MUSIC

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-14	15-30	31-46	47-55	56-67	68-76	77-100

Standard level group performing

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-14	15-30	31-49	50-60	61-66	67-76	77-100

Standard level solo performing

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-14	15-30	31-47	48-57	58-69	70-79	80-100

Standard level creating

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-15	16-31	32-46	47-56	57-67	68-77	78-100

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

The work presented showed great diversity in programming and some diversity in performance media. Vocal and guitar submissions outnumbered most other media and there were some outstanding programs submitted for percussion and string bass solo performance, which is unusual. Overall, the work was suitable for candidates with a few exceptions. A surprising development this session was the submission of a selection of excerpts from a larger work instead of the piece. There is no justification for such choices as the integrity of the performance is undermined, prompting questions of suitability. Some recitals were highly accomplished displaying outstanding musicianship, performance skill and sophistication in breadth, range and understanding. There was a clear demonstration of very effective teaching for the component in specific schools while the standards, guidance and rigor were not so evident in the preparation in a few schools.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

The majority of the programs were chosen appropriately for the ability level of the candidates and a large number included appropriate variety. The accompaniment guidelines were followed in most cases, although there were instances where this did not happen, or did not happen in its entirety where the accompaniment was a pre-recorded track of low quality or barely audible causing issues of balance for the candidate. Such choices lowered the candidates' overall marks for this criterion.

Criterion B

Fluency in technique was variable, as is to be expected, with some excellent technical flow, and some more limited technical capability displayed. Technical proficiency of the performances was generally appropriately marked by the teachers with a few instances in which marks were severe and a few others in which the standard was lenient. Pitch and technical diction aspects would benefit from more attention in the training of vocalists. Few candidates achieved full marks for this criterion. Dynamics are not always sufficiently demonstrated. Phrasing, structure and overall shape showed consideration. Timbre was not always understood or varied to any degree. Where it was, the performances stood out and were much more musical.

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Criterion C

There were some wonderful articulations of stylistic interpretations of a broad variety of pieces. In several instances this understanding was demonstrated despite technical inconsistencies. In the more academic genres subtleties of articulation and the appropriate approach to rhythm, phrase character and overall colour was not always delivered. Stylistic integrity is learned through exposure and informed evaluation of performances. It was clear that some candidates would benefit from more of it.

Criterion D

Effective musical communication was shown in a large number of performances. Very few lacked vitality or failed to make musical sense. Despite technical flaws or clear stylistic integrity in some, many performances engaged the listener and showed a musical approach to the works presented.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Select repertoire that stimulates while it entails sufficient musical and technical challenges; yet that is attainable for the candidate to demonstrate solo performing abilities with conviction.

Stretch the candidate's performing range and exposure towards quality music other than familiar repertoire.

Hold candidates accountable to high standards of musical performance and support them in developing the necessary technical skills and commitment to work. Demands, support, attention and preparation can be much more meticulous in many instances to produce intonation, articulation and character delivery work so that the musical content gains presence and authority. Train candidates to search and develop awareness of pitch accuracy. Concentration, consistency and perseverance are key. Some schools are lenient in their standards and the level of work is consistently mediocre. When supported appropriately youngsters can learn to prepare, develop, discern and deliver musical performances of substance.

On the other hand, several schools offer outstanding preparation in solo music performance and are to be commended.

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

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The range of work was ample, going from 'emerging' to excellent. In general, the quality of recording continues to improve with the advances in technology. Many school ensembles showed commitment and enthusiasm. However, there were some problems with the submissions in terms of following the requirements of the IB music guide and they deserve to be discussed in this report. These mostly pertain to the area of the group participants. There were several schools that submitted recitals where the different pieces were performed by 'different' ensembles. For instance, one piece could have been performed by an 'a cappella choir' then another piece by the 'women's choral', a third piece by the 'SATB choir', and finally another piece by the 'SATB choir + symphony orchestra'. While it is true that the IB candidates assessed through this recording performed in all the pieces, the recital was not of the same ensemble as required by the IB music guide. Teachers must remember that in this component it is the ensemble and not the particular student that is assessed.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

In general, there was an appropriate selection of repertoire. However, there were a few occasions where the repertoire selected was beyond the capabilities of the performers. This consequently impacted the group's ability to achieve at the higher levels in the other criteria as ensembles were struggling at a basic level to engage with the music.

Criterion B

The technical ability varies greatly. Intonation is always an issue; however, this was much improved from previous years in most of the groups' presentations. The string sections/ensembles found intonation most challenging and in some cases this was because the repertoire that had been selected was too difficult for the performers.

Criterion C

Overall, the groups were able to demonstrate a good understanding of appropriate musical style. As mentioned earlier, where groups were only able to achieve at lower levels for this criterion this was often due to the performers finding the repertoire too difficult to play at a basic level.

Criterion D

Communication was appropriate in most of the submissions. Schools presenting multiple performances taken over the course of the year were in general the ablest to communicate musical intent and collaboration.

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

It is suggested that choirs be more adventurous and move away from the contemporary tonal style of Rutter and the like. There is an extended literature of choral works.

The use of school ensembles seems to be the best representations for group performance. Some candidates chose to work with duets or very small groups and only in those cases where every participant of the small group was very proficient the overall result was optimal.

Further comments

Teachers are reminded that the work must come from a single core ensemble. Instances such as a cappella choir that subsequently sings with symphony orchestra are not accepted.

A recommendation to teachers is to be more careful in filling in the 6/MGP form: timings, comments, correct order of pieces. Examiners sometimes need to spend unnecessary time in understanding the submissions.

The selection of 'demanding' repertoire beyond the capabilities of the ensemble rarely resulted in high grades. Teachers are invited to carefully select the ensemble's repertoire that best matches the group's capabilities.

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

Most of the work presented was suitable for inclusion in a music creating portfolio. There was a good variety of styles and instrumental contexts, with just the more modernist end of composing a little absent — perhaps not surprising for a pre-university diploma.

Compositions remain the most popular option, with music technology following, and then arrangements. Improvisations and stylistic techniques remain the least popular components.

Pieces that made extensive of use of chance elements (dice rolling - random numbers) were at risk of not scoring well. The exploration of chance elements may be a useful classroom exercise: exploring different ways to get over a writer's block, using random factors to create a new motive, but giving an entire piece over to chance, eliminating any choice by the composer, usually leads to mediocre if not weak creations. It should be remembered by teachers that this

sort of work will still be subject to the same assessment criteria and examiners can in no way make allowances for the candidate not being responsible.

Arrangements, although quite popular were not generally among the higher scorers. Apart from the fact that only a small minority presented some form of the original that had been worked from, obliging the examiner to search for the material on line, or work from memory, there seems to be a tendency to choose to arrange pieces that are available in midi file or free sheet music on line and just to modify this, rather than create an original arrangement. Subsequently most of the musical elements, in these cases, were almost identical to the originals and very little creative arrangement had been undertaken.

In general there has been a noticeable increase in candidates taking music from on- line sources (midi files and other forms) and incorporating this into their work rather than creating everything themselves. Usually this is easily identifiable. For example, drum tracks that have been taken direct from commercial midi-files usually have differently weighted drum strokes which would be very complicated to achieve using Finale or Musescore. In short there seems to be entering a mentality of getting things from the web rather than creating. This may, to a certain extent, be in line with some contemporary working practices, but cannot be acceptable for a Diploma Programme examination. Teachers should be aware of this.

Arrangements that attempted to "mash" together two pieces were not often successful. This is at the limit of suitability since it is not an arrangement of "a piece" as required by the guide. In these cases, creative arrangement was often limited to alternating phrases from the different pieces. Once again, this may be a useful classroom activity but it does not necessarily produce good, suitable work for a portfolio.

Improvisations tended to be jazz or rock solos in group contexts, or soloing to a backing track. The playing in both cases was generally competent but in the case of group performances the solo interventions were sometimes brief (a short solo in the context of a song) and in the case of playing along to backing tracks the playing was often routine, following the chord changes, with a lack of any real risk taking.

Music technology creations were mostly suitable and often of good quality. These were mainly electronically created pieces. There was little use of field recordings, and manipulation of sound was mostly limited to enhancing sonority rather than seeking out new sounds. Electronic pieces were usually well structured, sometimes making too much use of repetition rather than developing material. Examiners are aware of the repetitive nature of the genres but are still looking to award marks for creative development of material.

Pop songs presented as music technology creations generally scored quite well, but the creative use of the technology was not always evident. Where the technology was part of the piece, (and consequently a conventional score would have been inappropriate) the pieces tended to score better.

