared confused by this.

#### Extract A

- (i) A substantial number of candidates identified Waltz correctly; however, a surprising number chose Galliard or even Pavane.
- (ii) Most candidates who correctly identified the waltz in part (i) gained a mark here.
- (iii) Most answered Ballroom for this question; relatively few candidates were able to place the solo piano as a concert piece. It is important to note that the specification requires candidates to understand how the 'music for the dance floor would have been transferred to the concert room'.

#### Extract B

- (i) Most candidates gained a mark for Blues/Jazz.
- (ii) There were some pleasing answers that included some very good aural awareness of the vocal melody that was heard. However, there were answers that mentioned the type of voice, the accompaniment to the melody and comments about the lyrics, none of which gained any credit.

#### Extract C

- (i) The vast majority of candidates scored 2 marks. A few candidates unfortunately ticked only one box instead of two and lost a mark.
- (ii) Most candidates correctly identified a string quartet but there was a significant number who were less specific and wrote 'string orchestra', which gained no marks.
- (iii) Many candidates scored at least 1 mark for 'bowed' or 'short notes' but fewer were able to be specific enough to gain the full 2 marks.
- (iv) Few candidates gained the full 4 marks. Answers were far too general or vague i.e. 'the music got faster'; many answers referred to the vocal line, which was not required, and many candidates felt that more instruments

were added. Some candidates were able to identify that there were longer or smoother notes, each of which gained 1 mark, but more specific detail was not forthcoming.

## Question 2

(a) A very large number of candidates of all abilities were able to identify Soprano, Alto, Tenor and Bass. In the centres where this had been taught, it had often been clearly understood and applied. Most candidates were able to name at least two of the four voices. Unfortunately there was a significant number of candidates who used terms such as high or low female, which gained no credit, and yet again there were candidates who had no knowledge of this choral tradition at all. These words do form part of the Language for Learning with regard to Area of Study 2.

(b) Many candidates correctly identified minor.

(c) Again a significant number of candidates heard the modulation correctly.

(d) (i) Very few candidates scored full marks. Many scored 1 or 2 marks for answers such as 'going up' or 'step wise' and a number were able to hear the repeated pattern or Ground Bass. However, there were many candidates who simply named instruments or who did not limit their answer to the bass line. These answers did not gain any marks.

(ii) Many candidates wrote 'call and response' as part of their answer here and received no credit as this term is not generally used for Baroque or Classical music. Answers showing musical understanding of the relationship between the choir and the orchestra were required.

(e) (i) A disappointing number of candidates failed to identify Baroque. Many appeared to be misled by the lack of harpsichord and chose Classical. Some candidates even chose Romantic, despite the fact that this period does not feature in Area of Study 2. A significant number of candidates wrote dates when the name of a historical period was required.

(ii) The two parts here were rarely given any marks.

### Instrument

Probably because of the confusion regarding the period, this question was not well answered. There were very few candidates who identified the *continuo* role of the organ. This is something that does not appear to have been picked up by centres from the 2004 paper when a Baroque piece of music was used with the organ as the *continuo* instrument.

### Harmony

This was quite a challenging question that gained few correct answers.

## Question 3

(a) Many candidates gained marks for filling in the missing notes. Marks were given here for correct shapes as well as pitch accuracy and a number of candidates gained marks in bars 5 and 6 because they repeated bars 1 and 2. However, a significant number got the first 5 notes completely correct, slipping up only with the last note. Bars 15 and 16 were also well answered on the whole with a great many candidates recognising the rising scale. A few candidates wrote 3 notes in bar 15 not realising that the first beat was already given. This did result in the loss of a mark for these candidates as the first 6 notes only were marked.



Candidates should be encouraged to use the rhythm that is written above the stave.

- (b) The answers to this were very mixed and a large number of candidates forgot to do this part of the question at all.
- (c) (i) About half of the candidates gained a mark for the perfect cadence although a number identified only one bar and not two. They were given credit if this was the second of the two bars on the basis that they had heard the cadence.  
(ii) This was less well answered and candidates often identified 2 bars instead of 4. A great many candidates gave bars 1 & 2 and bars 5 & 6 as their sequence, not understanding that a sequence needs to be in adjacent bars.
- (d) This was often very well answered. With 2 marks given for a comparative statement, many candidates gained full marks here for identifying that the phrases had the same rhythm or shape or that the second phrase was lower.
- (e) (i) Unfortunately a great many candidates mistakenly thought that the music was a waltz and not a minuet. As a consequence there were many candidates who wrote Strauss for the answer to this part. This question was based on Area of Study 2 and the waltz is part of Area of Study 3. Candidates should be encouraged to think through the statements that are written in the questions (and that are spoken on the CD) in order to prevent this type of mistake.  
(ii) Likewise here, many candidates gave features that linked the music to a waltz and not features that led to a Classical composer. If a Classical composer had been given for part (i) answers in this part were still very vague and did not show enough understanding of Classical music.

#### Question 4

This question was generally well answered.

#### Extract A

- (a) Virtually all the answers were correct.

- (b) Speed/Pulse/Beat

Most candidates identified that the music was fast, was at 120bpm and had a steady tempo.

- Use of instruments

Candidates gained marks here for their descriptions of the drum kit rhythm, for the brass stabs, for comments on the bass line and for comments on the piano. However, a significant number of candidates only listed the instruments that they heard and did not go on to describe what they were doing. This gained them little or no credit.

- Use of voices

Many candidates gained at least 2 marks here for male solo and female chorus. A lot of candidates also recognised the 'hook' line and the use of syncopation by the voices. Candidates who failed to score here wrote in very vague terms about men and women singing and were not able to give any musical detail.

- (c) A great many candidates were able to identify the use of loops, multi-tracking, synthesisers, microphones and electric guitars etc. and so gained full marks.

#### Extract B

- (d) Most candidates gained marks for Pavane.

- (e) Quite a lot of candidates scored 1 here for 'Consort' although far less were able to identify it as a 'Viol Consort' or a 'Whole Consort' and so gain the full 2 marks. There were also many answers that did not show an understanding of the Renaissance period, including 'strings' or 'string orchestra'.
- (f) Structure  
Many candidates scored 1 mark for hearing that the music was in Binary Form. However, fewer were able to comment specifically enough on the music to gain the full 2 marks for the AA1BB1 structure. There were also many mistaken Ternary Form answers.
- Texture  
This was very poorly answered and proved to be one of the most difficult questions on the paper. Thick or thin was not really relevant here, only the texture being the same throughout was accepted. Also, blanket statements regarding the music being homophonic or polyphonic were not accepted; answers had to reflect that the music was mixed in this regard.
- (g) This was answered very well for both Extract A and Extract B. Most candidates were able to identify at least one venue or occasion and link it to a feature of the music. Some candidates did not refer to the music at all, just the venue and the dance steps. The music had to be mentioned in order to get the 2 marks allowed for each extract.

### Question 5

- (a) Many candidates scored marks here for *Chaal* rhythm, *Dohl* drum and Punjabi language. However, only 1 mark was allowed for each of these answers (1 mark per single word) – it is important that teachers note this and alert their students. There were a great many 'sitar' for the melody and 'Indian language' given as answers, which gained no credit. Candidates in this question were able to identify the features that they heard but they often did not describe their use.

Some repetition occurred in this question between parts (b) and (c). Where this occurred, candidates were credited only once for their answers.

- (b) Candidates often described features of technology when answering this question and the use of synthesisers, drum machines or bass guitars were popular answers. Unfortunately candidates often went on to repeat these features in part (c) of the question, for which they gained no marks.
- (c) Often very well answered if not a repeat of part (b).

### Question 6

A significant number of candidates wasted time here because they wrote about more than two features. When a question asks for two features then only that number of features can be credited.

A number of candidates also muddled the wording of Questions 5 and 6 and tried to describe the use of individual features instead of describing the features themselves. A significant number of candidates wrote their answers to Cuban Son and American Jazz the wrong way round.

- (a) Generally well answered. Many candidates were able to identify the *clave* rhythm that was clapped at the beginning of the extract and also went on to describe it as the '2:3' rather than the '3:2' version. This gained them 3 marks.

- (b)** This was less well answered. Candidates were apt to talk about what they expected to hear rather than what they actually heard. Many candidates identified the 'brass stabs', although fewer were able to specify 'trumpet stabs'. A number were able to give good descriptions of the piano.
- (c)** Most answers were correct, although a disappointing number of scripts mentioned Jazz fusions and Sambas, neither of which appears in the OCR specification.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education  
Music (1919)  
June 2006 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

<b>Component</b>		<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>a*</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>g</b>	<b>u</b>
<b>01</b>	Raw	180	-	140	119	99	86	73	60	47	0
	Weighted	180	-	140	119	99	89	73	60	47	0
<b>02</b>	Raw	15	-	12	10	8	6	5	4	3	0
	Weighted	45	-	36	30	24	18	15	12	9	0
<b>03</b>	Raw	100	-	63	53	43	35	28	21	14	0
	Weighted	75	-	47.3	39.8	32.3	26.3	21	15.8	10.5	0

**Specification Aggregation Results**

Overall threshold marks (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to weighted marks)

	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>1919</b>	300	248	217	186	155	132	110	88	66	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total No. of Cands</b>
<b>1919</b>	9.97	29.69	51.24	70.98	81.66	88.67	93.31	96.57	100	12,278

**12,278 candidates were entered for certification this series**

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2006

