

# **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2007**

**1919/MS/R/07**

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.

This report on the Examination provides 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.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
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	1
1919 01 & 02	Principal Moderator's Report	3
1919/03	Principal Examiner's Report	11
*	Grade Thresholds	16



### **Chief Examiner's Report:**

The specification has now been running for five years and in most Centres there is continuing evidence that students are developing good musical understanding through its content. There are still Centres where it appears that the content is not being taught. This particularly affects candidates' achievement in the Listening Examination, in the Integrated Coursework, and in the Terminal Task.

It was pleasing to see an increase in the number of candidates accessing very high marks in the Listening Examination this year.

The reduction in the number of performance pieces this year, from three to two, has been welcomed as relieving some of the coursework pressures on candidates and easing the burden of assessment on teachers. The requirement for a solo performance and an ensemble performance still remains, and one or two Centres appeared to have overlooked this.

OCR recognises the hard work that teachers undertake year on year in order to meet the coursework requirements of the examination. The most consuming issues for Moderators this year have related to the administration. This has not been helped where Centres have either not sent the correct materials or have been slow responding to the Moderator's requests. A number of issues are referred to in detail in the report, but the following are highlighted as reminders.

- When submitting paperwork to the Moderator, **all the Candidate Assessment Forms should be sent with the MS1 forms**. These forms should be placed in candidate number order, separate from the work itself.
- Centre Authentication Forms are now mandatory and must be sent to the Moderator with the candidates' work.
- Centres should plan well in advance to meet the 15<sup>th</sup> May coursework deadline. Where, in extenuating circumstances, this is not going to be possible, Centres must contact OCR **before the 15<sup>th</sup> May deadline**, not after it has passed.



## **Components 01 and 02: Coursework and Terminal Task**

### **Principal Moderator's Report:**

#### **Administration**

It is pleasing to note the increasing confidence and accuracy in the submission of coursework this session. Most Centres have read and digested the key issues and points raised in last year's report and acted positively and effectively in striving to produce a submission of the highest quality. However, it is frustrating that some Centres have taken little or no heed of the comments made on the CW/Mod/Reps which are provided by Moderators each year. These Centres are still assessing their work in the same way, requiring the need for mark adjustments.

The coursework was presented in a variety of different ways and for the most part work was clearly identified. There were fewer poor quality recordings this year overall. Most work is now being presented on CD and, provided there is a track list, this is the simplest way of presentation for Moderators to deal with. Occasionally a CD arrived that had not been finalised and therefore could not be played. CDs also make for slimmer, manageable packets, which are less costly to send. Moderators were often pleased, after a busy day at school, to receive coursework through their letter boxes, rather than having to drive to a local sorting office to collect a heavy and unwieldy parcel of cassette tapes. Where Centres are still using cassette tapes, care must be taken to avoid using tapes of inferior quality. Some tapes contained background noise from previous recordings that had not been effectively erased. Centres are reminded that, when using tapes, **all of the work should be recorded on one side**. A few Centres used mini disks, and this sometimes presented problems when recordings were not in standard format. In some cases, Centres kindly loaned a player to the Moderator, which speeded up the process considerably.

To accommodate the reduction in coursework required, the Candidate Assessment Form GCW760 was redesigned this year. It is regrettable that in this process a typographical error had crept onto this new form. About half of the Centres made administrative errors requiring amendments to marks. However there was no evidence to suggest that these were caused by the new formula for reaching a total. Indeed the requirement to undertake the multiplication of a relatively large number by 3 was only occasionally a cause of error. Only a small handful of Centres submitted three performances instead of two. Candidate Assessment Forms should be completed in **black pen** if they are not word processed. If the two sides of the form are duplicated on separate sheets of paper, these **must** be stapled together to avoid the risk of the sheets becoming separated. This will avoid the anonymity of the reverse of the sheet, since it does not have a space for the candidate name/number or Centre name/number.

There were more instances of Centres not transcribing the correct marks onto the MS1 forms this year, and this is an area that schools are advised to check internally, alongside the arithmetical calculations. It is imperative that both the lozenges and numbers are filled in when using the traditional NCR MS1 forms.

