



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Assessment Report

Scholarship, 2006

Music Studies

Music Studies, Scholarship, 2006

Commentary

Candidate scripts were better this year. The examination offered a considerable breadth of choice. Successful candidates were able to demonstrate an intelligent selection of questions, a depth of analysis and critical commentary as befits the level of this examination. Candidates who perceived the examination to be merely an addendum to Level 3 requirements tended to provide poorer quality responses to the questions. They did not apply critical evaluative processes in their selection of questions that would maximise the quality of response within their personal capabilities. It is important to prepare for this examination through the analysis of 'unseen' scores and through developing an appropriate understanding of what is meant by the commonly used terminologies, such as "mood", "tonal structure", "texture" and "historical and cultural significance".

The best performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and / or knowledge:

- well developed analytical skills
- fluent and consistent use of appropriate musical terminology
- perceptive and unique responses to questions that demonstrated in-depth knowledge and literate flair
- ability to judiciously appraise and select questions for responses
- convincing and in-depth understanding of previously studied work(s) used for comparative purposes
- coherent conclusions, drawn from both the examination script and previously studied material, that demonstrated an ability to explore the music's relevance to broader contexts beyond the printed score.

Candidates who did NOT achieve scholarship lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge above and in addition they:

- misunderstood musical terminologies and this was reflected not only in incorrect or inadequate descriptions, but in limited application of relevant terminologies
- utilised more general identifications and descriptions rather than in-depth explanations and analyses in responses
- failed to draw conclusions from what they had written
- made a poor selection of score extracts to support responses to questions
- demonstrated an inefficient use of time.