

MUSIC

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-14	15-29	30-45	46-55	56-66	67-76	77-100

Standard level group performing

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-13	14-30	31-49	50-60	61-67	68-78	79-100

Standard level solo performing

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-13	14-30	31-47	48-58	59-70	71-81	82-100

Standard level creating

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-14	15-31	32-46	47-57	58-68	69-79	80-100

Solo performing (HL/SLS)

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-3	4-7	8-11	12-13	14-16	17-18	19-20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

A great range of programmes and capabilities presented, from sophisticated and wide ranging to very basic. Musical genres showed increasing diversity presenting numbers from traditional musical cultures along with popular urban music standards and Western Art music. Some numbers that required accompaniment were presented without it, limiting the candidates' range of marks. A few performances were accompanied with pre-recorded tracks. These, although accepted, are not desirable as they permit no live interaction between the performer's work and the accompaniment. Additionally, in some instances, accompaniments were poorly prepared, showing rhythmic or pitch inconsistencies, letting down the candidate's work by circumstances they are unable to control. In a few other instances recitals seemed over controlled, that is, "studio" produced rather than the result of a live performance. Such productions do not comply with the component's guidelines. Schools must ensure the candidate files are clearly recordings of a live performance.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

The repertoire was often appropriate to the candidate's capabilities and thoughtfully chosen. There were interesting musical pieces, substantial and imaginative in content, expression and technical demands.

There was mostly appropriate variety in musical styles. Again, some submissions were not suitably selected and featured mostly short and basic pieces. These did not support candidates in their demonstration of musical skill or communication abilities.

Criterion B

The technical aspects of many of the performances were of a high standard. Most pieces matched the capabilities of the candidates. Several examiners noted, however, that vocal performances were often poorly developed. Candidates were largely weak and seemed uninformed about appropriate technique. In the instances where this applied to either vocal or instrumental performance, particular recommendations were issued to the specific schools. Adequate expectations, careful repertoire selection and expert professional guidance to develop technical control, attention to detail and rigor in the preparation of the pieces are key aspects here.

Phrasing, dynamics and tone colour were considered in many of the pieces. Several performances showed a real understanding of structure, direction and musical lines.

Criterion C

The candidates showed a variety of levels in their understanding of musical style. From recitals with impressive range and depth to some that were clearly limited. Pieces that are too short and basic, or all too similar do not support candidates in demonstrating an understanding of this aspect.

Criterion D

Musical communication was evident at a variety of levels from some to highly consistent and mature. There were instances of impressive communication of musical intent and understanding.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

For future candidates, it is recommended that all performances be recorded in front of live audiences, as per the directions in the study guide. In some instances there is clearly no audience, or evidence of only one or two people in attendance.

It is also important that guidelines for accompaniment be followed and that accompaniment is well prepared. Lack thereof limits the marks allocated for Criterion A and affects Criteria C and D. In addition, candidates should be exposed to a range of recordings or live performances of the pieces in their programmes wherever possible as this enables them to listen, compare and contrast different interpretations and supports the development and understanding of their own personal performance decisions in an informed way.

Group performing (SLG)

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-3	4-7	8-12	13-14	15-15	16-17	18-20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The new format of electronic submissions seemed to have worked well in general. There were relatively few problems with the uploading of recordings.

While traditional ensembles such as band, orchestra, and choir predominated in this component, there was a growing presence of less traditional groups including rock groups, trios, quartets and other chamber groups. Many groups, especially those framed in the school activities, had a teacher as director. However, candidates seem to demonstrate more creativity and independence in this aspect of the component. That is, some of the groups were autonomous in terms of their artistic direction.

In general the artistic performance of all the groups was from satisfactory to high. However, there were several cases where the requirements of the component were not clearly understood. Here are two of the main issues that arose.

- Submissions that were 'following' a candidate instead of a group. For instance, submissions consisting on a series of pieces where a singer performed with different groups (e.g. a cappella group, women's chorale, church choir). This is not an acceptable practice for this component because the goal of the component is to assess a group and not an individual.
- Some groups presented submissions including collaborations with other groups. For instance, a choir presenting half of the repertory a cappella or with piano accompaniment and the other half together with a full symphonic orchestra. While it is true that the choir was present in all the tracks, the 'group' changed dramatically once that the orchestra appeared. This was not anymore the same group. The nature/composition of a group cannot change in such a substantial form between compositions. Otherwise the submission is really presenting two different ensembles.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

The selection of repertory was in general appropriate to the level of the ensembles. Maybe due to the fact that the selection is often made by teachers/conductors, the repertory offered variety in style and contrast between the pieces. However, certain types of groups, for instance rock bands, showed less variety. While it is true that a 'specialized' group such as a 'hard rock' band

will have more limitations in the available repertory, groups should not neglect this aspect of their submissions.

Criterion B

Some of the submissions presented reached very high levels in this criterion. In some cases, the nature of the ensembles (schools) resulted in submissions that did not achieve such high levels. This was often the case where the ensembles included freshmen or even MYP candidates in the ensemble.

Criterion C

This aspect did not receive the same attention that the other criteria. While some submissions presented clear differentiations in style, in others this differentiation was less satisfactory.

Criterion D

The often excellent level of commitment demonstrated by the ensembles was engaging. Collaboration between performers was often evident, resulting on fine artistic products.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

As stated before, the number of 'independent' ensembles seems to be growing. Therefore, teachers are encouraged to clearly explain the requirements of the component to these 'independent' groups. There is a need to present appropriate and varied repertory. Invest time in selecting the repertory. It is not simply a matter of fulfilling the time requirement. A good selection of varied repertory offers the opportunity to showcase the group capabilities.

Further comments

The quality of recording (placement of microphones) could spoil what could be otherwise a good performance. If possible, ensure that someone monitors the levels of recording.

Creating (HL/SLC)

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-5	6-11	12-16	17-19	20-23	24-26	27-30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The increasing use of programmes such as Garage Band and Logic Pro can lead to candidates making use of pre-composed materials: not only drum parts, but bass lines, chord voicings and

accompanying riffs, and it is difficult for examiners to identify where the material is not all original. (This applies both to compositions and to music technology creations.) The use of these ready-made solutions has practically become part of the profession, so teachers apparently see no problem in letting candidates make use of them. Examiners however are meant to evaluate musical elements which may or may not have been taken from a “library” and structures that may be pre-set solutions in a programme. The examiner is therefore sometimes faced with the choice of declaring an entire portfolio “inappropriate” or trying to distinguish what is original and what isn’t. Reflections sometimes state clearly that elements have been taken from the solutions offered by these programmes.

Candidates presenting stylistic techniques continue to display a lack of adequate preparation. Although there were exceptions, the examples of stylistic technique submitted were largely unconvincing – in particular chorale writing reflected little familiarity with 4-part harmony. Several candidates presenting stylistic techniques said in their reflections that they had had a few months to familiarise themselves with the task.

Some candidates producing pieces using technology tended to write pieces that lacked much variety and development of musical ideas. This could be due to the fact that much of the electronic music they listen to is also very repetitive.

There was a higher proportion of live performances this year – mostly of a good standard.

Some schools opted to organise portfolios of their candidates, with all candidates from a batch presenting a similar set of tasks. This can have the advantage of ensuring a certain balance and variety in the portfolio, but sometimes these submissions lacked creativity and individuality.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

Few candidates achieved really low scores here and much of the work contained imaginative musical ideas. There was a general understanding of the need to develop material, although candidates sometimes had difficulty in achieving this.

Melodic and chordal writing were generally quite good, although harmony was by and large the biggest challenge for candidates. Weaker points were non-functional bass lines and uneven textures. Lower scoring candidates tended to lack control of the musical elements and were unable to develop them successfully. This led to pieces being based mainly on repetition.

Sometimes it was evident that a “trial and error” process was being used, with the aid of computer playback, until there was there was some kind of result.

Criterion B

As with criterion A, a general acceptable standard, mainly due to the recycling of material creating thematic unity. There seemed, in fact, to be few problems with cohesion of works although there was often too much reliance on repetition as a means of achieving this, with only the more capable candidates manipulating their ideas to good effect. A simple key change or

change in instrumentation, from one section to another can create variety and direction in a piece.

Candidates presenting songs made effective use of song forms, but often the same candidates, when writing instrumental pieces, lost this structural cohesion. Candidates who made a conscious choice and use of form, having studied the music of other composers, were more likely to be successful in this criterion. Candidates without this background were more likely to produce pieces that rambled without direction, using long or odd length musical phrases.

Some songs still made the “mistake “ of presenting consecutive verses of a song with exactly the same music (varying only the text) leaving the examiner with little material to evaluate.

Criterion C

Fewer cases of impossible instrumental writing with several candidates making good use of their personal knowledge of instruments. There were more cases of live recordings and this will have helped candidates to understand the possibilities and characteristics of real instruments.

Successful examples here included cases where candidates were composing for the instruments that they played, or had researched.

Candidates writing just using the computer, and without research, were more likely to make errors with range or inappropriate parts such as impossible piano chords. Such submissions often also failed to exploit the potential of instruments, for example; remaining in a very limited range at the piano.

There were some good examples of the use of musical technology software. It should be remembered that teachers should be looking to award creative use of technology.

Criterion D

A generally good standard of notation. Many scores gave complete performance instructions and there were more cases of bowing instructions and more complete phrase markings.

Scores that scored less well often did so through an apparent lack of care rather than knowledge: no title for the piece, instruments not specified, initial tempo and/or dynamics not specified. Transposing instruments were often presented without the parts transposed, even when the specified instrument was, for example “clarinet in Bb”. Often this lack of attention made the difference between a high and an average score in D.

Improvisation candidates could pick up marks here with a good score for spontaneity - although it should be remembered that working with a “minus one” backing track can lead to a certain limitation in spontaneity tending to remain at the same dynamic level, and a tendency for the candidate to think that playing along with the right notes on the right chords is the most important thing- rather than spontaneity and the creation of something new.

Sound quality in music technology creations was mostly good, with some excellent examples showing care taken in mix and panning.

Criterion E

Achievement here tended to mirror that in Criteria A and B – that is, those candidates who were able to develop or extend their musical ideas with a clear idea of what they wanted to achieve, were more successful in shaping their work and in creating expressive music. There were only a few weak entries that were uncommunicative, mainly due to a lack of continuity caused by inexperience.

Criterion F

Some marks were lost here apparently due to misconceptions about the reflection task. In general more clarity and organisation were needed. Despite being worth 5 marks, the reflection does not always appear to be regarded as an important part of the creating process. Many candidates apparently did not take enough care over this task, or seem to have been poorly advised.

Although the standard of reflections seems to be slowly improving, Intent and Outcome often continue to receive insufficient attention.

There was, as in previous sessions, too much subjective writing giving personal life details, in place of information about the music created. Description of Process was often replaced by a sort of programme note, describing what happens during the piece, but not giving information about how it was composed and the decisions that were made during the process.

Higher scoring reflections gave detailed and intelligent explanation of the three required elements, with the Intentions perhaps mentioning pieces that had inspired the composer, and stating the medium (instrumentation) and why this has been chosen, and Outcomes stating what had been learned from this process and what might be done differently on another occasion.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

The best work was produced by candidates who had clearly studied a broad range of different musical styles, as well as compositional techniques, such as harmony, thematic development and the use of form.

Candidates might be encouraged to begin their compositions at the piano or on his/her chosen instrument. Drafts should be used to help guide the process of the composition as it takes shape. Understanding of melody and harmony should be introduced at an early stage in order to maximize the amount of time the candidates have to develop their work.

Although working from a computer and making use of software playback is a common approach, candidates should be made to understand that with compositions the appropriate use of real instruments is an important factor and the instruments specified on the score are not just options from a soundcard. Live performances are to be encouraged as this greatly enhances overall understanding, and the suitability of compositions for the chosen instruments. Midi playback from programmes such as Finale and Sibelius often tends to soften dissonances and make poorly crafted music sound presentable.

Candidates presenting stylistic techniques should have a more thorough preparation for the task. A few lessons in music theory or some listening to examples on line is not adequate and will lead to marks being lost.

Candidates presenting music technology creations should understand that the audio presented is taken as the actual work of art and in no way will be considered a “demo”. So a recording of a song with only basic sound manipulation might score better if it were being presented with a score as a composition, in which case the recording would be just a demo to help the examiner.

Whilst there is evidence of some committed and well-organised teaching, there are some instances where it appears candidates have been ‘let loose’ to follow their own interests without much guidance at all. The best examples were when individual creativity was evident but the guiding presence of the teacher was also to be perceived.

Clearer instruction needs to be given to schools about the use of composing software that gives ready-made solutions. All the musical elements have to be the work of the candidate.

Paper one (Listening paper) (HL)

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-9	10-18	19-31	32-38	39-44	45-51	52-100

Paper one (Listening paper) (SLS, SLG, SLC)

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-8	9-17	18-27	28-35	36-42	43-50	51-80

General comments

The May 2016 paper revealed a number of issues which would seem to have important future repercussions for both examiners and teachers. The inclusion of the word ‘counterpoint’ in Q3 (HL), and the subsequent discovery that the term/concept was unknown to many candidates, was perhaps the most significant of these, but responses to Q2 (SL/HL) and Q3 (SL)/Q4 (HL) in particular also highlighted the fact that many candidates did not really possess analytical skills of a sufficient order to engage with these questions in adequate depth. There has been

considerable feedback from teachers on the perceived difficulty of these (and other) questions that will be valuable in preparing future examinations for the music listening paper. It is clear that questions must use terminology that will be generally understood, that candidates should reasonably be expected to possess the skills required to produce an acceptable response, and that extracts for aural analysis should not present unreasonable challenges. At the same time questions must also provide sufficient scope for abler candidates to demonstrate their abilities.

However, it must be said that many of the responses to the questions listed above revealed a very minimal understanding of basic areas of Western music theory such as simple harmony, key and the use of modulation. And while candidates can and do produce responses without such knowledge, by virtue of the very nature of the markscheme they are unlikely to achieve more than very modest marks for them. Some fundamental instruction in such areas is therefore an absolute prerequisite for achieving higher scores in Section A in particular, and further suggestions on how this might be achieved are given under 'Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates' below.

The areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

Many candidates were unfamiliar with the term/concept 'counterpoint' in HL Q3, often resulting in poor performance on this question and some negative feedback from teachers. Several responses to Q2 (SL/HL) also revealed that candidates lacked sufficient analytical skills, particularly regarding harmony, to attempt more than a superficial response to the question. There were also issues with the wording of Q1 (SL/HL – see below), while unfamiliarity with the genres represented by Q5 (HL) / Q4 (SL) and Q7 (HL) / Q6 (SL) suggested that many candidates were not prepared for encounters with these styles. More generally, candidates had difficulties with critical analysis and evaluation, and found it challenging to use a variety of musical terminology.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Most candidates seemed to have studied the Gershwin in some detail and were able to provide a broadly acceptable answer to Q1 (SL/HL). Candidates also seemed well prepared for the format of Section B (e.g. making sure that they addressed all four criteria), and some good responses to Q6 in particular suggested that the style of this track was one with which many felt comfortable. More generally, other strengths which examiners identified included: the location of musical evidence to support the context of the responses; effective aural perception; an ability to identify principal structural features and compositional devices; a clear understanding of such phenomena as 'call and response', 'improvisation' and 'syncopation'; and an ability to aurally recognize and describe percussion instruments

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Section A

Candidates should be reminded here that they must justify their answers with reference to the question asked, and in particular stay focused on that question.

Question 1

This was the more popular Section A option, and strong points here included a background knowledge of the piece and the ability to identify significant themes/motifs. However, few really engaged with the question of 'motifs and their development', instead more commonly focusing on 'themes/melodies' and their 'restatement/repetition', or superficial changes such as transposition or re-orchestration. Responses also tended to take the form of a narrative account, and – as in previous sessions – many of them bore striking similarities, suggesting answers memorized from an external source. A popular ploy was to seize on the word 'use' in the rubric as a pretext to discuss the way in which Gershwin 'uses' motifs for programmatic purposes; however, the question was quite specifically asking about compositional use.

Question 2

This was by far the less popular of the two Section A options. Candidates seemed to have no difficulty understanding the task, and could generally comment on some similarities and differences between the two passages, often pointing out interesting details regarding the use of articulation and rhythmic devices. However many lacked the necessary analytical skills to give a full account of the harmonic and tonal differences, thus making it difficult to offer more than a superficial comparison.

Question 3 (Higher Level only)

As suggested above, this question proved particularly problematic. While some candidates did have sufficient understanding of the term 'counterpoint' to produce satisfactory responses, for many the concept was clearly wholly unfamiliar. In many cases this resulted in candidates either omitting the question, discussing whatever they thought the term might mean (e.g. 'countermelodies'), or writing about other matters in the hope of gaining some credit. Sadly most of these strategies did not earn particularly high marks, though credit was given for discussion of any musical features (e.g. countermelody) which at least contained elements of contrapuntal writing.

Section B

Question 4 Higher Level/Question 3 Standard Level

As usual, this extract (with score) was the more popular of the two Section B options, and many candidates were able to describe musical elements such as the texture, dynamics, and 'call and response' figures. However, comments could often be superficial or inaccurate, again pointing to a lack of basic analytical skills and vocabulary. There was also a tendency to

duplicate information found in the score/rubric, thus not really demonstrating the ability to listen, or – conversely – to provide timings rather than bar numbers, thus not referring to the score at all. Some candidates demonstrated an adequate knowledge of the musical context supported by musical evidence, but others had difficulty recognizing the period in which the piece was composed, and few identified its ‘scherzo’ character.

Question 5 Higher Level/Question 4 Standard Level

This question was the less popular option and clearly a challenging choice for many candidates, though some demonstrated a clear ability to perceive musical elements such as pitch, timbre and articulation. Few however seemed to be able to follow the sectional structure of the extract, or to perceive that there were more than one pianos involved, and several used words like ‘atonal’, ‘serial’ or ‘minimalist’ to describe its context, suggesting a lack of any nuanced familiarity with 20th century art music.

Question 6 Higher Level/Question 5 Standard Level

This was arguably the most successful question. Many candidates were clearly on home ground here and able to identify such features of ‘blues’ style as the strophic structure, 16-/12-bar progressions, blue notes, swung accompaniment, etc. In some cases the contextual knowledge could be quite detailed, though others mistook the style for ‘country’ or some other popular American genre. While a surprising number were able to identify the kazoo, an equally surprising number mistook it and/or the harmonica for a muted trumpet or saxophone. Other weaknesses included limited perception of textural changes and the typical ‘call and response’ patterns, or working backwards from the blues context to the piece and finding in it ‘jazz’ features which were not there, such as a ‘walking bass’.

Question 7 Higher Level/Question 6 Standard Level

This was clearly another challenging exercise for many candidates. Quite a few were generally able to recognize the Indonesian context, but for many it was clearly unfamiliar, even though gamelan is a major ‘world music’ genre. Strengths here included an ability to describe the instrumentation (even if actual names were not known) and perceive the work’s modal (though not necessarily pentatonic) nature. And while the lack of clear structure also proved problematic, many were able to produce a fairly accurate account of the general ebb and flow of the tempo/dynamics, or identify the solistic events involving rebab and suling. At the other extreme, some candidates responded to the piece using negative terms such as ‘primitive’, ‘native’ or ‘chaos’ – revealing a form of cultural prejudice not sympathetic to the spirit of the paper itself.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

As already noted in the ‘General Comments’, the results of this paper strongly suggest that the single initiative that would most significantly increase the general standard of candidates’ performance would be more instruction in basic elements of Western music theory and their analytical application: functional harmony, keys and modulation, etc. If limited teaching time

does not permit this to take place in class, candidates might instead be directed to one of the numerous online sites providing instruction in music theory specifically aimed at young people – both the Naxos Music Library and Classic FM, for example, provide materials of this kind. Time invested in visiting such sources would certainly be much more profitably spent than in visiting the kind of ‘revision aids’ responsible for the memorized responses to Q1.

Other general suggestions by examiners for teaching practice include: reminding candidates to reference music examples adequately; discussing prescribed works at a deeper level, not just generally; encouraging candidates to learn appropriate terminology; providing a grounding in fundamental analysis, its associated terminology and basis in aural perception – ideally in parallel with practical music-making rather than as a standalone ‘add-on’; teaching candidates to identify the basic musical forms (sonata, rondo) and generic types (symphony, tone poem), and to recognize styles and historical periods; cultivating understanding of terms related to texture, and the various scales used in Western music; exposing candidates to music outside the WAM tradition, and to post-1900 WAM; ensuring candidates can recognize common orchestral instruments; developing skills in critical analysis and analysis of music, where strong links between this paper and Composing/creating can be made; and emphasizing that they should not use terms which the examiner is unlikely to understand (e.g. classifications taken from a specific revision aid, such as ‘Theme B4’).

Musical Links Investigation (HL, SLS, SLG, SLC)

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-14	15-17	18-20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

There was a large range of work submitted with the majority of papers falling in the middle to low mark range and very few really excellent submissions showing consistency across all the criteria. A great number of scripts were presented as “essays” rather than media scripts, whilst others chose more ambiguous mediums such as radio program, television chat show or drama which, in most cases becomes a hindrance to the delivery of their investigations.

There was a variety of musical cultures, many successful choices, but also many which showed a lack of understanding of the MLI task, or of the different cultures themselves. Links were often vague or not clearly stated, which led to a lack of focus in the investigation. Some cover sheets showed potential, but then the work itself did not bear fruition and, in a number of cases, some good work was undermined by a lack of organization (e.g. poor labelling of musical examples, incomplete referencing, or sometimes none at all). A significant weakness in many submissions was the lack of depth of musical analysis, and the inability of many candidates to relate their analysis to the stated links, or provide musical evidence in support of their discussion.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

Although in many cases, the choice of musical cultures was distinct and, at times quite adventurous, there are still issues with this aspect of criterion A. Candidates should be reminded that simply naming a country is not the same as stating the “musical” culture. Equally variable was the stating of musical links. Some were quite well-focused but more often the links were vague or non-musical (e.g. historical, text setting, mood or instrumentation).

Criterion B

There were few scripts which achieved highly for this criterion. Lack of sustained analysis is the primary problem for most low scoring papers, with a tendency to use general description or generalizations without specific musical evidence to back this up. Lack of clefs and key signatures in musical examples continues to be an issue and, more often than not, the lack of these essential “grammatical” tools undermines the accuracy of the musical example and weakens the supporting evidence for the discussion.

Criterion C

While there was some good evidence of the use of musical terminology, there are still many candidates who use terminology but do not show understanding, and several who do not understand basic terms. There was considerable misuse or confusion with many terminologies, in particular tonality and texture, but also inappropriate use of terms like ritornello, basso continuo, call and response, ostinato and syncopation.

Criterion D

In general, the layout and organisation of scripts was acceptable and often well thought out, although more attention could be given to labelling of musical examples, specific order of musical examples (e.g. not having ex 9 come before ex 7) and general clarity of the presentation. In addition, there were many instances where there was a great deal of reference to audio and/or scores but these were not attached as supporting materials, which showed a lack of organisation.

Citation of sources continues to be a significant weakness. Primary sources (audio or score) were often not clearly identified, with candidates apparently assuming that a list of web addresses that included those where sheet music or audio tracks could be found, was sufficient. Although the Music guide is clear, many candidates did not cite sources within the body of the investigation. There is a greater need to understand that any idea which is not their own should be cited in the body of the work. This includes quotes, tables, images, and screen shots from other websites.

Criterion E

Candidates submitted a wide range of creative scripts, some of which were very imaginative and engaging. However, many fell short, showing a lack of understanding or depth. Intellectual

initiative is not always shown in the papers and while there were few really poor submissions (e.g. those showing a lack of interest) there were also few really excellent examples. There was some creative use of format, and there were fewer candidates who wasted time with the format at the expense of content.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers need to read the instructions more carefully as there were many obvious teacher errors, even to the point that teachers marked the work.

Teachers are advised to spend more time in developing the analytical skills of their candidates, and perhaps introduce the investigation expectations and skills earlier in the learning process. More clarification is needed for candidates on what constitutes a specific musical link.

Lists of note values rather than musical notation are not successful as musical evidence, especially when relating to rhythm, which is better notated.

The use of audio and supporting materials was not always successful. Rather than judicious clips aimed at backing up points made in the script, audio files were frequently whole pieces well over the 5 minutes total allowance.

Please ensure that candidates have included a bibliography/discography and that all referencing is complete. Candidates should not use the MLI's of others as literary sources.

Further comments

There must be further clarification for teachers about the importance of uploading the written script to the MLI file. Candidates must not provide a link to a website.

The requirements for Criterion A need to be more clearly understood by teachers.

When distinct musical cultures are selected, along with suitable musical examples and strong and clearly focused musical links, there is a good foundation on which to build the investigation.