Most of the work was received within a day or so of the deadline of 15th May; it is unfortunate that there are a few Centres who continue to pay little respect to the deadline year on year. OCR will only authorise short extensions to the deadline for compelling reasons. Any extension request should be made to OCR **before 15<sup>th</sup> May** and a copy of the authorisation received from OCR should be sent to the Moderator. Some Centres did contact their Moderator before 15<sup>th</sup> May to explain that they had received an extension, and this courtesy was much appreciated.

In the interests of fairness to all candidates, and of the integrity of the examination, Centres are asked to respond to requests from Moderators promptly. In order to meet their deadlines, samples of candidates' work would ideally need to be with the Moderator before half term.

## *Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

Centres are reminded that if they have more than ten candidates a sample will need to be selected and, in order to do this, the Moderator needs to receive **all of the Candidate Assessment Forms** with the MS1 forms. This enables a representative sample of instruments and styles to be selected. Examinations Officers in schools are not always familiar with these instructions.

Centres with ten or fewer candidates should send all candidates' work, with the MS1 forms and Candidate Assessment Forms, to the Moderator. These Centres are reminded that the Candidate Assessment Forms are dealt with separately and not returned. All of these forms should be submitted together in candidate order number and not placed individually with the work.

If coursework is lost, there is a procedure that Centres should follow, and this involves the completion and submission of a Lost Coursework form, in accordance with the instructions provided with it. OCR appreciates that there are sometimes extenuating circumstances which cause loss of work, but is equally very concerned that some Centres seem to lose significant amounts of work year on year.

The authentication of coursework by the Centre is an important aspect of the submission of work. The form CCS 160 should be submitted to verify that the candidates have completed the work themselves, and Centres need to put procedures in place to ensure that this verification is possible. If there is any uncertainty then **the work cannot be submitted**. The number of cases of obvious plagiarism is diminishing. It is acceptable for one CCS160 form to be submitted for both Components 1 and 2, provided this is made clear on the form. There were instances of incomplete and unsigned forms being submitted and these had to be returned to Centres for completion, causing further delays in the completion of the moderation process.

The majority of Heads of Music and Examination Officers were accommodating when contacted by Moderators. There were a few cases where it appeared that issues of internal communication impeded the effective relaying of messages, sometimes causing Moderators to have to make several telephone calls to a Centre.

### **Component 01: Coursework**

#### **Performing**

Many candidates achieved an excellent standard of performance within a wide range of styles and genres. Some of the performances were well above the standard expected of GCSE.

There were many examples of candidates linking their first performance with their first composition within Area of Study 1, and in doing so there was much more understanding displayed of how their instrument was used. This said, there were also more examples of Centres where candidates appeared to make little or no attempt to study any performance pieces in relation to their own instrument or their first composition. 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 must be commercially available or arranged by the Centre for the candidate. Centres need to be aware that if all performances consist of own compositions, candidates will not be able to fulfil the requirements of Area of Study 1.

The assessment of performing is concerned with the **quality of the playing**, the musicality, and the difficulty of the part. Some Assessors felt the need to award marks for effort or for simple repeated patterns without candidates demonstrating other skills.



Centres must state how a performance has been created when ICT has been used. 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 candidate edits the rest of the piece by using dynamics, velocity, expression, modulation and other controller functions within the sequencing software.

In some cases, candidates were awarded higher marks for difficulty than for musicality, e.g. mark of 4 for musicality and 5 for difficulty: this is not allowed. If the performance only merits 4 marks, then 4 is also the maximum for difficulty. This rule is to be found on Page 36 of the specification. Half marks are not available.

Although the coursework requirements for performing have reduced, there appeared to be some confusion as to what is to be submitted. The requirement is for candidates to enter **ONE solo** and **ONE ensemble** performance. The order on the assessment sheet can be performance 1: solo, performance 2: ensemble, or *vice versa*. When an ensemble is entered and it is not audibly clear what the candidate is playing, a score is required.

Candidates **cannot** perform with 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. If this is not done, the difficulty mark may need to be reduced. Centres are 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.

As an alternative, it is permissible for a solo performance to be accompanied. There were a few Centres that appeared to think that a solo could not have a piano accompaniment. The requirement is for a musical performance and therefore in such cases accompaniments are supportive and necessary.

Centres are reminded that **an ensemble performance** must contain **two or more live performers**. In order to demonstrate ensemble skills, the parts must be performed simultaneously for a substantial amount of the piece.