Not many candidates chose the stylistic techniques option. The most popular options seem to have been the four-part chorale and the 12 tone exercises. Candidates presenting four-part chorales (and other stylistic techniques options) often did not show the necessary level of

preparation and some were almost completely unprepared – having said in their reflections that they had "listened to come Bach chorales" before attempting the exercise.

The 12 tone exercise appears to have been popular because it is perceived as being a mechanical exercise despite the requirement for notation of expression. There appeared to be little aesthetic concept behind the submissions with candidates apparently convinced that it was sufficient to present a series of notes that followed the scheme. Having said that there were a few good, interesting creations presented in this option.

Some candidates presented all three reflections on one file. While this is acceptable, it is easier for the examiner if the reflections are separate.

A few candidates presented only one refection for all the work. Marks were inevitably lost here.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

Generally, candidates scored average to well in this criterion (3-4) The difference between a good mark and full marks was often a difference in the amount of care and attention taken. Most candidates seemed to have some grasp of triadic harmony, higher scorers were able to create functional musical textures, write bass lines that gave direction to harmony, and to develop rather than just repeat material.

There was some good creative use of dynamics, although some candidates chose to exaggerate in this respect making too many sharp contrasts. Not all candidates made use of key change and many pieces remained static in tonality, those who did use key change or modulation were usually among the higher scorers.

Criterion B

Usually in line with marks in A. Song forms as usual were competently handled. Pieces opting for "classical" forms such as sonata did not always take into account the tonal scheme, limiting themselves to the exposition and development of themes in one key.

Good marks were attained by candidates who had made some effort to think through the structure and identity of the piece. Some marks were lost in criterion B due to work being discontinuous.

Criterion C

Instruments were mostly employed correctly and there were some cases of strong, idiomatic writing. Inappropriate (unplayable) writing was less evident in this session. Writing of parts for drum kits was often weak, limiting itself to a repeated pattern for most of the piece. (In several cases it was evident that the drum pattern had been imported from another programme). Personalization of drum parts — adding fills at the end of phrases or changing patterns from one section to another was rare.

Most good cases of idiomatic writing came when the student was writing for his own instrument. Consequently, some instrumental writing lacked variety and character when the student was a relative beginner on his instrument for example, (flute parts that stay in a lower register and risk being covered by a piano part).

In improvisations, the higher scorers made full use of the range and characteristics of their instruments, less effective improvisations stayed in "comfort zone" and produced little that was idiomatic.

Music technology creations often made good use of programmes although, as stated above this was more in the enhancement rather than in the manipulation or creation of sounds.

Criterion D

The general level of notation presented has been steadily rising, with the introduction and now almost universal use of computer publishing programmes such as Finale, Sibelius and Musescore. Scores were therefore in the acceptable to excellent range. The difference between a medium scorer and a high scorer was often the amount of care taken – some pieces inexplicably lacked initial dynamics whilst having dynamic indications all the way through. Phrase markings were often absent, and although this may be considered fine detail, it was often fundamental to the character of the pieces. Pieces obtaining less than average marks usually had some fundamental problems with notation – such as incorrect bar lines or time signatures. Forgetting to write transposing instruments' parts in the appropriate key remains a common notation defect.

Criterion E

This criterion whist often being a simple confirmation of A and B gave the chance for examiners to award communication and commitment. Higher scores here were portfolios that presented a good variety of work, music that showed a strong desire to communicate and where it was evident that the candidate had given time and energy to the project. Lower scorers were those that seemed routine or even uninterested.

Criterion F

Reflections remain a missed opportunity for many candidates. Candidates who presented organised reflections, even with the headings: Intention - Process - Outcome, inevitably scored the higher marks or at least avoided low marks.

Marks could have been gained for greater clarity: intentions going a little beyond "I decided to write piece for.." processes that mentioned choices made along the way, and outcomes that went further than presenting personal satisfaction and said what had been learned and what the candidate might do differently the next time,.

There remains a tendency to confuse process with description. Some process reflections merely talked though piece rather than reflecting on how it had been composed.

There were also a good number of short reflections which lost marks simply because they said so little.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Explain to candidates that the work presented has to be all their own and unoriginal material found on-line will be identified. Sampling and quoting may be part of contemporary music culture but this is a music creating portfolio which has to show the work of the candidate.

Some useful types of classwork do not necessarily produce pieces that are appropriate for a music creating portfolio. At risk in particular are: "mash" arrangements, and aleatory pieces.

Candidates should be able to take pride in all the pieces they are presenting.

Candidates presenting arrangements should be taught that they are going to create a new musical context for the material. They should always present the original that has been worked from and try to go further than just transcribing this material to a new instrumentation.

Audio files should be listened to carefully before uploading – some were distorted or incomplete.

Scores should be read through and if possible performed from to make sure they are correct and appropriate.

Candidates presenting stylistic techniques should have a firm grasp of the style as well as the "rules". This can only be achieved by completing exercises and analysing examples.

The teachers' notes which accompany the marks are important for the examiner, particularly when there are doubts concerning authenticity or missing materials.

Candidates should be reminded of the benefits of presenting variety in the portfolio. Portfolios with breadth and variety tend to score better than those with two or three similar pieces.

If an improvisation is in the context of a group performance, it should be clear in the reflective statement which instrument the candidate is improvising on.

Paper one (Listening paper) (HL)

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-10	11-20	21-32	33-38	39-45	46-51	52-100

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

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-9	10-18	19-28	29-34	35-39	40-45	46-80

General comments

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

In Section A, candidates often had difficulties understanding which features they needed to isolate in order to answer the question. In many cases this resulted on their falling back on learned material which was not always relevant to the topic. A lack of appropriate terminology was also apparent in some cases, particularly regarding Q1. Q3 (on rhythm) seemed to prove particularly challenging, with many candidates struggling to find musical links, and often veering off the topic into related areas such as metre or tempo to find examples. In Section B, a few candidates lost marks because they had not given adequate attention to some of the marking criteria (especially structure and context). Overall, some candidates clearly had time management problems which resulted in a lack of balance between the length and depth of their answers.

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

Generally speaking, candidates seemed to have studied the prescribed works in some detail and were well prepared for Section A, particularly for the fugal analysis of Q1. Responses to Section B suggested that candidates also had a good knowledge of genres and forms, with many clearly comfortable with the jazz elements of Q6, and an astonishing number of them familiar with Mongolian throat singing.

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

Section A

Question 1

Many candidates had a good grasp of fugal principles and often gave quite detailed analyses of the movement, though there was a tendency to concentrate solely on the exposition section. Others clearly had a rather shallower understanding of the genre, particularly in terms of key relationships or the correct use of terminology. Concerto grosso principles generally seemed to be less fully discussed than fugal features, and few candidates ventured to speculate on the relation between the two.

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Question 2

Stronger candidates here produced a structured discussion of different types of relationship between clarinet and orchestra that often demonstrated a detailed familiarity with the score. Other candidates were more obviously challenged by the question, and tended to give a narrative account of clarinet entries, and/or construct a simple 'clarinet/orchestra' opposition which ignored the fact that the former is also a member of the latter. There was also a noticeable tendency towards including irrelevant material on verbunkos music (often on the pretext that either 'the clarinet' or 'the orchestra' was playing it). Many candidates were also unaware that the instrument transposes, giving rise to errors in analysis.

Question 3 (Higher Level only)

For many candidates this was clearly a problematic question. Some were obviously prepared for it and could provide some good examples of links between the two works (for example, in terms of syncopation). Others seemed to be struggling to find points of contact, and often digressed into neighbouring areas (tempo and metre, for example) or irrelevant features such as instrumentation and melody. In some cases, too, there was a tendency simply to list the types of durational values used rather than the rhythmic patterns created by them.

Section B

Question 4 Higher Level/Question 3 Standard Level

The presence of a score seemed to help many candidates here, and most were able to identify quite a range of features in the piece, with an encouraging level of harmonic analysis in many instances. Some however clearly confused tonality with key signature, failing for example to identify the A major opening or F# minor ending of Movement II, and structural analyses often showed a revealing tendency to equate the beginnings of pages with beginnings of sections. Many also were unable to identify the work as Baroque, despite such obvious features as the presence of a harpsichord, and surprisingly few commented on the discrepancies between score and recording.

Question 5 Higher Level/Question 4 Standard Level

As always, this was the less popular choice of the two WAM options. Of those that attempted it, some did surprisingly well (for example, identifying the motivic features and/or producing a credible narrative account of the structure). Others had problems coming to grips with the constantly changing texture, or concentrated mainly on instrumentation at the expense of other features, and there was a tendency in some responses to drift into 'programmatic' interpretations. Situating the piece in context also proved problematic for some, with a remarkable number of candidates mistaking it for a 20th-century work.

Question 6 Higher Level/Question 5 Standard Level

Candidates generally did well on this question, producing more balanced answers that addressed each of the four criteria. Many grasped the basic overall structure and identified the jazz/electronic elements, though surprisingly few recognised the bowed bass solo with

electronic treatment, often describing it as a guitar, violin or even a wind instrument. However subtler details, such as the use of modality/bitonality or the metrical changes in the middle section, were less frequently discussed.

Question 7 Higher Level/Question 6 Standard Level

A surprising number of candidates were able to identify the Mongolian throat singing here, and in some cases the level of contextual knowledge was quite astonishing. The strophic form was also easy to perceive, and many candidates produced satisfactory basic timelines. Some candidates however struggled with more specific musical elements, often applying inappropriately 'Western' concepts such as functional harmony. Strangely, too, remarkably few candidates realised that the 'whistling' sound at roughly 01:19 was vocally produced rather than instrumental.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In Section A, candidates should be reminded to read the question carefully and to ensure that their answer addresses it. The point needs to be reiterated that no credit is awarded for irrelevant material, or for distorting the wording of the question in order to include it ('The role of the orchestra is to play the verbunkos themes that Kodály found in a book of piano transcriptions published in…').

For Section B, some candidates are still presenting their responses in essay form, which is usually wasteful and should be discouraged. Candidates should also be advised to give sufficient attention to each of the four marking criteria – sadly, marks are still being lost unnecessarily because candidates have given inadequate consideration to one or more of these. Structural analysis seems to be particularly problematic here, and it may help to suggest starting at the highest level (identifying the main landmarks, with accurate locations) and then working downwards to smaller details, rather than just starting at the beginning and hoping for the best. Segmentations of pieces should also be 'musical' (for example, correspond to phrase lengths, rather than just consist of arbitrary selections of bars). And while terms such as strophic, binary, ternary etc. may be appropriate in some cases, candidates should also remember that the tracks are mostly excerpts rather than complete works.

With regard to particular questions, responses to Q1 suggested that, in general, candidates need to be equipped with adequate terminology to discuss such features as (in this case) fugue and concerto grosso accurately and articulately. It also emerged from Q2 that many candidates would benefit from help with transposing instruments, while in Q4 inaccurate readings of the viola part suggest that something similar applies to alto and tenor clefs. On a positive note, however, the level of contextual knowledge for Q7 implies that, as far as exposing candidates to world music is concerned, many teachers are already doing an excellent job.

Further comments

Some examiners have commented on specific points of terminology to which candidates' attention in general should be drawn. The term basso continuo, for example, should only be

applied in Baroque music, 'word painting' can only be used for works with vocal texts, and 'hemiola' only applies to triple metre.

Note also that the marking scheme for Q1 alerts examiners to the possibility of alternative interpretations of the overall fugal form, and we have not penalised any candidates whose analysis differs in detail from the one given here, provided that it is still plausible.

Finally, it is worth reiterating the point (made in previous years) that candidates, though obviously under stress, should strive to make sure that their handwriting is legible. In general, in fact, they should consider how examiners will receive their work, and try to avoid making unnecessary difficulties for them (for example, using timings instead of bar numbers for Q4).

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 is an indication that candidates are exploring a variety of musical cultures and it is pleasing also to see that many world music cultures are being explored. As is normal we were presented with a wide range of work but the majority was a standard of average to low. Format of the task was varied but a great many candidates presented with magazine articles. The majority of websites and radio interviews failed to provide the depth needed due to missing musical examples and candidates engaged more with format than content. It is vital that candidates view the content as the priority and then look to their format and how they can present this task creatively.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

With a few exceptions the cultures chosen were appropriate and it is pleasing to see that this concept of "culture" is showing more understanding. The stating of links had less success and candidates often referred to general links without explanation, or the links themselves were rather superficial and did not allow for depth in the investigation. For example, some candidates focused their links on the instrumentation in itself which is not a strong link and/or the cultural and historical aspects, which again is not a musical link as prescribed by the task. Links such as just comparing that both pieces were in a major key came up often but once again did not allow for depth of analysis.

