

## MUSIC

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0-15	16-32	33-48	49-59	60-71	72-81	82-100

#### Standard level group performing

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0-14	15-32	33-51	52-62	63-69	70-79	80-100

#### Standard level solo performing

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0-14	15-32	33-48	49-59	60-71	82-82	83-100

#### Standard level creating

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0-15	16-32	33-48	49-58	59-69	70-80	81-100

### Solo performing (HL/SLS)

#### Component grade boundaries

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

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

A strong session for most schools with commendable preparation resulting in superb distinguished solo performances. The recordings of the candidates displayed their work with appropriate clarity and prominence and the time requirements were largely met. There was evidence of effective and inspired teaching, guidance and support for the development of solid solo performance skills and understanding. The majority of candidates demonstrated

motivation, purposeful engagement, industry and convincing delivery. Many recitals revealed a breadth of exposure to different types of music, appropriate technical control of the pieces, and understanding of interpretation, stylistic character and commitment.

The performances often produced effective musical communication.

There was variety in the range and suitability of the performances with most submissions demonstrating dedication and commitment to music making at adequate to very high achievement levels. The weakest submissions usually presented inappropriate repertoire, in some cases due to the selection of a set of pieces that are too similar in technical and expressive demands. This lack of contrast may be apparent even in programmes with selections by composers from different stylistic periods. In a few other cases recitals did not follow accompaniment guidelines, mostly in guitar and drum set submissions. The material performed was supportive within the group rather than that of the leading role.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### Criterion A

The suitability of repertoire varied according to schools. Some schools supported candidates to demonstrate exposure and preparation in different music styles and a range of performing skills. There was evidence of careful planning so that the repertoire posed appropriate technical challenges while being suitable to the candidates' abilities. Accompaniment guidelines were carefully followed.

In a few schools, more informed and active instructional guidance was essential. The stylistic range of the submissions was inadequately narrow. There was limited evidence that the candidates were prompted to explore, learn and develop skills in styles other than those they liked or were familiar with. Such submissions were inadequate and demonstrated only limited understanding of the aims of the course. More details below in the section on recommendations.

### Criterion B

Technical challenges were appropriate in most submissions. Mostly successful to highly consistent technical control levels were evident. There was evidence of dedication and industry beyond the expectations for the age group.

### Criterion C

There was evidence of performance practice understanding, with mostly effective communication of stylistic character.

### Criterion D

Usually some to consistently highly effective levels of musical communication were demonstrated.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

The majority of submissions were well prepared for this component. There was evidence of highly effective music teaching.

Guidance and planning of repertoire choices is essential. Inadequacy may arise from

- Submitting group rather than solo material and the candidate presents group selections where their part is supportive and not that of a soloist. This supporting role is not suitable for solo performance demonstration. This occurs most in submissions from guitar, bass or drum set performers. Special attention for selecting suitable solo repertoire is needed for candidates being assessed in these media. Similarly, candidates must be reminded that only one group submission is permitted for solo performance
- Not submitting pieces with clear contrast in terms of articulation, phrasing, tone colour, technical, structural or stylistic demands. Some programmes had only commercial, well exposed numbers from repertoire that is very familiar to the candidates. Interpretation in these cases is clearly derivative and the candidates do not demonstrate adequate exploration and study. The stylistic range is narrow
- Selecting pieces that are beyond an individual's abilities.

## Group performing (SLG)

### Component grade boundaries

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

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

There were a small number of group performances this session, but these included a broad range of choral performances, jazz ensembles, string orchestra and mixed ensembles from within a whole class.

Some exciting repertoire was chosen, especially for the choral groups which featured the works of contemporary composers from their own country alongside substantial traditional works.

One or two entries were more inclined towards the solo rather group performance - for example a featured singer with guitar accompaniment is not within the parameters of the group performance.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

Choice of repertoire was usually very good, and in some cases extremely creative and exciting. There was a good mix of traditional and more modern jazz numbers and it was good to see candidates developing improvising skills. Repertoire was well chosen for the level of the candidates, both musically and technically.

#### Criterion B

The technical level of ensembles ranged from satisfactory to excellent. One or two of the choral groups were extremely polished and proficient, showing outstanding training in voice matching, blend, balance and application of good vocal technique. This was a pleasure to hear. Likewise, jazz ensembles met the technical demands of their repertoire with an overall sense of ease. Balance was generally well considered and tightness of ensemble, especially through transitions was mostly well managed.

#### Criterion C

All ensembles did well in showing good to excellent awareness of the various styles in their repertoire. There was some stylish Baroque string playing, more successful in some part than the modern repertoire which tended, in performance, to be less refined and musically considered. It was encouraging to see candidates improvising sections in their jazz performances, although with variable success. Improvisation is an essential skill in the jazz genre and it was good to see it being developed.

#### Criterion D

Most groups did very well in this criterion, showing enthusiasm and commitment in their performances. It is not only energy and enthusiasm that combines to communicate the musical intent. This is also achieved through a clear sense of musical intent and by the confidence of delivery. Where entries are perhaps tentative, or the playing possibly rehearsed to a point of being mechanical, the qualities sought by this criterion are compromised.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

It is clear from the submissions in this session that there is much dedicated teaching of group repertoire in the schools. Issues that continue to need focus are intonation, quality of tone and balance. Understanding each player's role within an ensemble is vital to the overall success of the group. At times, for example, within a string group when playing classical repertoire, the bass line lacked shape and harmonic direction and was too heavy. In rock or jazz groups, drum kit and piano or bass guitar need to be more aware of supporting the vocals or solo instrument.

There is such good teaching apparent in these submissions that there is really very little to add - except "Keep up the good work!"

## Further comments

Thank you to all those who made group submissions. It was a thoroughly enjoyable collection of recordings showing long term commitment, enthusiasm and skill from both candidates and teachers.

## Creating (HL/SLC)

### Component grade boundaries

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

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

There was a fairly broad selection of work, tending for the most part to stay within the category of 'composition' with the majority of candidates opting for the more traditional formats of chamber music rather than pop songs or jazz compositions, although there was no significant difference in marks between these genres. The options to present technology pieces, arrangements, improvisations and musical techniques were taken up by far fewer candidates this session.

While most schools appeared to leave a fairly free choice of how to compile the portfolio, a few schools opted to present all their portfolios with a similar combination of pieces.

There was a good use of live recordings, showing the playability of the pieces, and even when the performance was not perfect this was generally preferable to computer playback, and was certainly of use to the candidates themselves in their development as composers. It is, of course, understood that not all candidates will have the musicians available to perform and record their pieces.

In terms of overall quality this session showed a good level, from mediocre to excellent with very few really poor entries.

Not many candidates in this session presented stylistic techniques, and those who did, did not display a particularly developed understanding of the techniques required.

There were very few problems with the length of pieces, with the lower limit of three minutes being generally understood and respected, and very few cases of pieces that appeared to overuse repetition in order to achieve the three minutes. Very few pieces went beyond five minutes so it would appear that this required length is acceptable and workable. Most candidates presented a variety of musical situations in their portfolios. Those presenting two or three pieces with similar instrumentation tended to earn lower marks.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### Criterion A

Candidates displayed an average to excellent grasp of the use of musical elements. Textures were generally well organized and knowledge of functional harmony was apparent. Weaker submissions featured mistakes such as concluding a piece on a second inversion chord or ineffective part writing with confused crossing of voices. Use of tone colour and dynamics was

also satisfactory with several candidates showing a good grasp of the possibilities of these dimensions.

Improvisations, although often coherent, tended to overuse the same material rather than develop it.

Arrangements sometimes were more like transcriptions of the material to only slightly different instrumentations, which does not fulfil the requirements of the task. Although others were genuine attempts to revisit the material.

#### Criterion B

There was a good level of musical coherence among the pieces submitted this session. The importance of form and organization of material appears to have been understood. The possibilities offered by copy and paste when using computer programmes, although offering greater simplicity with recapitulating material should be used with some caution: there were instances of material reiterated out of scansion – copied onto the wrong beat of the bar. Computer audio playback will not make this evident as it rarely emphasises accents at the beginning of the bar.

The adoption of classical models and forms, minuets, rondos, usually helped in this criterion. Pop songs, generally following standard formats, were nearly always structured successfully but sometimes lacked musical development, almost because of this, tending simply to repeat material within the format and rely on the words to create variety. Candidates who created variety within the format (in the arrangement for example) were better able to achieve higher marks.

#### Criterion C

Candidates were divided between those with an understanding of real instruments and those for whom these were available sounds from a computer. The latter group were in the minority in this session and most of these had made an effort to conceive the performance as if by real players.

There were some instances of requiring the impossible; a single plucked note with a crescendo or (perhaps the most common error in instrumental writing) impossible leaps in keyboard writing, but generally instruments were employed correctly. Several candidates mentioned in their reflections getting to know the instruments in order to write for them, and although writing was not always idiomatic there were few cases of notes out of range.

Technology candidates appeared to have understood the requirement to demonstrate understanding of the software employed and there were some good submissions in this category.

Improvisers were less effective in their use of the medium, sometimes playing safe and performing in a central register where more variation in tone and register, perhaps employing some techniques peculiar to the instrument, would have been more effective. Risk taking can be rewarded here.

In stylistic techniques submissions the use of instruments was mostly correct, and voices were kept in the right ranges.

#### Criterion D

With the vast majority of submissions using one of the more common music publishing programs, scores were generally well presented. Yet candidates should be wary of some of the defaults in these programs.

For example, some will print 'Clarinet in Bb' alongside the staff whether or not the part is transposed. Transposing instruments should, ideally, be presented in their appropriate transpositions with the appropriate key signatures.

As regards key signatures themselves, it is not essential that a tonal piece be presented with a key signature, especially if it is in a chromatic modernist style, as with Hindemith, but in the case of a piece being obviously tonal, with little or no modulation, it should be remembered that for performers and readers, having the key signature, rather than the same accidentals occurring throughout the piece, makes the score easier to use and therefore more effective. More serious mistakes included the omission of tempo and/or dynamics, and it should be remembered that to achieve full marks in this criterion it is better to add phrase markings and if possible, pedal and bowing indications.

In technology pieces the care taken in producing good sound quality with effective control of signal level was evident.

Amongst improvisers there was some evidence of spontaneity although not at a high level. Candidates opting to perform in a group situation should be mindful of the need to show creativity and even take risks rather than sit back and just play along with the band.

#### Criterion E

At the upper level submissions were well shaped, creative and communicative. Among the less effective compositions were those that had inconclusive endings, and indeed some promising compositions had disappointing endings where more care and attention from the candidates would have been appropriately rewarded.

#### Criterion F

Candidates respecting the requirement to address the three elements: intention, process and outcome fared better here.

It should be remembered that a reflection is required for each piece submitted and that there is an upper limit of 300 words for each reflection.

The reflection should try to avoid being too subjective at the expense of talking about the music. Mentioning models and influences is helpful, but talking too much about one's favourite rock bands is superfluous.

When describing process candidates should try to include some specific information regarding decisions taken along the way, perhaps about how the piece was structured. An

analysis/description of the finished work is not called for here. Candidates presenting technology compositions should remember that the reflection should mention the technical process.

The outcome should be something more than a personal appraisal of the piece. Many candidates limited themselves to a simple “I think the piece works”- Information about what has been learned here during its refinement is very useful.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should read the guide carefully in order to give candidates the possibility of achieving the maximum marks for each criterion. It should also be remembered that the criteria are assessed separately by examiners and that, for example, mediocre pieces can pick up marks with a good reflection, and there is no guarantee that excellent work will automatically score well in criterion F if some care is not taken also with the reflection. Candidates presenting jazz or other compositions with sections for improvised solos should remember to include the solos on the audio and transcribe them onto the score, rather than just leaving a blank section with instructions for the soloist, even though this is the usual practice for jazz publications.

When presenting arrangements a copy of the original that has been worked from should be provided. Audio is acceptable. Candidates should be reminded that the arrangement will be assessed for its creativity and expressivity.

Candidates offering musical techniques should be sure to have a good understanding of the idiom and techniques required with the observation of the relative ‘rules’ and requirements in each case, such as the need for modulations and appropriate cadences. Teachers should pay careful attention to the requirements here and be sure to give the candidates the appropriate ‘start’ in each piece of work. This should also be clear to the examiner. In the case of serial techniques a strict adherence to the row is not necessarily enough to achieve full marks..

More successful examples here set out to create a piece with some sort of musical identity: a movement from a sonatina, or a duet, or even a short programmatic piece. Strict adherence to Schoenbergian aesthetics (avoidance of octaves and fifths) is not specifically called for, although pieces adopting a purely atonal approach were generally more effective here.

Dynamics and phrasing are recommended in those options that customarily would have them, for example the 19th century song.

A statement, by the teacher, justifying the marks given, must be included on the 6/MC form, and CDs should have the candidate number as well as the candidate name for clarification purposes.

## Paper 1 (Listening paper)

### Component grade boundaries (HL)

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---



<b>Mark range:</b>	0-19	20-38	39-57	58-69	70-82	83-94	85-140
--------------------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------

### Component grade boundaries (SLS, SLG, SLC)

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0-13	14-27	28-40	41-49	50-57	58-66	67-100

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

The questions that require more critical thinking (section A and C) resulted on less satisfactory answers. Evidence suggests that candidates are capable of memorizing information and perceiving facts. However, the exercise of linking the perceived events was certainly more elusive.

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

Candidates showed good knowledge of Mozart's "Jupiter" symphony. In section B candidates showed knowledge of aspects of context and certain strategies to describe structure. In general the use of the score in question 4 was satisfactory. Candidates were usually able to recognize many of the instruments in the pieces.

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

#### Question 1

Candidates had no problem when answering this question in terms of form (sonata form and minuet). Other aspects such as orchestration, texture or tonality were also mentioned. However, more sophisticated aspects such as 'Alberti bass', use of antecedent/consequent phrases, role of the instruments were often neglected.

#### Question 2

Candidates struggled in general with this question. Despite being apparently the obvious aspect of the question: "Why is this described as a potpourri?", candidates did not directly answer this. Instead many embarked into offering an analysis of the piece from different angles, often unrelated to the question. Candidates found it difficult to respond to the second part of the question that related to form.

### Question 3

This question resulted in answers that described the differences in instrumentation and, to a lesser extent, some of the roles played by the different instruments. From here the candidates seemed to have run out of ideas. Many completed their answers with irrelevant comments such as structure, tonality, or phrases.

### Question 4

This question provided the best answers of the paper. Most candidates recognized the period and, with the help of the score, elements such as tonality, meter and structural aspects. There were a few candidates who did not refer to the score to answer the question.

### Question 5

Many candidates recognized period and offered some contextual information about the piece and composer. The recognition of instruments was in general correct. However, attempts to describe structure were less successful. There were few candidates who recognized the presence of the opening motive in the whole extract.

### Question 6

Many elements of the piece were easy to recognize to the candidates: certain instruments such as the violin and clarinet, different sections, tempo changes. However, few candidates recognized the relationship between sections and certainly struggled to identify the cymbalon which was often described as harp, banjo, guitar or 'old piano'.

### Question 7

Many candidates recognized the style and period. Many also identified the piece and the composer. In terms of structure, candidates identified the different sections but mostly due to the text of the lyrics than to musical features.

### Question 8 (HL only)

In general this question was not responded to with the finest answers. Candidates often cited unsubstantial links such as the use of vocals or instruments. There were few answers that showed deeper critical thinking.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Some of the less satisfactory answers were the result of poorly followed instructions. In these cases candidates offered comments that did not match the question.

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

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	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 very good range of work presented, with some interesting and sophisticated choice of musical cultures and examples, and some outstanding presentations. In the majority of cases, candidates appeared to have a greater connection with at least one of the pieces selected for investigation, sometimes leading to an imbalance in the comparison.

There were some very interesting works that showed creativity and commitment as well as those which were more mechanical, seemingly more guided by teachers or by a template developed through the teaching process. In these cases, candidates appeared to have a clearer idea of musical analysis and comparison, but creativity and engagement were not always evident.

Musical cultures were chosen from very diverse areas of the globe and pieces were generally between three and five minutes long, or if a longer work was used, then a significant section was analysed. There were still some cases where the investigation seems to focus on just a few bars of the piece, or only a few bars (usually the opening) were used solely as examples for analysis and comparison.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### Criterion A

There was still some confusion on what is meant by a musical culture and in many of these cases candidates seemed to believe that a country was a culture. There was variable success in the choice of musical links - some well-chosen and significant links were presented with clear intent. On the other hand, non-musical links such as mood or emotion were stated. Some candidates still wrongly stated instrumentation as a link. Only where this is in fact in relation to timbre (quality of sound) can it be considered. It is also important to qualify the aspect of the musical element that is being linked such as melody – contour or use of disjunct intervals.

#### Criterion B

Many of the scripts analysed aspects of the links in great detail, but did not always compare differences as well as similarities. In addition, there was a tendency to general description/analysis of characteristics of the chosen culture with little reference to the specific

musical examples chosen, and often without musical evidence to support the claim. It is important that candidates analyse the complete piece or section thereof and not just the opening section or one or two fragments that fit a perceived link. Some candidates let themselves down by focussing almost entirely on the performance practice of their chosen pieces (for instance, strumming techniques, the use of vibrato, or the level of technical difficulty in a piece). While this produced some interesting work, it does not fully meet the requirements of the MLI, especially in this criterion which concerns musical elements and features within a piece, not the execution of the music.

#### Criterion C

For the most part, knowledge and use of terminology has improved and there were some excellent descriptions of rhythmic and textural aspects of many of the works. There was also very appropriate or even sophisticated use of terminology that had often been copied from secondary sources, without the evidence (from musical examples or correct application in context) that the candidate fully grasped this terminology. It was encouraging that, in this session, there were fewer instances of candidates misapplying the terminologies (for example using rhythmic terms when discussing melody, or confusing harmony with melody). There appeared to be more clarity and confidence in the use of appropriate terminology.

#### Criterion D

In the main sources were appropriately acknowledged with a good mix of texts, journals and audio sources along with published music. However, there were some scripts that lacked any bibliography, and also a number that relied solely on internet sources.

CD tracks were, on the whole, within the time frame of 5 minutes and there were some excellent demonstrations of examples used in support of musical analysis.

Whilst there were examples of some outstanding presentations, many investigations lacked organization. There was a lack of linear thinking when making the case and often there was a lack of clarity in the presentation of musical examples. Clefs and key signatures were frequently missing, which undermined the discussion, especially if it was melodic or harmonic. It is more helpful to the intended reader if points are highlighted on musical examples. Not only does this show the candidate's understanding of the issue, but it helps maintain engagement with the reader.

#### Criterion E

Many candidates presented a mechanical investigation, often going through a list of the elements without a sense of true "investigation", although there were instances of great commitment and enthusiasm for the task which were a pleasure to read. It is important that images are used in relation to the discussion and help to give perspective or add to the depth of understanding. Too often they seem to be there only to enhance the visual.

## Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Spend time explaining to candidates the concept of culture (as stated in the IB Diploma Programme *Music guide*). Encourage the candidates to complete an analysis of two works

from the point of view of the musical elements and finding links – both similarities and differences. Look at the overall structure of both works and consider the balance between significant aspects of both works.

## Further comments

The generally high standard of the MLIs in this session is a reflection of the quality teaching that is happening in this aspect of the course, which also has implications on the analysis and understanding of the course in general. Teachers are to be congratulated on the excellent preparation of their candidates.