### **Quality of Assessment**

The assessment of performing was, on the whole, good, with some Centres being a little lenient with the marks awarded for musicality, mainly in the upper range. Assessors need to read the criteria carefully when assessing work. Often performances which had noticeable fluency issues were awarded marks in the top band, when they would have been better placed in the band 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.

It is always helpful when Assessors comment on why a mark was given for the difficulty of the piece when it is not obvious. 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.

Where a part is repetitive in nature and uses just pitch and/or simple rhythms, a difficulty mark of 0 is appropriate. In many instances drummers and guitarists were given high difficulty marks for very simple patterns.

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.

## **Composing**

Year on year the evidence is that Composition 1 is of a higher quality than Composition 2. The process of writing for one's own instrument again motivated candidates to achieve well, and encouraged personalised learning. There were some excellent examples of original compositions that demonstrated understanding of the capabilities of the candidate's chosen instrument. There were still a few compositions, purporting to relate to Area of Study 1, which bore little or no resemblance to the chosen Area even in the broadest sense, although the quantity of these is diminishing year by year.

Composition 2 is becoming increasingly formulaic. There is evidence that candidates are applying features of the selected style without the necessary musical understanding. Learning of the context of the style and the purpose of the music, and the application of that learning to inform the composition process, is very important. Often the mechanical application of stylistic features created something unmusical and inappropriate to the style. ICT was sometimes used very badly, resulting in Waltzes with relentless oom-pah-pah accompaniments or minimalist pieces that used mundane triadic materials. Some Centres required all candidates to compose in this way, and candidates produced pieces which were all very similar in structure and content.

Some of the most successful compositions were found within the Disco style. The more interesting submissions occurred where Centres had encouraged extra parts to be added such as effective bass lines and countermelodies. There were only a few Salsa compositions and even fewer Bhangra ones. Whilst there were a number of Pavaues and Galliards, there were very few of high quality.

There were some examples of imaginative pieces which were well above the expected level for GCSE, but there were considerably fewer compositions of this nature for Composition 2 than for Composition 1. Some candidates showed that they understood the style and had moved beyond it into something more personal, and this was to be credited. On the other hand there were some submissions where the relationship to the style was only tenuous. For example there were Salsas which purported to be so because of the use of the trumpet voice on the keyboard. Compositions of this nature cannot justify Area of Study marks.

The Candidate Information Sheet GCW 761 is an important part of the coursework submission. It should be completed by the candidate. The reverse side of the sheet enables candidates to provide a brief for Composition 2, against which the composition is assessed. This brief in itself does not earn marks, but it impacts on the Area of Study mark since the assessment criteria require a judgement of the quality of the composition against the brief. Some candidates jeopardised their mark here by not providing a brief. At the other extreme, there were many candidates who incorrectly submitted the brief for Composition 2 as part of their appraisals.

Whilst some written compositions were of high quality, many did not convince the Moderators that candidates knew what they were composing. In cases where notational skills of candidates were limited, the written score did not always reflect the candidate's intentions. Examples abounded of compositions where the melody and chords had little in common and of songs where the melody and words did not fit. Had these candidates had the chance to use ICT to record and listen to their work, they would have been able to refine their pieces. The worst

## *Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

examples of written compositions remained within the minimalist genre, where mathematical formulae were applied without any consideration of the aural impact of the music.

Centres are also reminded that where written and recorded versions are submitted, they need to indicate on the assessment form which part of the submission (score or recording) has been assessed.

Centres are advised not to submit joint compositions and, fortunately, the number of these continues to decline. Joint compositions cannot be submitted as Composition 1. Only the identifiable input of the candidate can be assessed and in most cases this will not reflect the candidate's full contribution.

Although comments on every piece of coursework are no longer mandatory, assessors are still expected to indicate in the space on the Candidate Assessment Form the extent of the candidate's contribution to the composition, especially where ICT is used. The use of presets or pre-recorded sound samples is not precluded, but the assessment must be based on the candidate's compositional input.

Some candidates, who composed for ensembles, presented work which utilised the improvisatory talents of others in the group. In such cases, only what the candidate had composed could be considered in the assessment, and Moderators struggled with band pieces where another student was performing a stylish drum part with effective fills, and no information was given about whether the candidate had any input into it.

There were also a number of examples this year of compositions being performed by the teacher in accordance with the candidate's instructions, with no evidence presented of the candidate's work, or what those instructions were. Assessors need to be absolutely clear about the candidate's input.