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Criterion B

This was the one aspect of the task that clearly gave many candidates difficulty. It was disappointing to see many examples of merely narration rather than an in depth analysis of the musical elements.   Many candidates described pieces generally, without any concrete evidence, and made the links only evident at the end of this description.   Musical examples were poorly presented with many written examples missing clefs/key signatures/time signatures and often examples did not validate the argument presented.   It was disappointing also to see so many candidates refer to audio examples or use CD reference numbers and no tracks were uploaded.   Overall, the analysis presented was very weak and superficial. Of course there were some examples of excellent analysis and work but this was very limited.

Criterion C

Overall, the technical language used was adequate.   At times candidates used terms but did not make their understanding clear with the use of them.   There were many candidates who used technical terms in a confused manner or did not take the opportunity to use them when they could.

Criterion D

Referencing appears to have improved but there were still some scripts that were submitted without a bibliography, which is disappointing.   Many candidates failed to list their primary sources – scores/transcriptions and audio. Referencing within scripts was done poorly. Overall paraphrasing was not referenced, images and musical examples which is potentially an issue for academic honesty.

Criterion E

There were some scripts that really showed a creativity and depth in thinking but overall the work presented lacked to fulfil this criterion very well. Many scripts showed a lack of commitment with very low word counts, only one culture chosen or overall poor organization of their thoughts and ideas.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Criterion A

It is vital that candidates are guided to choosing correct cultures from the beginning of the process and the idea of a "musical culture" should be in their thoughts long before the introduction of this task.   The links chosen need to be ones that allow for depth in the analysis. For example, just choosing homophonic texture is not going to allow for depth in the analysis unless this can then move into chordal use, structure etc. Many candidates chose jazz and improvisation as a link.   While this is a great idea they must then be able to transcribe and discuss the improvisation in a detailed manner.   The cultures and links need to be made clear at the very beginning of the script.   Many candidates chose arrangements of pieces and they need to ensure that if they are after 'traditional' music it is this and not a modern variation of this.

Criterion B

Candidates should not spend the majority of their word limit on contextual information, they need to get into the analysis very quickly. Candidates must be able to discuss why they have chosen the links they have clearly. To do this they need to present their points and validate them with musical evidence. Written musical examples are a very good way of doing this but they should be careful to always include clefs etc. and also state where they are from. Audio examples are fine but it is recommended that the candidates prepare the audio and only upload extracts and not whole tracks. Musical evidence is crucial and candidates should be studying ways of doing this prior to this task. Teachers should be encouraging their candidates to ensure that the points they are making are clearly supported with evidence.

Analysis should delve deeper than things like 'the same tonality'. While two pieces may be in the same key this is not significant analysis. Candidates could then go on to look at intervals used, cadences, harmonic rhythm etc. Analysis needs to be substantial.

Criterion C

They should use technical language at all times possible and ensure that they have shown an understanding of that term within their explanation.

Criterion D

Candidates should be encouraged to research widely and not go for the quickest and easiest sites. While Wikipedia may be a good starting point it should not be relied upon. Teachers should help candidates ensure they have listed all their primary sources and also referenced within the script. Musical examples, pictures and paraphrasing must be referenced within the script.

Criterion E

A well-considered and carefully planned script is what is needed for candidates to have the opportunity to do well in this task. Candidates should be given tasks prior to this that encourage them to think independently but also require they consider and discuss analysis of pieces. Teachers should also ensure that candidates are given adequate time to plan and research this task prior to submission date. This can be a challenging task but candidates who are guided carefully and given the encouragement to explore many different options are the ones that find a creativity of thought and intellectual depth.

Further comments

Now that this component is e-marked teachers need to think carefully how candidates present their work. Websites are wonderful but ensure that the transfer of this information and layout is conducive to the effort and quality of the work. Hyperlinks that are put into websites or any other media format will not work in the assessing software. Scanning of documents should be done at a high dpi to ensure that the candidates work is presented in the best possible manner. Scripts should be able to be read in portrait only. Landscape is hard to read on a screen and examiners will usually have to print this work to be able to mark it. It is vital that teachers and

candidates ensure all elements of the submission are uploaded, labelled correctly and put in the correct order. It is recommended that candidates use the opportunity of the word limit (2000) to ensure they have explained and explored their pieces to the best of their ability. Uploading of entire scores is not needed, if examples are used within the scripts and this is referenced then no score need be uploaded.

This task is an exciting independent project but candidates need to be prepared and ready to work on it. Preparation tasks in the prior year can help enormously and teachers also need to ensure that candidates have been exposed to a depth and variety of music to enable them to make an informed choice of cultures and links.

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional