

# MUSIC

---

Paper 0410/01

Unprepared Listening

## General comments

In general, the Examiners were pleased that so many candidates had made a genuine attempt to answer the majority of the questions - there were far fewer incidences of blank answers this year. The melodic dictation question was answered less successfully than in previous years, and there was widespread misunderstanding of the type of interval found in the skeleton score question. However, aside from these two questions there were no consistent areas of weakness, which is very pleasing.

## Comments on specific questions

### SECTION A

#### Music A1

- 1 Soprano / high female voice. Most candidates answered correctly.
- 2 Starts with an ascending interval, and mainly moves in leaps. A variety of responses.
- 3 Recitative. A variety of responses.
- 4 Line 8 is set to a contrapuntal / polyphonic texture at first, with the voices coming in one by one singing the same motif in imitation / in canon/fugue. The voices come together at the end of the line. Line 9 is sung homophonically / in chords. Instruments double the voices.

Many candidates gained at least some credit here.

- 5 Opera. Well answered.
- 6 (a) Baroque. Well answered.  
(b) Use of harpsichord and cello as a continuo part. Polyphonic texture. Reasonably well answered.

#### Music A2

- 7 Trumpet (or clarinet). Well answered.
- 8 There were many ways to gain credit in this question and most candidates gained some marks, with many achieving full marks eg there are scales in semiquavers (*glissando* was accepted due to the speed) which ascend followed by descending arpeggios; the scales are split between string instruments and the arpeggios are played by flutes; the melody is also accompanied homophonically; there is a pizzicato bass line / walking / scalic bass line; cymbal crash on the last beat.
- 9 There were a wide variety of responses to this question. Many candidates observed the ternary form, but very many were either incorrect in their bar numbers, or failed to refer to bar numbers at all [A = 1 - 16; B = 17 - 24; A = 25 - 40]. One further mark was available for observing that either the rhythm of B was derived from A, or mention of contrast between major / minor key, or that the sections divided into four bar phrases or the main theme is repeated four times.

- 10 Well answered, with many candidates gaining at least one mark. Marks could be scored from a variety of observations: 4/4 time signature; very clear/strong beat / very rhythmic/unchanging pulse; Lively tempo e.g. *allegro*; regular phrase lengths and repetition of themes; prominent brass instruments / use of trumpet playing fanfare-like music.
- 11 Tchaikovsky – not always known.

### **SECTION B**

#### **Music B1**

- 12 (a) Bass, Tenor, Alto, Soprano. Very well answered.
- (b) Reasonably well answered: the same theme is sung by the second and third groups of voices, each at a higher pitch, creating parallel motion / chords / harmony.
- (c) Reasonably well answered: they sing a repeated / ostinato pattern in a high register / as a descant. Credit was given for a description of the melodic pattern, e.g. 3 or 4 note pattern which moves in leaps.
- 13 Three. Reasonably well answered.
- 14 Africa. Most candidates answered correctly.

#### **Music B2**

- 15 E minor. Reasonably well answered, although G major was a common mistake.
- 16 Descending sequence. Reasonably well answered.
- 17 A second instrument doubles in thirds / plays in parallel thirds OR the melody is doubled in thirds. There is a different guitar counter-melody in bar 2. This question was poorly answered; very few candidates observed that the melody was doubled, and many simply said that the accompaniment was different without attempting to explain how.
- 18 (a) Latin America / South America / Central America / specific countries were accepted. Very well answered.
- (b) Guitars / charangos / banjos, pan-pipes / zampona, syncopation. Well answered.

#### **Music B3**

- 19 (a) This question was poorly answered with very few answers making a specific musical point.
- The examiners were willing to accept a variety of answers eg the music starts with short rhythmic units which become longer and more complex (descriptions of shorter/faster note lengths were credited, for instance in terms of quavers to semi-quavers); or all of the instruments play a similar rhythm.
- (b) Some candidates recognized the heterophonic texture, but very few commented on the octaves.
- 20 Gamelan. Reasonably well answered.
- 21 Bali / Java / Indonesia / Far East. Well answered.

### **SECTION C**

#### **Music C1**

- 22 Minor Sixth. Most candidates identified that the interval was a sixth, but large numbers stated it was a major sixth and therefore received only partial credit.

- 23** (a) G major, Perfect. Reasonably well answered.  
(b) Dominant. Reasonably well answered.
- 24** Trill. Reasonably well answered.
- 25** A – G – G – E – F – D. Candidates found the melodic dictation difficult this year; there were few fully correct answers.
- 26** Many candidates observed the canon; not all provided enough accurate detail to gain three marks, but many candidates gained one or two marks.
- 27** Most candidates gained at least one mark in this question, usually the 3/4 time signature. Examiners were willing to accept a variety of observations: eg 3/4 time signature; moderate tempo/fairly fast; ternary structure/ABA with the final section written as a Da Capo; fewer instruments in the trio/contrasting trio section.
- 28** (a) Classical. Well answered.  
(b) Regular phrase lengths / periodic phrasing / balanced phrase lengths. Mainly diatonic / consonant harmony. Reasonably small orchestra. Trumpets and timpani playing tonic and dominant notes. Homophonic texture. Timpani are the only percussion instruments.
- Many candidates gained at least one mark here, but some candidates listed features that were typical of the period in general even if they were not heard in this extract and therefore could not get credit for these.
- 29** Mozart. Reasonably well recognised.

# MUSIC

---

**Paper 0410/02**  
**Prepared Listening**

## General comments

As last year, the questions on world music in **Section D** were answered very well by many candidates. The answers in **Section E** were more variable, although it is pleasing that most candidates did attempt to answer most questions.

## Comments on specific questions

### **SECTION D**

#### **Music D1**

- 30** (a) Erh-hu. Well answered.  
 (b) It is a bowed string instrument. Well answered.  
 (c) Pitch bending / sliding / glissando / portamento / vibrato. Well answered.
- 31** Monophonic. Well answered.
- 32** Pentatonic. Well answered.
- 33** (a) The same melody is used. Reasonably well answered.  
 (b) It is accompanied by a pipa (ch'in was accepted), playing higher tremolos and lower single notes in a broken chord / arpeggio pattern in homophonic texture. It is more metrical / the rhythm is stricter. Many candidates gained at least one mark.

#### **Music D2**

- 34** The structure is A B A B A B A A. When the A section is repeated for the first time it is decorated with extra notes / passing notes. This also happens when the B section is repeated (variation was accepted). There is a change of timbre / more instruments / different instruments for each B section (credit was given for a description of the new instruments). The final A section is an octave higher at the end. A wide variety of responses – some candidates were able to describe the structure accurately, but many failed to attempt this and talked only in very general terms about any changes.
- 35** Any three were accepted from: Dizi (or hsiao / ti-tzu), Erh-hu, Sheng, Pipa (or ch'in). Well answered.
- 36** Use of pentatonic scale, heterophonic texture, decorated / varied melody with trills / ornaments, repeated phrases. Most candidates gained some credit here.

#### **Music D3**

- 37** Tambura (sitar or sarod was accepted). Well answered.
- 38** (a) Sarangi. Reasonably well answered.  
 (b) It is a bowed string instrument. Well answered.

- 39 (a) The first instrument plays the melody and is copied by the second instrument. They frequently come together on long notes (credit was given for heterophonic texture / canon / imitation). They play with slides / glissando / pitch-bending. Reasonably well answered.
- (b) Raga. Well answered.
- 40 Alap. Well answered.
- 41 It is slow / free. There is no tabla. It is improvisatory in character. The instruments are exploring the notes of the raga. Well answered.

#### Music D4

- 42 (a) Flute / bansuri. Well answered.
- (b) Pitch bending / sliding / glissando / portamento / vibrato. Well answered.
- 43 There is a melody and drone. Reasonably well answered.
- 44 Tabla. Well answered.
- 45 Jhala. Well answered.
- 46 There is a slow and free section at the beginning, known as the alap in which the flute explores the notes of the raga. There is then a much faster jhala section later in the piece. The texture of melody, drone and tabla. The improvisatory character. Melody based on notes of a raga. Most candidates gained some credit.

#### SECTION E

##### Music E1

- 47 There is a melody (or ostinato) in the first violins, sustained chords in the woodwind, a pedal point in the basses and broken chords in the second violins and violas. Few candidates were able to describe the texture in enough detail to gain both marks.
- 48 It is the same rhythm as the second bar of the first subject (or fragment y). A variety of responses.
- 49 (a) B flat major. A variety of responses.
- (b) Sub-dominant. Poorly answered.
- (c) G major. Poorly answered, with C major being commonly stated.
- 50 Development. Reasonably well answered.
- 51 The main theme / motif / first subject is repeated in A major. Many candidates observed that the main theme is repeated, but hardly any knew that the new key was A major.

##### Music E2

- 52 Muted. Reasonably well answered.
- 53 Appoggiatura. A variety of responses.
- 54 B flat – F. Reasonably well answered.
- 55 Bar 13. Very few correct answers.
- 56 Continuous flowing quavers / semiquavers in compound time. Lyrical melody. Quiet dynamic level. Almost entirely diatonic. Major key. Bird calls at the end of the movement. Reasonably well answered.

- 57 (a) Flute. Reasonably well answered.
- (b) There are semiquavers in the lower strings. There are rising arpeggios from some instruments and repeated quavers from oboes. Very few candidates made any correct specific observations here.

**Music E3**

- 58 It was played by viola, was unaccompanied and slower / rubato and/or quieter. Reasonably well answered.
- 59 C – G. Reasonably well answered.
- 60 Without mute. Well answered.
- 61 Dorian. Well answered.
- 62 Cimbalom. Well answered.
- 63 (a) A principal theme alternates with a cadenza four times. Variation form. Reasonably well answered.
- (b) It is the second variation of the principal theme (or the third time the theme is heard). Reasonably well answered.

**Music E4**

- 64 D major, Imperfect. A variety of answers.
- 65 It is fuller. The melody is played in octaves by more instruments (credit was given for a maximum of one specific example: clarinet / bassoon / viola / cello). The dotted string accompaniment is higher. The flute counter-melody is an octave higher and doubled by oboes. Most candidates observed that the orchestration was fuller, but very few could give any further detail.
- 66 Mordent. A variety of responses.
- 67 Use of the cimbalom. Using dance / folk rhythms from a dance called “verbunkos”. Scotch snaps / lombardic rhythm. Using chromatic notes (e.g. bar 19). Ornamentation. Most candidates gained at least one mark.

# MUSIC

---

<p>Paper 0410/03 Performing</p>
-------------------------------------

## General comments

The Moderators enjoyed hearing performances of a wide range of music played on a variety of instruments, sometimes to a very high standard. Many Centres continue to provide excellent ensemble opportunities for their candidates, but there still remain some Centres where candidates are given ensemble pieces which do not allow them to demonstrate the full range of their skills. The issue of over-marking remains in some Centres, and was on occasion quite a serious problem. **It is essential that those Centres whose marks are reduced considerably by the Moderators every year address this issue in their future marking.**

## **Solos**

As in previous years, most solo performances were well matched to the candidates' abilities, allowing them to demonstrate a range of musical and technical skills. Candidates were usually well prepared, and there were few problems with hesitancy and serious inaccuracy. Again, some pieces for drum-kit demonstrated only a very narrow range of skills, but were marked much too leniently by some Centres. Simple, repetitive patterns, played at a constant dynamic level, do not constitute the demonstration of very good technical control, or a wide range of well-developed skills. If candidates choose music which does not allow them to demonstrate their ability to play with sensitivity to phrasing and expression, then they cannot be given marks at the top end of this category. On a number of occasions, sheet music was supplied which bore absolutely no resemblance to the recorded performance, yet no explanation was provided as to why this was the case, or how the sheet music had been used as a starting point by candidates.

## **Ensembles**

Many Centres continue to provide excellent ensemble opportunities for their candidates, either through playing or singing ensemble music in its original form or by creating arrangements which are well matched to each candidate's abilities. However, it is again necessary to repeat the advice given in this report last year: there are still many instances where candidates who have demonstrated impressive instrumental or vocal skills in the solo section performed ensemble music which was either so undemanding, or in some cases not an ensemble at all, that they failed to demonstrate their true ability.

The advice about suitability of ensemble repertoire is also given as a reminder: "An ensemble performance should normally consist of three or more live performers; the candidate's part should not be consistently doubled, and the candidate should demonstrate true ensemble skills with the other players. A general rule of thumb is if the candidate's part could be described as a solo, then it is unlikely to qualify as an ensemble. For instance, some candidates played or sang pieces accompanied by two instruments (for instance piano and drums, or piano and bass), but they were still clearly performing as a soloist; in pieces like this, the accompanying instruments respond to the needs of the soloist, whereas in a true ensemble all the performers will be interacting with each other. Exceptions to the need for at least three instruments include acting as an accompanist (e.g. on the piano, accompanying another instrumentalist or singer) and piano duets. **If there is any doubt about the suitability of a piece, then please contact CIE who will be more than happy to provide guidance.**"

As in previous years, it is still necessary to bear in mind that where an ensemble consists of more than one instrument or voice of the same type, it is impossible for the Moderator to know which performer is the candidate if no further information, specifically sheet music *with the candidate's part clearly indicated*, is provided by the Centre.

## Assessment

As noted in the introductory comments, although many Centres marked the coursework realistically and accurately, much of the marking was very lenient, and in some cases the Moderators had to make substantial reductions to the number of marks awarded. It is particularly disappointing that some Centres whose marks are significantly reduced every year do not appear to take this into account when marking the coursework. These Centres **must** re-familiarise themselves with the distance training materials, as these provide the benchmark standard for this component. As a reminder, the advice about minimum performing time from last year's report is quoted here: "to be gaining the highest marks, candidates need to perform for at least four minutes, at approximately Grade 4 or 5 level. Some performances which lasted for barely two minutes were being given extremely high marks. The key point to note in assessing the performances is that candidates must *demonstrate* the skills described in each of the criteria – if they are performing for less than four minutes, it is not a *consistent* demonstration of the skills expected for the highest marks at IGCSE. For example, they may play the notes accurately for two minutes of music, but they have not demonstrated that they have the ability to do so for a further two minutes."

Again, some Centres included very useful comments supporting the marks awarded in the space provided on the working mark sheet. All Centres are encouraged to do this: it not only helps the Moderator, but also focuses the assessor on the skills that have been demonstrated, and should lead to more objective marking.

Although it is mentioned almost every year in this report, there are still some Centres which persist in using half marks; please only use **whole** numbers.

## Presentation of coursework

Most Centres submitted performances on CD, which is very welcome. However, it is vital that Centres check the final version of the tape or CD they submit, as some CDs did not work at all or could only be played on a computer, not a domestic CD player. Sometimes the CD was not divided into tracks – this made the process of moderation very difficult. Please could all Centres listen to the CD before it is submitted so that these problems can be avoided in the future. Cassette tapes are a perfectly valid format, but the Moderators encountered some tapes with very low recording quality this year, which made some of the moderating difficult.

There were again many Centres who submitted the coursework without any accompanying sheet music. **It is a requirement of the syllabus that copies of the sheet music should be sent, with the sole exception of music which has been improvised.** It is extremely difficult to moderate ensemble performances in particular when there is no sheet music to clearly show the candidate's part.

There were hardly any cases this year in which the performing and composing coursework had been incorrectly sent in the same package – thank you for this.



# MUSIC

---

<p><b>Paper 0410/04</b> <b>Composing</b></p>
--

## General comments

This was the first year in which submissions reflected the recent changes in the requirements for this component, in particular the reduction from three compositions to two. On the whole, the standard of work seemed to reflect the additional time available both to teachers and to candidates. There were fewer really outstanding compositions than in previous years, however.

## Assessment

Many Centres were broadly accurate in their internal marking, needing only relatively small adjustments to bring them into line with the required standard. Among the Centres where larger adjustments were needed, most had been too lenient. It was common to find that the assessment was accurate for some candidates (often in the middle of the mark range), but that stronger candidates had been marked too generously and weaker ones too harshly. In such cases it often seemed as though candidates had been marked by comparing them with each other, rather than by judging each one against the criteria. In some Centres the rank order of candidates was incorrect, although, encouragingly, this problem was less frequent than it has sometimes been in the past.

On the Coursework Assessment Summary Form the column on the extreme right is headed 'Internally Moderated Mark'. There was some confusion about the use of this column, which is only to be used in circumstances where there is more than one teaching group (which, in the case of Music, would be quite unusual). In such cases, internal moderation of the marks is necessary to ensure that all candidates have been assessed to the same standard. When there is a single teaching group, no internal moderation is needed and this column should therefore be left blank.

There were several instances of the misuse of internal moderation. Some Centres appeared to have used it as a device for adjusting the marks in a similar way to the holistic adjustments that were permitted until 2008. Adjustments of this kind are no longer allowed: for the majority of candidates the total mark should be identical to that shown on the individual Working Mark Sheets.

## Compositions and scores

Most of the compositions submitted this year were relatively unadventurous. In several Centres, all the candidates had submitted very similar pieces, having evidently been set certain tasks by their teacher. This may be an appropriate strategy, especially in the early stages of the course, but in principle candidates should be free to decide what they wish to compose: the teacher's main responsibility here is to facilitate, not to make fundamental decisions of this kind on the candidates' behalf. It is also important for teachers to ensure that candidates observe all the syllabus requirements: there were several instances of both pieces being for the same instrument(s) and in a very similar style.

All compositions must be notated – at least one using standard staff notation. It is not within the spirit of the syllabus for teachers to tell their candidates that they are free to sacrifice the marks for notation in order to save the time and effort required to produce a score. There were some cases where no candidates at the Centre had provided any scores, and marks of 0 had been awarded for notation. This is not an acceptable interpretation of the requirements.

There were few handwritten scores this year: almost all candidates submitted computer-generated scores. Most were accurate, with few errors, and there was much greater attention than usual to performance indications. Some candidates, however, seemed to have put in far more dynamic markings than were necessary (and which were not always reflected in the performances), as if they had put them there just to

satisfy the marking criteria and not for musical reasons. Candidates who submitted songs (whatever the style) often needed to pay closer attention to the conventions governing the placing of the text. There were many instances of a single syllable being split up with hyphens if it was sung to more than one note: this was a frequent error in several scores.

Another common error in several scores was the order of instruments on the page. A piece for solo instrument and piano should always have the solo instrument written above the piano, never below. Similarly, a song should show the voice part above the accompaniment. Some notation programmes will by default assume that the instruments should be shown in the order that would be correct in an orchestral score. Candidates need to take care not to follow this order if they are composing music for groupings where other conventions apply.

### **Performances**

There was a marked increase in the number of synthesised performances this year, and their quality was extremely variable. Live performances, even if they are not very accurate, are always preferable and the Moderators are grateful to the Centres that took the trouble to provide them. As part of the learning process it is essential that candidates discover what is practicable and what is not, and there is no substitute for the experience of hearing their music brought to life by real players and real instruments. There were many examples of the problems that can result when this aspect of the work is not given sufficient prominence. Some of the most common included:

- over-elaborate piano parts, with too many notes in chords;
- piano parts that included sections that were too fast to be humanly possible;
- parts for orchestral instruments that lay outside the range of the instrument;
- vocal parts with too wide a range;
- inappropriate combinations of instruments which would have caused unsolvable problems of balance in a live performance.

Several of these problems were also present in last year's submissions and attention was drawn to them in last year's report.

Recordings taken directly from the playback of a notation programme were often rather crude and usually did not do justice to the compositions.

### **Recordings**

Almost all Centres submitted their recordings on CD rather than cassette. If cassettes are used, the Moderators would be grateful if a separate cassette could be used for each candidate. This makes it much easier to find specific pieces and thus allows the moderation process to be more efficient.

CDs should be clearly and accurately labelled, a list of tracks should be included, and the CD should contain a spoken introduction to each candidate's compositions. In a number of Centres, one or more of these instructions had not been followed. It is also essential for each individual composition to be given a separate track on the CD. In a few cases, all the recordings had been transferred onto a single track, so that it was impossible to locate any specific candidate's work without listening to the Centre's entire submission.

Some Centres, this year as last, did not observe the current instructions about the format of CD recordings. CDs must be playable on standard domestic hi-fi equipment, so Centres are asked to ensure that they use **CD-R** format only, and do not submit recordings on CD-RW. Please do not submit recordings that can only be played on a computer, since the Moderators do not necessarily have access to the appropriate software for playing the tracks. Centres should check that their CDs play on standard domestic hi-fi equipment before submission to CIE.

Some Centres did not record every composition. These Centres are reminded that the syllabus states that *all* pieces must be submitted in the form of a score *and* a recording.

### **Administration**

In most Centres the administration of the submissions was good: this was a definite improvement on last year. In some cases, however, one or more important aspects of the administration were not carried out properly.

The most common problem was the absence of a form showing the marks that had been sent in to CIE (either form MS1 or a print-out if marks were submitted on line). The Moderators need to check that the marks have been transferred correctly from the Working Mark Sheets to the MS1, but they cannot do so if the copy of form MS1 is missing from the package.

In a few cases, work for Performing was included in the Composing submission. Sometimes the recordings for both components were on the same CD. Centres to which this applies are reminded that Performing and Composing are moderated by different people, and that all the work for these components must be kept separate at all stages.