### **Quality of Assessment**

The assessment of Composition 1 was often accurate for the mark out of 10 although some Centres were generous with marks at the top of their range. Some Centres tended to spread their marks across the full range, awarding top marks for their best candidates, whereas the evidence presented did not justify this in relation to the criteria.

Where there was no composition brief presented for Composition 1, or where the composition did not include the instrument studied, then no Area of Study marks could be awarded. This had a serious impact on the marks of some candidates.

Composition 2 was often generously marked. The Area of Study mark was usually too high. The mechanical application of a few simple features of a style was often awarded 4 or 5 marks where 1 or 2 would have been more appropriate.

Sometimes complex written scores were over marked. Whilst at a glance some of these looked good, they did not stand up to more detailed scrutiny and, in such cases, it was sometimes very difficult to match them against the assessment criteria.

### **Appraising**

The quality of appraising improves every year, although there is still a number of candidates who do not submit properly focused work. Most work was neatly presented in typescript, making reading easy. It was very pleasing to see that many candidates who played in contemporary pop styles were writing passionately and with understanding of their instrument.

## *Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

The following were the most common issues.

- Some candidates wrote evaluations of both their Performances, instead of just Performance 1.
- A few able candidates submitted very brief appraisals, which only provided evidence for the lower bands of marks.
- Candidates often missed out aspects of the Performance Appraisal: the vast majority wrote appraisals of their performance, but fewer referred in depth to the instrument specific features of all of the pieces studied.
- Some candidates provided unnecessary information: historical facts and beautiful pictures of instruments and composers in professionally presented folders did not gain credit.
- Sometimes there was no information about techniques for the instrument (which is the focus of the Area of Study) and candidates wrote exclusively about compositional techniques and structural features of the pieces.
- Some appraisals muddled the information, presenting their comparison of the three pieces as part of the Composition Brief rather than where it correctly belongs, in the Performance Appraisal.
- Composition Briefs need to present a statement of intent and as such should be written in the future tense. Many were written in the past tense, suggesting that the composition brief had been written as an afterthought.
- Composition Appraisals sometimes merely repeated the information found in the brief, or described the compositional process. Composition Appraisals should provide an evaluation of the success of the composition.

### **Quality of Assessment**

The assessment of this area was generally accurate where appraisals were properly focused. There is evidence that Assessors are now becoming more familiar with the criteria for assessment. In a few cases Assessors appeared not to have read the criteria at all and awarded marks for quantity rather than quality of work.

Sometimes whole Centres, often with able candidates, provided sparse appraisal work and in these cases marking tended to be very generous. Occasionally marks were awarded where no evidence was presented at all.

At the lower end of the range, candidates who make simple statements can be awarded marks in the 1-2 band. Only rarely was it found that a candidate's work merited no marks. In this area, some Assessors were unduly harsh.

Many candidates achieved marks in the 3-5 band when, with a little refinement, their appraisals could have moved into the 6-8 band. To achieve a mark in the 6-8 band, some sort of understanding of the musical impact of techniques and features is needed, rather than just a list. In order to move candidates into this range, teachers need to advise the use of words and phrases such as "because" and "...in order to..." when referring to features. Many composition briefs would have benefited from a little more elaboration in this respect.

Some Assessors very helpfully provided pencilled annotations on candidates' work to indicate features of the text which supported their mark.

## **Component 02: Terminal Task**

A few Centres presented excellent work in this component. Written presentations were generally less musical than recorded ones. Centres must not underestimate the importance of the Terminal Task, where every mark of the 15 available is the equivalent of 1% of the examination. The rhythm and note patterns were the most popular stimuli. The response to the chord sequence was the least successful, with often no real melodic development present. There were some successful melodies created by singers using the chord sequence as the backing.

The change of the rhythm to 3/4 time should not have presented a problem to candidates who had properly explored this time signature in dance forms, and were able to transfer their understanding to this task. However, there were some candidates who converted it back into 4/4 and therefore lost marks for not using the stimulus correctly.

There was a small number of candidates who did not use the stimulus at all, and a small number of Assessors who, when questioned about this, provided tortuous justifications of how the stimulus had been so subtly manipulated that it had become unrecognisable! The composition must show evidence that the stimulus has been used.

A common failing was the inability to **develop** a melody from the stimulus. Centres are reminded that the task is closely linked to Area of Study 2, and that melodic techniques, many of which can be found commonly across a range of styles and genres, need to be used. There were some very lengthy, dull, pieces showing little development with either endless repetition of the opening motive or aimless melodic rambling with little sense of metre, structure or development. The melody does not have to be lengthy. The aim is to produce something musically satisfying and, as such, this short test is a very useful gauge of a candidate's musicianship.

Whilst it is good practice to provide students with ideas for structures and strategies for developing the stimulus, some Centres had done so with a degree of prescriptiveness that resulted in formulaic responses, which seemed to presume that the stimulus would fit into a predefined template. Such responses restricted the opportunity of candidates to demonstrate real musical invention, and this led to unmusical pieces which did not attain high marks.

### **Quality of Assessment**

The assessment of the Terminal Task was generally lenient. The leniency was most noticeable in the mark awarded for communication. Hesitant performances with little attention to dynamics or articulation were often awarded 4 marks where 2 would have been more appropriate. Where written versions are presented, to achieve a mark above 2 more than just an accurate presentation of the pitch and rhythm is necessary. Some candidates sprinkled dynamics around the score that did not make musical sense, and again these offerings tended to be over marked. To achieve full marks, a written presentation must contain everything that is needed to create a musically stylish performance and this includes the name of the instrument, which was sometimes missing.

Very occasionally Assessors were harsh on candidates who had made an attempt at the task. Centres are reminded therefore that 1 is the lowest available mark, not zero.



## Component 03: Listening Examination

### Principal Examiner's Report:

#### General Comments

The paper maintained a similar standard to previous years and the spread of marks was good. The top mark was higher than last year, at 92 out of 100.

Clear evidence was seen in answers from many Centres' candidates that the teaching of the Areas of Study was thorough. These candidates were well prepared and were able to answer knowledge based questions with understanding and accuracy. Conversely there were Centres where individual topics did not seem to have been covered at all.

Whilst it was pleasing to see some improved use of musical terminology in many areas of the paper this year, there were still candidates who used inappropriate words such as *upbeat* where this was not a suitable answer in the context of the style.

Centres are reminded that the running time for the paper varies from year to year, and this time is determined by the length of the CD. According to the instructions on page 29 of the Assessment Arrangements "There will be one Listening Examination lasting about one hour. It is suggested that Centres timetable 90 minutes for the Examination, which will allow ample time for the Examination to be administered."

#### Comments on Individual Questions

##### Question 1

This question generated mixed responses with Extracts A and B generally gaining good marks but Extract C often being poorly answered. It was quite clear that few candidates had a real understanding of Gamelan despite the fact that it is part of the Area of Study 4 starting points and a style on which the core style of Minimalism is based.

##### Extract A

- (i) Many candidates correctly identified the scale as *minor*, although there were some who chose, incorrectly, *pentatonic* or *whole tone*.
- (ii) Most candidates identified *brass* although some were less specific and gave wind as the incorrect generic answer.
- (iii) A good proportion of the candidates chose the correct rhythm.
- (iv) It was very good to see some candidates with the correct answer of *homophonic*. Other candidates, whilst not getting the right answer, did at least use the correct type of terminology relating to texture, with a great many writing *monophonic* and a few *polyphonic*. A few less able candidates still used the incorrect *thick/thin* style response and some wrote *harmonic* instead of *homophonic*. It is apparent that whilst some Centres are addressing the understanding of texture, others are not.

##### Extract B

- (i) Nearly all candidates gained a mark for *Disco* here.
- (ii) Many candidates gained marks here particularly where they identified that the brass instruments played in the introduction and played stabs. A good number also noted that they played in between the vocal melody. The sub-question about backing vocals was less well answered and a number of candidates mistook this for a question referring to backing instruments and mentioned the role of the drum kit and riffs etc. However there were some good answers that gave detail about adding to the texture, singing the hook line and emphasising some of the words.

### Extract C

- (i) Most candidates gained a mark for identifying the piano but the vast majority of candidates then identified xylophone as the second instrument despite the fact that the xylophone is a wooden tuned percussion instrument and the instrument in question was metallic.
- (ii) Some candidates correctly identified *Gamelan* but there were a substantial number that mistook this extract for an Indian Classical piece, and one or two even chose *Plainsong*.
- (iii) Candidates who identified the musical style wrongly often failed to get any marks here but even those who correctly chose *Gamelan* did not understand the style and few good answers were found. There seemed to be very little accurate knowledge of this style despite it being part of the specification. A number of candidates simply gave answers relating to minimalism itself.

### Question 2

The quality of answers to this question was mixed, but generally the understanding appeared to be better than in previous years. There was some evidence of good teaching here although part (e) (ii) had some obviously pre-learned answers. A number of the more able candidates scored quite well in this question whilst less able candidates struggled to answer parts (c) and (e).

- (a) It was good to see that most candidates wrote a time signature rather than just a single number, as has often happened in previous years, and many candidates correctly gave the answer as 3/4. A significant number thought it was 6/8 and some 2/4. One or two candidates who identified the correct time signature immediately thought that the music was a waltz and their subsequent answers reflected this, particularly in part (e).
- (b) Whilst a good number of candidates correctly answered *trill* for this question, a significant number did not understand the term *ornament* and wrote down the name of an instrument instead.
- (c) (i) Whilst very few candidates scored the full 4 marks here, a good number, particularly the more able, gained at least 2. Most correct answers reflected the use of ornamentation or the trill and many candidates heard the use of sequence with the more able candidates being able to give some accurate detail. Other features identified were staccato and repeated notes or patterns. A number of candidates gave answers more appropriate for part (ii) and so did not gain marks here. Some less able candidates referred to *brass stabs*, which is terminology that is more appropriate to Disco or Salsa music not Baroque music. Some candidates repeated answers about the brass instruments from Question 1 B. There were also incorrect references to sequencing here instead of *sequences*, which is the appropriate term.  
(ii) There were some very vague answers here including *call and response*. Without any correct detail, this gained no marks. Some able candidates were able to hear the imitation and gave sufficient detail to gain 2 marks.
- (d) (i) Many candidates correctly answered *Dominant*. for some it was the only correct answer in this question.  
(ii) Quite a lot of candidates answered this question correctly although others did not appear to understand the term *Cadence*.
- (e) (i) There were fewer answers this year that fell outside of the Area of Study 2 genres. Most candidates wrote *Baroque* (the correct answer), whilst others mistakenly wrote *Classical*. A few candidates heard the brass instruments and thought the extract was from the Romantic period, which showed a lack of knowledge of the content of Area of Study 2. Once again, despite this being highlighted in the report last year, a high proportion of candidates wrote dates, which, whether correct or not, are not allowed when the question has asked for a period of composition.



**(ii)** Very few candidates gained full marks here; the majority of marks gained were for ornamentation and imitation, answers that had already been heard when answering part (c). Very few candidates, including those that correctly identified Baroque, appeared able to hear the harpsichord and identify its role as a continuo instrument that would have given them 2 marks.

### **Question 3**

This question was better answered than in previous years although very few candidates gained above 16 marks out of 20 with some scoring below 5.

- (a)** This was well answered by many candidates, with nearly all those who attempted it scoring some marks out of 12. However few candidates actually scored full marks. One common error made in bar 4 was the omission of the first D. A number of candidates started on the E and only wrote 6 notes instead of 7. This resulted in marks being given for shape only, as marking begins from the first note written by the candidate. Marks in bars 13 and 14 were mostly gained for shape with many candidates repeating bar 12 in bar 13.
- (b)** There were very mixed answers to this with many candidates leaving it out completely. Other candidates opted for the incorrect C natural rather than the correct C sharp or B flat.
- (c)** **(i)** and **(ii)** Candidates of all abilities answered this question well. Common errors, however, were bar 10 for (i) and bars 2, 7 and 11 for (ii).
- (d)** Unlike in previous years the comparisons in this question only gained 1 mark not 2. This did not appear to be a problem because of the more visual rather than aural nature of this question. Many candidates were able to observe the fact that the rhythm was the same in bars 6 and 10 and yet different in bars 7 and 11 and many candidates saw that bar 6 started higher but ended lower than bar 10. This was enough to give them the full 4 marks. Some candidates wrote about quavers rather than semi-quavers in bars 7 and 11 and so gained no marks here. Others mentioned descending sequences not descending scales which meant they also gained no marks. Some candidates also referred to articulation and dynamics, which was not required here. It is also important to note that candidates should be careful to write the correct bar numbers down when comparing and must not refer to whole bars when their statement is only true about half of the bar. This lack of accuracy sometimes resulted in no marks being given because their answers were too vague to be able to credit, often with general statements about all 4 bars.
- (e)** A good proportion of candidates gave a Classical composer for the answer to this question. Some candidates opted for an incorrect Baroque composer but far fewer than in previous years chose a composer from a period outside of the Area of Study 2 Baroque and Classical styles.

#### Question 4

The marks for this question appeared to be better than the equivalent question in previous years. Candidates are demonstrating a better understanding of the requirements of comparative answers.

#### Extract A

- (a) Many candidates were able to identify the correct structure of this extract.
- (b) This question was not very well answered with many candidates referring to the time signature or speed rather than giving specific information about the rhythm.
- (c) Many candidates gave three beats in a bar here, which was correct.

#### Extract B

- (d) There were very mixed answers to this question. Many more able candidates gave an incorrect answer here.
- (e) Candidates often wrote imprecise answers but most wrote enough to gain at least 1 mark. Marks were mainly given for reference to crescendos and diminuendos. Some of the more able candidates gave some detailed answers about the sudden changes in dynamics towards the end of the extract and were able to gain the full marks, however there were some candidates who did not understand the term *dynamics*.
- (f) Many candidates chose 3 beats in a bar or *fast* and gained marks here.
- (g) A good proportion of candidates underlined the correct answer although because it was a Galliard some mistakenly underlined *modal*.

#### Comparison questions

Comparisons here gained 2 marks as in previous years.

- (h) Tempo – The majority of candidates recognised that Extract A was faster than Extract B although some felt that the speeds changed in the extracts.  
Instruments – Many candidates were able to find at least one comparison  
Texture – Once again candidates found this question hard. However there was some indication that understanding is developing and candidates were certainly trying to use the correct terminology with much use of the words homophonic and polyphonic, although not always correctly. Extract B having a thicker texture than Extract A was allowed here.
- (i) Whilst a few candidates incorrectly gave information about the steps of the Waltz or the Pavane, there was a pleasing number who were familiar with the leaps, jumps and kicks required to dance a Galliard.
- (j) The marking for this question was quite flexible and many candidates gained at least 1 mark. It must be noted however that the answers given need to refer to the music and vague answers such as “the music for Extract A sounded happier” were not credited.

### Question 5

Those candidates who recognised this extract as minimalism generally gained quite good marks. Some candidates mistook the extract for a piece of serialism, despite the question being from Area of Study 4, and therefore gained few marks. Some of the more able candidates did not score well in this question, appearing not to have learnt any of the basic concepts of minimalism.

- (a) Most candidates identified a correct composer of minimalism.
- (b) Some candidates did not understand the term *counterpoint*, whilst others did not know how to apply it to this piece of music and so did not gain any marks. Most answers here were vague.
- (c) Many candidates scored marks here although only the most able appeared to score full marks. Candidates were often able to name the features but then either gave poor or irrelevant descriptions. This question asked for a description of two features of minimalism and, like last year, although they listed more than two features in their answer, some candidates failed to give descriptions and so were not able to access full marks. However, many candidates correctly heard repetition, layering, metamorphosis or phase shifting.
- (d) There were some very good, focussed answers to this question and many of the less able candidates scored marks here. However, some of the more able fared less well, with quite a lot of answers that lacked understanding.

### Question 6

This question gained a significant number of full mark answers.

- (a) Nearly all candidates answered this correctly.
- (b) Many candidates scored marks for shouting or chanting *Hoi* but other answers were generally quite poor with many answers referring to the echo, not how the voice was used.
- (c) Quite a few full mark answers here with many candidates identifying multi-tracking, sampling, drum machine, or synthesiser.
- (d) Those who had been taught the history of Bhangra fared very well here with a great many candidates achieving at least 4 marks and many the full 5. A common mistake, however, was that modern Bhangra had its roots in Indian Classical music instead of, correctly, the traditional music for the harvest celebration of the Punjab region. Also, modern Bhangra was developed in the UK and not in India as many candidates suggested.
- (e) Once again most candidates correctly answered this question.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education**

**Music (1919)**

**June 2007 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
1	180	140	119	99	86	73	60	47
2	15	12	10	8	6	5	4	3
3	100	67	56	45	37	30	23	16

**Overall**

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Threshold Marks	249	218	187	156	134	111	89	67
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	11.03	29.3	51.4	70.51	81.48	89.44	94.26	97.02

The total entry for the examination was 13,073

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.



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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@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 2007