

GCSE Examiners' Report

Music

GCSE

Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd. 2025



Introduction

Our Principal examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each unit.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.¹

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	WJEC offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the WJEC subject page
Grade boundary information	<p>Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade.</p> <p>For unitted specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and unit level.</p> <p>For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each unit that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.</p>	For unitted specifications click here: Results, Grade Boundaries and PRS (wjec.co.uk)

¹ Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Exam Results Analysis	WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	Portal by WJEC
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.wjec.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	Portal by WJEC or on the WJEC subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Become an Examiner WJEC

Contents	Page
Executive summary	5
Unit 1: Performing	6
Unit 2: Composing	10
Unit 3: Appraising	21
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	31

Executive Summary

The WJEC GCSE Music Principal Examiners' Report for Summer 2025 offers comprehensive feedback across all assessment units—Performing, Composing, and Appraising—with key insights into strengths and areas requiring improvement.

In Unit 1 (Performing), candidates showcased a diverse array of instruments and styles, reflecting strong engagement and individuality. The uploading of work via Iamis generally aided submission processes, and most centres managed administration effectively, with well-labelled files and prompt responses to queries. However, issues persisted around annotated scores, inflated marks for simple pieces, and unsuitable ensemble choices that compromised mark band access. Technical challenges such as poor recording acoustics and unedited submissions also undermined moderation. Scores often lacked necessary annotations, and candidates occasionally performed the same piece for both solo and ensemble, which is discouraged. Programme Notes showed commendable engagement but tended to focus more on biography than musical evaluation.

Unit 2 (Composing) evidenced imaginative efforts, particularly among candidates using notation software, with strong pieces demonstrating modulation, polyphonic writing, and stylistic coherence. Yet many mid-range compositions were over-credited, relying on repetition and simplistic harmonic content. Excessive use of loops and automatic music generation in DAWs like Bandlab skewed marking, as such tools don't show candidates' musical understanding. Evaluations were generally fair but often lacked sufficient depth and specific terminology. Free composition briefs varied widely, and some failed to connect to final outputs. Admin lapses included missing logs, incorrect file formats, and inconsistent labelling—problems which hindered moderation and sometimes obscured authenticity. Scores and leadsheets ranged from professional to unhelpful screenshots, and candidate logs frequently omitted essential details about musical authorship and external input.

Unit 3 (Appraising) saw varied performance, with many candidates struggling to accurately identify musical elements or use terminology correctly. Prepared extracts failed to yield higher scores than unprepared ones, despite prior study. SPaG questions showed limited planning, with students writing about unrelated elements and omitting required ones. Questions requiring specific musical vocabulary, notation accuracy, and contextual awareness highlighted gaps in teaching around harmony, tonality, and rhythm. Nonetheless, engagement with set works and some listening extracts was encouraging, with top responses showing clear understanding and effective terminology usage.

Across all units, common themes emerged around administrative accuracy, over-generous marking, limited musical literacy, and inconsistent evidence of technical control. Continued staff development, careful adherence to criteria, and emphasis on originality and musical elements will support stronger future outcomes.

MUSIC

GCSE

Summer 2025

UNIT 1: PERFORMING

Overview of the Unit

This year saw the introduction of uploading candidates' work to lamis, which we hope facilitated the process of submission for all centres.

All moderators reported that performing folios contained a great variety of instruments and styles reflecting individual candidates' interests, and it was pleasing to note the mix of new with traditional music.

The main problems reported by moderators this year were:

- Administration errors
- Lack of annotation on scores
- Unsuitable ensemble choices
- Inflated marks for very simple pre-grade 1 pieces
- Candidates' understanding of the evaluation of technical demands required for the Programme Note.

The moderation team thanks all centres for their submissions and prompt responses to moderator queries.

Comments on individual questions/sections

ADMINISTRATION

Overall, administration was handled well by most centres. Files were clearly labelled, which made navigating the moderation process straightforward. Most marksheets were thoroughly completed and accurate, with timings, difficulty levels, and candidate roles clearly indicated. Nearly all centres uploaded the required materials, and in most cases where there was missing work, incorrect folios uploaded or additional samples required, centres responded promptly. Moderators were grateful for the centres' co-operation in this.

All the information regarding the uploading of material may be found on the website. Centres should consult the following document on the WJEC website:

Preparing and Uploading NEA – Performing. [This document is updated annually.]

It should be noted that **all candidates** must be listed on the Timing Penalty Sheet, not just the candidates who are under time (timings must be accurate from the candidate's entry, not the duration of the recording):

- Scores should be uploaded as one PDF file, not individual pages.
- Zip files should not be uploaded.
- Please upload recordings as MP3 files if possible.

A welcome addition to the mark sheet was the box with "Details of other live parts," and most centres completed this correctly. It should be noted that a "backing track" does not constitute a "live part".

LEVELS OF DIFFICULTY

Levels of difficulty were generally well-indicated and agreed. The criteria for assessing levels of difficulty may be found in Appendix A of the specification. Many centres are sending scores to the music team to assess their level of difficulty, and it was useful for moderators when centres stated this on the mark sheets.

This year, there were some submissions, especially piano duets, which were taken from duet books claiming a graded standard. These are not necessarily equivalent to accredited exam board pieces, and centres must continue to assess such pieces against the criteria in Appendix A.

Please also see the following document, which is available on the website.

Selecting repertoire for WJEC GCSE Music Performance

RECORDINGS

Recordings were generally of excellent quality, appropriately formatted as MP3s, but some had issues with balance and clarity. The candidate's performance must be distinguishable from other performers in the recording, and care must be taken as to where the recordings take place; some performances were recorded in acoustically poor spaces (for example, large halls with excessive reverb). Occasionally, the recording device was placed too close, causing distortion.

It must also be noted that recordings **must not** be edited before submission; moderators reported that several centres cut recordings, resulting in abrupt endings.

SCORES

Many centres submitted scores that were clear, accurate to the performance intentions, and annotated where deviations occurred. The most successful lead sheets and tab scores contained the melody (where applicable), rhythmic patterns and performance directions. Centres had often highlighted the part of the candidate on ensemble scores, which was helpful for the moderation process.

It is important to note that if a score or lead sheet is **not** submitted, marks in band 4 for Accuracy should not be awarded.

Moderators reported that many scores this year were not annotated to indicate the candidates' intended performances. Whilst this is time-consuming for centres, annotations are vital to support marks for Accuracy.

There were several centres that either submitted scanned sheet music which was in the incorrect page order, omitted pages or submitted photographs of scores which did not contain all the music. Please submit scores in PDF format as one file.

A final note regarding scores – a score or detailed lead sheet must be submitted. WJEC will not accept reference recordings or links.

TIMINGS

Most candidates met the minimum timing requirement, and where timing penalties were incurred, they were correctly and fairly applied across the sample.

Some candidates fell just short of the required timings, sometimes by as little as five seconds, and in several cases, the addition of a musical repeat would have enabled them to meet the 4-minute minimum requirement. Performances must be timed from the entry of the candidate and the timing should not include sections where the candidate is not performing.

REPERTOIRE

Most centres submitted an appropriate repertoire for both solo and ensemble performances, and moderators commented on the wide range of instruments and styles offered by candidates. Most candidates submitted 2 pieces (some with “musical” repeats inserted), with a few submitting 3 or 4 performances to make up the 4-minute minimum time.

It is not recommended that a candidate submit the same piece for solo and ensemble, albeit different parts; and performing the same part for both solo and ensemble is not acceptable.

Whilst it may help some centres to have all candidates performing the same ensemble, it was felt by moderators that some candidates were unfairly disadvantaged as their part was often either beyond their capabilities or so simple that the evidence to award high marks was not offered in their part.

Concerns around ensemble choices were a recurring theme. Several centres submitted pieces which were “solo with accompaniment”. Examples of such practice were piano solos with a drum part added, duets where the candidate performed the melody throughout, often in octaves, or a solo singer with a band accompaniment. Such performances did not offer the candidates the opportunity to display the evidence in the context of an ensemble, which would be necessary to award a mark in the upper bands across all three assessment columns.

There were a few centres that submitted two short pieces for the ensemble. Please note that the one-minute minimum requirement must be contained within one ensemble piece. If an ensemble is submitted that is less than one minute, it cannot be awarded a mark in the top band, in any column, as there is insufficient evidence to support this.

If a candidate has submitted a solo piece or a piece with a recorded backing track as an ensemble, a mark of zero must be awarded for ensemble and the piece assessed as a solo. For example, if the non-ensemble scores 30 (as a solo) and the second solo performance scores 30, the calculation of the total mark will be $(0 + 30 + 30)$ (divided by 3) (multiplied by 2) = 40

Please refer to the following documents on the website for guidance on repertoire:

WJEC ensemble performance guidance

Ensemble flowchart

Producing a sequenced performance for WJEC GCSE Music

MARKING

Moderators reported that centres generally submitted accurate and fair marks across all three assessment strands, showing a secure understanding of the assessment criteria. If candidates are deserving of full marks (of which there were many), centres should not hesitate to award such marks.

There were fewer examples of candidates being double penalised under Accuracy and Technical Control. Single errors in intonation will affect marks for Accuracy, whereas more consistent intonation errors should be penalised under Technical Control.

There were, unfortunately, too many instances where candidates were awarded high marks for Accuracy when the performance did not match the score. As previously mentioned, any deviations from the score must be marked clearly before the performance to justify centre marks.

It is worth pointing out that performance directions are one of the strands for Accuracy, and it may well be in the centre's interest to add dynamics, etc, to a score which does not contain published dynamics.

This year, however, saw a large increase in very simple pre-grade one pieces, for example, one-handed simple piano pieces. Such pieces do not provide the evidence required to access marks in bands three or four across the three columns.

For further information regarding applying the criteria, please see the following document on the website.

Unit 1 performing amplification and further support in applying the criteria.

PROGRAMME NOTES

There were very few candidates who did not submit a Programme Note this year.

Many in-depth accounts of the music were submitted, with detailed evaluations of the technical demands. The weaker efforts rarely mentioned musical elements or the technical demands, concentrating instead on interesting facts about the composer/performer, or adding too much biographical or historical information. The better efforts included appropriate music terminology and honest accounts of the technical demands.

Marking of the programme note tended to be generous, mostly because the candidates evaluated their own performances or described how they rehearsed the piece.

Further information regarding the requirements for Programme Notes may be found in the amplification document mentioned above.

MUSIC

GCSE

Summer 2025

UNIT 2: COMPOSING

Overview of the Unit

Composing – AO2 (Compose and develop musical ideas with technical control and coherence)

Candidates were required to compose two compositions, one in response to a brief set by WJEC, along with a free composition. In total, Unit 2 is worth 84 marks, as each composition is marked out of 36 marks and the Evaluation out of 12 marks. For clarification: there are no penalties in this Unit for candidates not reaching the minimum time requirement, or for exceeding the maximum time requirement in their compositions. Assessment must reflect the musical content; short pieces are often self-penalising as they lack sufficient development of the initial ideas, while very long compositions are often overly repetitive, or lack structural focus.

This report will feedback on the main issues which moderators faced this year. It will focus initially on the centre assessments, but also on administrative procedures as there were shortcomings which hindered the moderation process. Though the report is detailed, centres are advised to consider all requirements thoroughly.

Centre Assessments

This year moderators reported that centre assessments were varied. Accurate judgements were acknowledged when careful consideration had been given to the assessment grid when awarding marks. Inaccurate judgements were evident when the assessment criteria had not been applied with sufficient rigour, resulting in marks that did not accurately reflect the quality of the work. In many cases, the marking was more often generous than harsh, particularly when dealing with a weaker cohort; the best candidates in a centre might still not be deserving of top marks. As a general observation, it seemed that judgements were usually quite well placed at either end of the range, as standards are more obvious when the outcome is excellent or limited. Mid-range pieces were often marked too generously, and some centre assessments were inconsistent across the range. There were many examples where centres had awarded Band 4 ('skilful' and 'highly effective') to pieces, when in fact, Band 3 ('generally effective') or even Band 2 ('simplistic') was more appropriate, particularly when ideas were repeated rather than developed. In such instances, marks were often a whole band – if not two bands - out. Some work had been considered as Band 3 when, for example, the harmonies were dissonant (though clearly not meant to be) and the outcome was lacking in rhythmic interest and melodic focus and flow.

There were also examples of harsh marking, though this situation was far less common. When the compositions had received the benefit of excellent performing and recording facilities, occasionally the quality of the recording had been assessed rather than the musical content of the piece. Centres using Logic Pro, Sibelius, and Musescore often submitted high quality work with creative ideas and centres marked them accurately. A portion of centres were using Bandlab and their candidates were copy/pasting loops; the marking here was incredibly generous as the work was under-developed and lacked evidence of technical control of the musical elements.

Top placed Band 4 candidates were able to use advanced creative techniques such as modulation, polyphonic writing, and effective instrumentation. Their work demonstrated contrasts in mood, clear structural development, stylistic awareness and skilful development of ideas. Any candidates/centres unsure of what exactly constitutes 'highly effective' must refer to subject expectations in the Appendix for GCSE Music, and judge how well the candidate has shown their musical understanding and control of elements as itemised there. In contrast, many Band 3 and below compositions showed limited development of the musical ideas and depended on repetition as the main device to extend their work, instead of introducing multiple ideas and developing them using musical elements such as texture, dynamics, or harmony through various compositional devices. This was not always reflected correctly in the marking. A number of portfolios demonstrated imaginative starting points and a willingness to experiment with musical ideas, but these were not always sustained with technical consistency; much work was competent and stylistically aware, but the development or structural control was limited.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Please take heed of all recommendations below as marks may well be adjusted according to the recommendations of the moderator.

AO2.1a Creativity and development of musical ideas

At the top of the banding, ideas were highly effective; melodic ideas were musically shaped and rhythmically interesting, supported by interesting, appropriate chords and explored, contrasted and extended using a variety of devices. Many candidates produced extremely creative and impressive compositions. However, moderators reported that assessment in this column was the most inconsistent. Many compositions placed in Band 4 for this column could not be agreed, as the content did not fulfil or match the relevant criteria. The main issues noted by moderators were the quality of the initial ideas and the lack of development.

Common weaknesses were identified as:

- Extremely simple melodic or triadic ideas maintained throughout the whole piece.
- Meandering or disjunct melodies with no sense of phrase structure, focus or balance.
- A lack of understanding of key, chords and cadences.
- Reliance on a limited and repetitive chord sequence throughout the piece.
- A lack of skilful development, as opportunities to develop were missed, or development was only partial, with limited motivic manipulation, or copy and paste in DAWs without change.
- An over-reliance on repetition as in the use of repeat marks, or exact repeats of a section.
- Use of loops or pre-existing samples where candidates describe how they mixed or produced the track, rather than creating musical ideas themselves (samples, given chord progressions, 12 bar blues, use of a chord generator)
- Insufficient contrast and variation, particularly in the use of tone colour, mood, tempo and dynamics.

Some candidates remained too dependent on musical influences and ideas that were not their own. Please advise that credit cannot be given for anything that is not their own work, as such practices risk crossing the line into the realms of malpractice and plagiarism. Furthermore, any use of technology that generates the musical ideas for the candidate cannot be given credit: candidates are required to create their own ideas to show their understanding of the musical elements, therefore the arranging of pre-existing musical patterns is not what is required.

Some centre assessments were extremely inaccurate, over-crediting content that was limited and static. Conversely, some lower-marked compositions showed more creativity than was reflected in the centre's assessment: for example, where centre marks were in Band 3, yet candidates had demonstrated highly effective development of a successful motif and in many cases included a countermelody, created musical shapes with interplay between the parts and including some highly effective contrasts throughout.

AO2.1b Technical control of musical elements and resources

The strongest compositions were extremely effective and sophisticated as candidates controlled the elements with mature musical understanding, writing well for the chosen instruments, from solo pieces to full orchestra. Such work was usually credited fairly with marks at the top of Band 4 and agreed by moderators. However, over-awarding was still evident. Many centres gave credit for the use and control of music technology, not fully considering how the elements had been used and controlled. Though candidates often demonstrate competence in software and DAW use, this does not equate to secure understanding of musical content and compositional technique. Moderators referenced soundscapes (e.g., haunted/horror film tracks) as using monophonic chromatic ideas, with rhythm and pitch as sound effects; these often displayed no more than a limited understanding and control of the musical elements.

Many centres were too generous in their judgements in this column, often awarding Band 3, when a Band 2 was more suitable. In some cases, moderators reported that simple content and partial development (Band 2) had been assessed as Band 4.

To ensure appropriate judgments of technical control, please advise candidates of the following.

- **Melody:** Ensure melodic ideas consist of balanced phrases that are not solely dependent on basic motifs and short patterns
- **Harmony:** Display an appropriate understanding of harmony at this level by not over-using root position chords, and include interesting harmonic content that is well varied and a secure support to the melodic ideas, refining the work to avoid unintended and awkward dissonances
- **Rhythm:** Ensure appropriate rhythmic balance and musicality, some contrast and musical interest
- **Instrumentation:** Even when DAWs are used to compose, candidates must consider the designated instruments and should not include ideas that are impossible in real performance (e.g., inappropriate spacing or positions for piano/keyboard, not composing chords for a single line instrument, impossible double stopping for strings or not extending beyond the range of the instrument or voice)
- **Texture:** Ensure some evidence of textural control through variation and contrasts (i.e., not all melody and basic chordal accompaniment throughout a piece).
- **Performance markings** Expression markings or instructions were often amiss.

AO2.1c Structure and stylistic coherence

Marking in this column was more accurately judged, possibly as it is obvious whether the outcome has successfully fulfilled the brief. Centres were able to credit candidates fairly and appropriately for well-structured work with pieces which captured a sense of the intended style and character.

Marks were lost when:

- a composition was coherent but did not fit the brief
- the organisation of a piece was unclear
- the overall structure of a piece was ineffective (lacking contrasts, overly long, meandering)
- uneven handling of musical ideas and formulaic structures sometimes detracted from the overall cohesion
- the stylistic intention / character had not been successfully realised
- no brief had been provided, therefore it was not possible to credit the intention.

Candidates must be advised to:

- Ensure there is a clear overall structure (or description of ideas and events if programmatic/cinematic) – including transitions, careful consideration of the character and mood, and a convincing conclusion. Fade-outs must be discouraged, as they do not demonstrate control over musical closure, and repeat marks avoided as this impedes development.
- Refine ideas to ensure musical conviction in terms of coherence and stylistic intention.
- Provide more appropriate briefs for the free compositions, clearly outlining audience, occasion, and stylistic intent. Greater autonomy in task design and individual choice of brief would help reduce the prevalence of formulaic outcomes and support more distinctive and individual musical voices.

Response to the chosen briefs

The coursework was varied and interesting, as many candidates engaged meaningfully with the compositional process. Set briefs were approached with creativity and stylistic awareness, and many candidates responded thoughtfully to the parameters of the task.

Areas of Study

1. Musical Forms and Devices

Compose a piece for voices which makes use of imitation. There must be at least 3 vocal lines and the work may be accompanied or unaccompanied. Choose suitable words or write your own.

Overall, few candidates attempted this, and the outcomes were mixed though the range of musical genres chosen was wide and interesting. There were some very effective pieces, particularly by candidates who are also singers, as they understood how to write vocal harmonies achieving a sense of interaction and balance in the ensemble, and including several imitative ideas throughout the piece. The pieces with instrumental accompaniment were usually more successful and carefully structured. Some candidates had even liaised with their church choirs to perform the final piece.

Other candidates selecting this option clearly found the task challenging, as they produced less effective results in which the harmonic control and writing for voices was not refined or successfully controlled. The imitation could usually be heard, but it was not always made a feature of the piece. Unison was used frequently, which is not incorrect, but did show lack of harmonic development. Accompaniments to pieces at this level were often chordal and very triadic. Marking was considered generous in several folios where candidates had not included any lyrics for parts and copied and pasted whole sections.

2. Music for Ensemble

Compose a piece of music for three or four instruments to be performed in the Llangollen Fringe Festival.

Responses here were mostly successful in response to this popular brief, as candidates created in different genres from Celtic to Classical, with lots in a rock/pop or jazz/blues style. Where acoustic instruments were used (using a 'traditional' score, like Sibelius or Muse Score) it was easy to hear the three or four distinct parts/instruments, but this was less clear from those using DAW; moderators reported multiple parts across different tracks which looked as though the brief for 3 or 4 instruments had not been met. Generally however, the compositions were well done, especially by classically inclined candidates who organised their ideas clearly in a ternary or binary form. The brief allowed for further musical development with the candidates passing the melody from one instrument to another successfully, with most – though not all – candidates writing appropriately for their chosen instruments. Marking was considered generous for pieces where the musical choices were restricted and lacking creativity. Sometimes the choice of ensemble was obscure, and the timbres did not always work. One candidate submitted a vocal composition in response to this brief which is not what was required.

3. Film Music

Compose theme music for a new drama set in the haunted castle of Craig y Nos in Powys.

This brief captured the imagination of many. The best examples were highly effective - well structured, with imaginative employment of instrumental timbres, and displaying thoughtful control of the musical elements to capture a 'cinematic' sound which successfully conveyed the intended character and mood. Such pieces were clearly deserving of marks at the top of Band 4. There was often a strong sense of programmatic story-telling in the most convincing pieces, though many candidates had not focussed on the whole brief, as they concentrated on 'horror' with very few considering Madame Patti's operatic background and weaving that element into their score.

In many pieces, the intention was not executed successfully. Much work was mid-range quality as the appropriate style and character was achieved through a focus on dissonance and chromaticism, but not convincingly, as candidates did not truly grasp the requirements of 'theme music'. The initial ideas were often underdeveloped, lacking structure and clear presentation; many were 'haunted' and 'spooky' in their style, but would have been more fitting as background music, rather than 'theme music' for the opening or closing credits. Some pieces had snippets and motifs that worked in isolation, (such as dim. 7th chords or dissonant intervals), but these were not combined effectively, and the result was not coherent. The weakest examples were limited, basic, or inconsistent as candidates presented a series of unrelated fragments and sound effects. Very few did not sound like haunted music at all (one example of this was a classical piano solo).

4. Popular Music:

Compose a piece of music in a popular style to be performed in a community dance-a-thon event.

This brief was also very popular and mostly executed successfully. It particularly suited rock and pop musicians who could play to their strengths. The best pieces included contrasts and musical ideas which were convincing and developed. There were some successful interpretations as songs, especially when the lyrics had been realized in the final recording. Some candidates demonstrated excellent control of musical technology, though the use of technology occasionally hindered marks when there was an over-reliance on copying and pasting music cells, rather than developing ideas. There were lots of different styles in evidence, and not all convincingly fitted into the Popular Music genre (with some that did not sound like dance music). EDM/Dance music was very common, but as per the style of the music, was repetitive and a little monotonous. Such attempts were simplistic and limited as the focus was on repetition of one short idea or ostinato and/or the use of loops/samples. At this level, the content lacked melodic flair, favouring more of a drum and bass feel. Many pieces employed a 'fade-out' – a poor choice for concluding ideas in an examination piece.

Evaluations

Centre assessments were mostly fair. Unfortunately, there were candidates who did not submit an Evaluation, and future candidates would be well advised to remember that the minimum word count for this is 500 words. Many failed to reach this limit.

Some candidates produced thoughtful and considered work, clearly evaluating the composition and not just describing it. Moderators considered the best examples to be in a layout presented in sections which assisted candidates to focus on how the individual elements and resources had been used. Several candidates failed to mention the effectiveness of the final recording and this affected the credit. Generous marking was noted when the content was 'general' and not offering the 'in-depth' evaluation required for top band accreditation. Many were too broad without including analysis, evaluation or critically perceptive comments using subject specific terminology that linked to the musical elements and how and why they were used in the pieces.

Some candidates included photos (for example, in the Film Music brief of *Craig y Nos*) and long introductory explanations which did not contain anything creditworthy in terms of evaluation. Some evaluations repeated the information from the candidate logs even though the logs are where candidates must describe and explain the compositional process, and the evaluations are for evaluating the musical elements and how they have been used.

Free Compositions

A wide range of styles were in evidence, often reflecting individual musical interests and skills. It was encouraging to see that many centres supported their students in taking a creative and independent approach. Other centres imposed rigid frameworks regarding structure and idea development. While guidance is important, excessive constraints appeared to limit student creativity and autonomy and in some centres, there were similar outcomes from all candidates in the cohort. Free composition briefs varied considerably in quality. Some were well-conceived and clearly articulated, allowing candidates to write with a strong sense of purpose and audience. Others were ineffective and did not follow the exam board convention; they lacked sufficient detail, omitting key contextual information, thus limiting the moderator's ability to assess the alignment between brief and outcome. In a minority of cases, the final composition bore little resemblance to the stated brief. Some "free" briefs appeared to be retrospectively written, and some read more as brief summaries of the finished pieces. A few briefs were unusually niche, e.g., *music for a Japanese-themed ride at a theme park*, or *music for when on hold on the phone*. In some centres the free brief was very similar to the set brief chosen, resulting in two similar pieces of music being submitted in a portfolio. Some candidates chose the same brief for both compositions which is not what is required.

Many of the issues already highlighted for concern in the set brief pieces obviously also apply here, namely, avoidance of awkward endings/ fade-outs, repeat marks, repetitive patterns, overly long results and the like. Previous Principal Moderator reports have frequently advised against the use of existing chordal patterns (such as 12-bar Blues ideas) and solo drum pieces. Both are acceptable, but candidates must be encouraged to be imaginative and creative with the Blues style to ensure individual creativity can be credited, and candidates must be made aware that a solo drum piece cannot access the full range of marks as the technical control of such musical elements as melody and harmony will not be displayed. Some candidates mentioned working with professional musicians as part of a BBC project who had changed their piece 'to make it better'. This is not suitable for an examination as the compositions should be the individual work of each candidate.

Administration

Moderators are tremendously grateful to all centres that follow guidelines and upload all the necessary documentation correctly as required. This ensures that the moderation procedures can be followed with ease. Mixed responses from moderators were received though a number felt there was a significant improvement in administration this year. Recordings, scores and paperwork were generally labelled correctly in accordance with WJEC guidelines.

Issues included:

- Late submissions, well past the deadlines and any extensions that had been approved.
- Outdated marksheets
- Missing GDPR declarations, marksheets, candidate details, and missing work (audios/scores/leadsheets)
- Clerical errors (mismatches between lamis and candidate labelling, incorrect marks input to lamis)
- Muddled labelling (including mixing up the set brief piece and free)
- Unit 1 uploaded instead of Unit 2
- Unnecessary duplication of tracks
- Incorrect file formats (including zip files and video files) some of which could not be accessed
- Mismatched audio and scores
- Submission of individual parts/pages rather than one supporting score or explanatory leadsheets (some candidates uploaded over 25 files on lamis)
- Incomplete candidate logs
- The inclusion of screenshots in the log, rather than a separate document
The repetition of information from the Evaluation in the log (even though the focus should be different).

Centres were generally (though not always) quick to respond to requests for additional work or corrections to their upload. Unfortunately, due to the half term break, there was a wait for some requested items which delayed the moderation process. Centres are reminded that careful attention to administrative accuracy is essential to support a fair and smooth moderation process.

Uploading

For clarification, six files are expected:

- Candidate Log (with authentication signatures)
- Composition 1 (set brief) audio
- Composition 1 score / lead sheet
- Evaluation of Composition 1(set brief piece)
- Composition 2 (free brief) audio
- Composition 2 score / lead sheet.

If a candidate needs to upload additional guide tracks to explain and demonstrate how parts have been taught to performers, that is permitted. Otherwise, any supporting work which contains multiple screenshots or pages must be combined in a single document.

Candidate Logs

There is no requirement to detach the marksheet; please upload the entire candidate log which includes the marksheet at the end. Moderators acknowledged that many candidate logs were well-written especially in confirming compositional authorship and the realisation of the brief, as candidates gave reasoning and explanation of what, why and how they have made their musical decisions. Most were word-processed which made them easy to read and allowed candidates to rework their drafts. Some were handwritten and less easy to read at times. A reminder that these are for the candidate to complete; in some centres, candidates had been given several set sentences which were copied and pasted between each log and no further explanation was offered in the creation/refinement box. Overall, the quality and depth of content varied considerably. While some were a tremendous aid to the moderation process, others were extremely limited, and of little or no help to the moderator. All questions in the log **must** be answered. The requirement for candidates to explain details of musical ideas not their original work was too often ignored or lacking in detail. This is particularly important as it directly affects the credit. It is understandably difficult for the centre to realise a candidate's dependence on non-original material at times, but as the teacher must sign a declaration confirming the work is original, the acknowledgment of any work that is not their own is crucial and must be firmly impressed on all candidates.

Many candidates used automatic drummers, or pre-recorded loops in the DAW, and/or relied on arpeggiators and synths to produce/arrange the harmony and texture. Although there is a musical element of this in the selection of appropriate ideas or sounds, it does not exemplify the candidates' understanding or control of elements. In supporting this, please advise that not all technology is suitable for examination work at GCSE standard; candidates must avoid those that consist of drag and drop loops and vocal samples, as these cannot be credited as their own work. This specification is aimed at the candidate's understanding, use, creation and control of the musical elements that are of their own creation, not an arrangement of pre-created patterns available otherwise.

Candidates often did not acknowledge all performers or submit lead tracks to help the moderator understand the extent of help they had with realising their composition. This situation was often unsatisfactory as the candidate's input and creativity was not clear and therefore could not be credited. Candidate logs must clarify how the candidate led the creative process—simply stating they "told the performer what to do" is not sufficient to ensure authenticity. Please refer to previous reports and requirements for further clarification.

Scores and Lead sheets

Many scores and lead sheets were of excellent quality; others were very basic leadsheets and/or screenshots (often unannotated, and therefore of little use to the moderator). In some cases, candidates submitted PowerPoint presentations which included the necessary information; some scores for piano pieces were handwritten, all of which is acceptable. When the documentation is minimal, it is often difficult to see how the piece had been constructed, especially in terms of structure and development. In general, those created using notation software were better than those that submitted screenshots from a DAW. There is no need for both scores and leadsheets for the same composition; candidates must be guided on the clearer option. Some candidates had used a website called 'Klangio' where it seems that a score is created from the audio file. Moderators felt that the resulting scores were inaccurate and not helpful. Some scores stretched over many pages (with many empty bars), some scores were uploaded a line at a time – in such cases, editing is advised to produce a full and more useful document.

Many weaker candidates failed to provide accurate or worthwhile scores and/or annotations, if any at all. A huge proportion of DAW screenshots (predominantly BandLab) gave no indication as to which instrumental sound belonged to which MIDI track and many also remained unedited; in such cases, a detailed written account would have been a more appropriate way of submitting written evidence of the composition. There are good examples of how to successfully complete an annotated screenshot from DAW on the secure site. Scores or leadsheets for vocal pieces or songs were frequently not successful with issues such as missing lyrics, missing chordal and melodic outlines, melodic content not explained, or chords and/or lyrics noted on the leadsheet not matching with the audio. Some candidates who provided just lyrics and chords did not explain details or musical intentions of rhythm, texture, instrumentation and other general details, which caused problems when moderating AO2.1b.

Candidates who compose by ear could use the '***If there was no score or other performers were involved***' section of the composition log to include photographic evidence along with annotated rehearsal notes and the chord patterns employed. This could be an effective alternative to a traditional score or leadsheet, particularly for candidates with weaker literacy skills.

Recordings

Audio tracks taken directly from the software were clear, though recordings varied from being of a professional quality, to live takes in a noisy classroom. Clearly, vast differences in technology were available in different centres. Recordings generally matched submissions, although some issues with balance, clarity, and synchronisation (particularly when combining live and MIDI elements) were noted. In a few cases, recordings lacked key components (for example, missing vocals in song-based briefs) which affected the realisation of the compositional intent. Not all centres submitted recordings in the file formats as requested.

Moderators identified issues such as:

- Poor audio quality (e.g., recorded onto a phone).
- Unbalanced recordings where some lines were inaudible or too quiet.
- Some parts too loud (e.g., candidates overused automation with volume and reduced middle harmonies and rhythmic content too much, focusing on drum and melody lines).
- Audio files frequently missing the beginning or end of the music.
- Audio files with built in DAW metronome still audible.
- Audio files over-running for, in some cases, 10 mins plus.
- Instances of people talking before, during and after live performance recordings
- Recordings which differed slightly from the score, a discrepancy which was not always noted in the candidate log. Instances where candidates had recorded vocals were always easier to follow than those where there were not, and these tended to be more 'successful'.
- Some centres had uploaded earlier versions of a composition or recorded over a previous version without editing any overlaps.
- The unnecessary announcing of all pieces and candidates.

The importance of carefully checking all audio tracks was stressed by all moderators. Best practice advice for candidates was outlined clearly in the Principal Moderator's Report for 2024, which is still available.

Summary of key points:

- The Assessment grid for Component 2: Composing, the Guidance for assessing Component 2, plus additional advice for composing within the areas of study can be found in Appendix B of the Music GCSE specification.
- Correct procedures, guidelines and expectations are available on the WJEC website, and much advice has been given in previous Principal Moderator reports.
- Continued engagement with exemplar materials and standardisation resources would be beneficial for some centres to ensure correct administrative procedures are followed and achieve greater consistency when assessing the coursework.
- Keep the requirements of the GCSE Music assessment criteria for Composing at the forefront of all musical decisions made and guidance given. Assess to the assessment criteria in the specification, not to the standards of the centre cohort.
- Check all recordings for balance/missing parts/interference/background noise.
- When other performers have been involved in recording a candidate's composition, either the notation or a guide track performed by the candidate must be included.
- All loops/autoplay/auto-accompaniments/auto chord patterns/arpeggiations and non-original ideas must be clearly credited by the candidate in the relevant section in the candidate log.

MUSIC

GCSE

Summer 2025

UNIT 3: APPRAISING

Overview of the Unit

Unit 3 assesses AO3 and AO4 criteria. This unit is assessed via a listening examination worth 72 marks which consists of eight questions in total, two on each of the four areas of study:

Area of study 1: Musical Forms and Devices

Area of study 2: Music for Ensemble

Area of study 3: Film Music

Area of study 4: Popular Music

Of the eight questions, six will be on unprepared musical extracts and two extracts set by WJEC which relate to two areas of study. The set extracts will be reviewed periodically but for this examination series are:

Q1: 'Anitra's Dance' from Peer Gynt Suite (Op.46) by Edvard Grieg

Q7: 'Everything Must Go' by Manic Street Preachers

Learners are encouraged to study the scores of the set extracts in preparation for the examination. However, scores must not be taken into the examination; sections of the scores will be printed on the examination paper when required for the question. The unprepared extracts played in the examination will be from genres, styles or periods specified in each area of study and will include examples of music by Welsh composers and/or performers.

In the examination candidates will:

- identify musical elements, musical contexts and musical language, and apply this knowledge to familiar and unfamiliar music.
- make evaluative and critical judgements about musical elements, musical contexts and musical language, using appropriate musical terminology
- complete the rhythm or pitch of a short section of music (questions will use mainly conjunct movement, though may include leaps within the major scale).

The standards achieved by candidates this year covered the whole range. It was felt by examiners that there were still many areas for development regarding the identification of musical elements and in many cases wrong terminology was used for certain elements. As in previous years, the extended SPAG question needs more planning and preparation as there are still candidates writing about all elements of music even though many were not required in the question. Many candidates only wrote successfully about one of the four elements of music requested and as a result could not access marks in the higher band criteria.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Question 1

Prepared Extract – ‘Anitra’s Dance’ (Peer Gynt Suite - Op.46) by Grieg

- (a) Some candidates positively identified the first chord of the extract as E major. A large number of candidates thought the answer was A minor but this was the overall key of the piece. The opening chord of the movement is the dominant chord.
- (b) Responses were varied for this question and many candidates did not give a specific definition for *divisi*. To simply write ‘separated’ or ‘divided’ did not give enough information. Players reading the same musical stave divide into two parts in this piece and candidates were required to refer to the parts to gain credit.
- (c) The first rhythm option was correct. This is where the crotchet rest was located on the second beat of each bar in simple triple time.
- (d) A large number of candidates failed to give a location when describing the features of the triangle part. It needed clarity because there was a roll/tremolo specifically at the start of the extract. Although the triangle was heard on beat one in a number of bars, the specific location details were required for the marks, i.e. played on the first beat of every other bar (bars 7-14) and on the first beat of every bar (bars 15-19).
- (e) Some candidates identified that the violas performed the melody an octave lower than the violins at the end of the extract. Many assumed it was at the same pitch but were incorrect.
- (f) It was pleasing that most candidates recognised the perfect cadence at the end of the extract. A few candidates wrote V-I cadence and this was accepted.
- (g) The vast majority of responses were correct for the context question and correctly stated the name of the movement written by Grieg, namely ‘Anitra’s Dance’.

It is interesting to note that this is a set work and candidates should be more prepared for this piece of music than in other unprepared questions. The item level data suggests that the set work questions did not receive higher marks than other questions. Please refer to the WJEC analysis which can be found on the website.

Question 2
Piano Sonata No.2 in A Major- Trio by Beethoven
Pie Jesu from Faure's Requiem

- (a) There were a wide range of options selected for the structure of the extract. The piano part had the same material at the beginning and end with a contrasting section in between (*i.e.* ABA).
- (b) The majority of candidates identified minor tonality at the start of the extract. Candidates were given a mark even if they gave a specific key (*e.g.* G minor) as only the tonality was expected.
- (c) A number of candidates misread the question which asked for a feature not heard in the extract. A crescendo was heard in the opening phrases, ornamentation included in the middle section and a perfect cadence at the end of the extract. By process of elimination, there was no glissando in the extract.
- (d) A large number of candidates stated the correct texture as homophonic. Melody and accompaniment were also accepted as an answer.
- (e) Most candidates recognised the type of voice as soprano.
- (f) Organ was identified positively by a number of candidates as the accompanying keyboard instrument in the extract. Popular incorrect answers included piano, harpsichord and synthesiser. In addition, there were some answers from different families of instruments.
- (g) This question asked candidates to describe harmony with location for a maximum of 2 marks. A large number of candidates identified the diatonic harmony overall (or consonant /tonal) and as this was throughout answers were accepted without specific location. However, many candidates lost the second mark due to a lack of location, especially the perfect cadence which occurred at the end of the extract.
- (h) It was clear that the only possible answer could have been *lento* regarding tempo. All of the other options would have signalled a faster tempo.

Question 3

Wiegenlied by Schubert

- (a)(i) This year, the melody was in the bass clef and there was a marked improvement in the number of correct pitches completed. Candidates must use a pencil to try to make the note heads clearer. Examiners did not credit unclear noteheads hanging too far over lines or spaces. Candidates must align notes underneath the rhythm as set out above the pitches. Some candidates did not add stems to notes but this did not affect the overall mark as only pitches were being assessed. The melody was mainly conjunct, apart from the interval of a perfect 5th between the final two pitches. Relative pitch, as always, was not accepted – pitches were marked as correct or incorrect. Examiners were asked to accept enharmonic notes too (e.g. the pitches D#/Eb were accepted as the final note).
- (a)(ii) Most candidates recognised that the solo instrument was from the string family but fewer stated cello as the correct response. There were some candidates that thought it was a wind instrument.
- (a)(iii) Few candidates selected both features heard in the extract. It could be that many thought that it could not possibly be both words relating to phrases (*i.e.* answering phrase and regular phrasing). It must be noted that some candidates ticked more than two features and lost marks as a result.
- (b)(i) The majority of candidates identified the time signature either by listening carefully or adding up the beats from the given score. Unfortunately, a number of candidates did not place this time signature in the correct place and it was found above the stave or before the clef.
- (b)(ii) The melodic interval of a 3rd was identified by several candidates. Again, candidates could have listened and double checked when viewing the score.

Question 4

That's a Plenty by L. Pollack

This question assessed the accuracy of specialist terminology and the quality of written communication, in addition to musical content. Candidates needed to describe structure, instruments, harmony and tonality. A large number of candidates wrote about all elements of music, most of which were not requested in the main question. These included tempo, metre, melody, rhythm, musical styles, dynamics, texture, performance techniques and articulation. Many candidates wrote information under the correct musical element headings but still included information not required. Fewer candidates accessed the higher mark bands this year as they did not refer to all four of the musical elements in the question. It was important for candidates to give locations for the musical elements in responses as highlighted in the question. Nearly all candidates included information about instruments but a significant number could only identify a trumpet and a drum kit. There were many more instruments included including: trombone, tuba, clarinet and banjo. Harmony was generally diatonic but references could have been given to the imperfect and perfect cadences, in addition to extended harmony. The structure was in four sections, one of which was repeated (*i.e.* ABAC form) but answers using popular section names like verse, chorus *etc.* were accepted. The tonality was minor in both A sections and major in the other contrasting sections. Additionally, candidates could have mentioned modulation under tonality. It was felt that candidates struggled to identify the specific tonality in each section and for many, responses concerning structure were unclear, partial or not detailed enough. Candidates could have gained full marks by writing a small paragraph including all of these details. Paragraphs, lists and bullet points were accepted as in previous years. It is important to remember that rough notes in the blank space are not assessed, though this only happened with one candidate this year. Answers can be written on the dotted lines where it states to start your answer.

It is interesting to note that there was an example of a candidate achieving full marks again this year with a short succinct paragraph where the content, location and SPAG were excellent. Generally, when marking this question, there were some common spelling errors in the responses including the words: trumpet, drums, tuba, clarinet, accompaniment, guitar, cymbals, snare drum and the word 'beginning'.

Question 5
'Escape' from Toy Story 3 by Randy Newman

- (a) Most candidates identified the major tonality at the start of section one.
- (b) While several candidates recognised the trumpet playing the melody, there were a wide range of responses from every family of instruments. The clarinet was a popular incorrect answer.
- (c) A number of candidates realised that the melody began on the first beat of the bar. Some responses identified the bar number too even though it was not requested.
- (d) Snare drum was identified by some candidates in this question but a range of percussion instruments were written as incorrect responses in addition to instruments from the string, woodwind and brass families.
- (e) The vast majority of candidates knew that pizzicato meant plucking the strings.
- (f) Many candidates identified the performance technique used by the strings as arco (bowed), sounding sustained or using legato articulation.
- (g) Fewer candidates identified the French horn in section 2 and many mixed up the answers with 5b) which was a trumpet.
- (h) Nearly all candidates selected that section one had the faster tempo.
- (i) A large number heard the diminuendo at the end of the extract – the other options all indicated louder dynamics.

Question 6

Ghostbusters Theme – Ray Parker Junior

- (a) A large number of candidates identified the musical instrument playing the glissando at the start. A few candidates incorrectly stated that the drum kit performed the glissando.
- (b) Three features had to be selected that were heard in the introduction. A minority of candidates selected all three correct options which were fill, ostinato and triplets. The fill was the most popular correct answer. Few candidates lost marks for ticking more than three options.
- (c) There were a range of answers for this question and only the first answer on each line was marked. Sadly, some candidates wrote two answers on some lines and none on others. Most responses referred to the solo and group voices and a number of candidates correctly identified call and response or question and answer between parts. Few candidates recognised the anacrusis, small pitch range and syllabic word-setting and this must be applauded. Not many candidates noted that the vocal parts were repetitive or had slides (glissando/falls) at the end of some notes.
- (d) The majority of candidates identified four crotchet beats in each bar which equated to simple quadruple metre.

Question 7

Prepared Extract – Everything Must Go by Manic Street Preachers

- (a) Some candidates recognised that there were 8 bars in the vocal and instrumental interlude. Many responses had 4 bars or 16 bars for the duration of the section but this was not the case. There were many irregular numbers of bars that were incorrectly identified (e.g. 3, 5 or 7 bars).
- (b) Many candidates identified one of the instruments performing the melody as violin or viola. Some candidates responded with electric guitar but it is an accompanying instrument in this section. The chord sequence in the section was first heard in the introduction. The question asked for the specific section where it was first heard.
- (c) Most candidates identified the male singers in the extract but tenor/baritone voices were also accepted. A large number correctly stated that the voices sang in harmony with 'ah' sounds. Few candidates mentioned sustained notes in this question.
- (d) The question on rhythm was not overly successful as the majority of candidates stated syncopation. The vocal melody began with an anacrusis and featured dotted rhythms, triplets and repetitive material.
- (e) Many candidates correctly identified the chord at the end of the pre-chorus.
- (f) There were a range of answers, starting from 1146 to 2016 stating the year when the single 'Everything Must Go' was released by the band. The answer was 1996.

It is once again important to state that this is a set work and candidates should be more prepared for this song than other questions as they have prior knowledge and know that it will definitely feature in the examination paper. Please refer to the WJEC analysis which can be found on the website.

Question 8

Take on Me by Aha Catalunya - Gwilym

- (a) Approximately one third of candidates noticed that the interval performed by the vocalist was a major 7th.
- (b) Most candidates selected one correct feature of the music but few individuals identified both falsetto and call and response.
- (c) Any answers containing the word 'pop' were credited here and the majority of responses were correct. Incorrect identifications included blues, folk, reggae and disco.
- (d) Chords I and IV were used in section one but a large number struggled to identify this progression. Many selected the I to V tonic to dominant chord sequence.
- (e) This question had very few correct answers and most candidates did not state that reverb was a feature in the extract.
- (f) The correct rhythm sung on the word 'Catalunya' was the first option. The second option was the most popular answer but it was incorrect as it was not a syncopated rhythm.
- (g) Nearly all candidates recognised an instrument in the rhythm section of the band.
- (h) Some candidates identified the correct tempo for this question but there were many answers that suggested slower speeds. 100-130bpm was accepted as a full answer too.

Summary of Key Points and Guidance for Centres

- Candidates are reminded to read the question carefully. In the extended SPAG question, you should only focus on the elements of music requested in the question. You should also try to mention all elements of music to access marks in higher bands. If you are required to select answers, try to ensure you select the number requested. Location was needed in some questions again this year and it is essential to clarify where elements of music occurred especially when they change during the extract.
- Candidates must be encouraged to attempt all questions. Once again, this year, examiners stated that many questions were not attempted, in particular for multiple choice questions.
- Always use a pencil when completing pitch and rhythm so you can easily erase errors ensuring it is clear to the examiner. It is important to state that if notes are unclear and hang over spaces and lines, they will not be awarded a mark.
- It was felt that more teaching focus was required on harmony, tonality and rhythm in this examination by rehearsing key words linked to each musical element followed by listening examples to improve identification strategies.
- The majority of the listening examination focuses on the musical elements so that should be the main focus for lesson starters. Constant revision and retrieval practice is paramount to learners succeeding with terminology even before they listen to extracts of music. For example, if the question is about texture, candidates should know that the main words would be monophonic, homophonic, melody plus accompaniment and polyphonic. It gives candidates a head-start to what the possible answers could be. For the more able and talented learners this could then extend to more specific terminology such as unison, imitation, countermelody, canon and Alberti bass.
- It is advised the teachers deliver the specification through musical elements, musical context and musical language rather than focus too rigidly on the areas of study. An element of music can be one focus for a lesson initially but genres of music could be used for listening examples (e.g. Classical, Welsh folk music and blues).
- Finally, candidates should be at an advantage when they have studied set/prepared works as they know that both pieces will definitely feature in the examination. More time should be designated to the context, language and use of musical elements in these set works. Interestingly, sometimes each year, it is an unprepared extract that gains the highest average marks of all questions which is difficult to comprehend when candidates have studied the works in greater detail than any of the other pieces of music.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: **029 2240 4300**

Email: Music@wjec.co.uk

Qualification webpage: [GCSE Music | Made for Wales](#)

See other useful contacts here: [Useful Contacts | WJEC](#)

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: <https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/>

WJEC Qualifications

As Wales' largest awarding body, WJEC supports its education community by providing trusted bilingual qualifications, specialist support, and reliable assessment to schools and colleges across the country. This allows our learners to reach their full potential.

With more than 70 years' experience, we are also amongst the leading providers in both England and Northern Ireland.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk