# INTRODUCTION

To enhance understanding of the standards of the HKDSE Examination, authentic samples of candidates' scripts in the 2020 examination are selected to form this set of exemplars which serve to illustrate the typical performance standards at different levels.

There are three compulsory papers in this subject. This set of exemplars is selected from candidates' scripts of the listening papers, their video recordings of the ensemble performances and their audio recordings of the creating portfolios to illustrate the typical performance standards at different levels.

It is advisable to read this set of exemplars together with the question papers and the marking schemes in order to understand the requirements of the questions and the marking criteria. The question papers and the marking schemes are published in the 2020 HKDSE Question Papers (with marking schemes and comments on candidates' performance).

# Paper 2

# Level 5 Exemplar 1

#### **Comments**

### **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. F. Schubert Gretchen am Spinnrade, Op. 2
- 2. W.A. Mozart Arch, ich fuehl's from die Zauberfloete
- 3. R. Quilter Love's Philosophy, Op. 3, No. 1

## Ensemble:

Voice and Piano

### Instrument:

Voice

### **Comments**

- 1. The songs were superbly presented in a buoyant ensemble.
- 2. Control of voice was good despite signs of slight immaturity. Basics such as pitch and rhythm were well-managed.
- 3. Flow of music was fluent on the whole. A small deficiency in diction, owing probably to the dental braces worn by the candidate, was observed.
- 4. A stylish performance on a well-chosen repertoire.

## Level 5 Exemplar 2

#### **Comments**

# **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. Ning Bao Sheng Spring on Xiang River
- 2. C. Debussy IV Ballet, Petite Suite

### Ensemble:

- 1. Dizi and Yangqin
- 2. Piano four hands

## Instrument:

- 1. Dizi
- 2. 1st Piano

- 1. Playing in both pieces was competent with good awareness of ensembleship.
- 2. Technique was very satisfactory but there were minor pitch imperfections in the dizi at times. Soft passages in the piano piece would have benefited from a more delicate touch.
- 3. Performance was generally fluent and the music was expressive and well- articulated.
- 4. Styles adopted were mostly appropriate.

# Level 4 Exemplar 1

### **Comments**

#### **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. J. Brahms Hungarian Dance Nos. 2, 3 & 5
- 2. G. H. Green Valse Brillante

### Ensemble:

- 1. Piano four hands
- 2. Xylophone and Piano

#### Instrument:

- 1. 1st Piano
- 2. Xylophone

### **Comments**

- 1. The ensembles were competent with good communication between players.
- 2. Technique was solid despite occasional slips.
- 3. Music flow was fluid overall but there were some minor tempo inconsistencies.
- 4. It was a pleasing performance on the whole but could have done with more variations both in expressions and dynamics.

## Level 4 Exemplar 2

### **Comments**

### **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. J. S. Bach Concerto for Violin & Oboe, Allegro (excerpt)
- 2. R. Schumann Romanze, Op.94

# Ensemble:

- 1. Violin, Oboe & Piano
- 2. Oboe & Piano

# Instrument:

Piano

- 1. Both ensembles played well together with sufficient communication among players.
- 2. The pieces were by and large well- paced but the concerto was a little slow for 'Allegro'. The pianist, obviously the strongest player in the ensembles, rendered good support to other members throughout the entire performance.
- 3. Flow of music was mostly fluid.
- 4. The candidate at the piano, together with the ensembles, was successful in presenting a decent performance, though there was a lack of strong features of musical interest.

# Level 3 Exemplar 1

#### **Comments**

### **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. C. P. E. Bach Allegro, Sonata in g minor, BWV 1020
- 2. P. Gaubert Sicilienne

### Ensemble:

Flute & Piano

## Instrument:

Flute

### **Comments**

- 1. The flautist stood in such a position that the piano was behind her back, thus inhibiting communication between the players.
- 2. Pitch and rhythm were well attempted despite occasional loss of control of embouchure. End of phrase long notes needed to be sustained more.
- 3. The performance was mostly fluent and steady.
- 4. It could have done with more expression and contrast to be musically convincing.

## Level 3 Exemplar 2

# **Comments**

# **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. J. S. Bach Air on the G String
- 2. Crosby Doane arr. D. E. Smith To God Be The Glory

# Ensemble:

- 1. Alto Saxophone Duet
- 2. 2 Alto Saxophone & Piano

## Instrument:

- 1. 1st Alto Saxophone
- 2. 2nd Alto Saxophone

- 1. The ensembles played well together despite some sluggishness by the Saxophones.
- 2. The instruments were mostly in tune but the Bach could have been more sustained and smoother.
- 3. The flow of music lacked fluency somewhat.
- 4. Some expressions were apparent but in general the playing needed more punch in dynamics, and variation in tone colour.

# Level 2 Exemplar 1

#### **Comments**

### **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. W. A. Mozart Allegro, Sonata in Bb, K333
- 2. F. Schubert Fantasia in f minor, Op. 103

### Ensemble:

Piano Duet

## Instrument:

Primo

### **Comments**

- 1. The duet played together but appeared a bit flustered and unbalanced. The players chose to do the pieces on two grand pianos and positioned themselves in such a way that they could hardly see each other. Hence, co-operation was difficult to achieve.
- 2. Technique was adequate to cover the pieces on hand but the lax attitude as well as the carefree approach brought little success.
- 3. There was no problem with the continuity of the music but there was plenty of sloppiness and clashes within it.
- 4. There was a lot of room for improvement in expressiveness, style, interpretation etc.

# Level 2 Exemplar 2

### **Comments**

## **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. F. Schubert Andante, Sonata in D, Op. 137, No. 1
- 2. C. Bohm Introduction and Polonaise, No. 12

## Ensemble:

Violin and Piano

## Instrument:

Violin

- 1. The ensemble collaborated well.
- 2. Basic rhythm was well handled but pitch was not always centred. Tone was rather Bland, partly due to the lack of vibrato. The music was also not properly phrased or articulated.
- 3. There was some fluency in the flow of the music.
- 4. Plenty needs to be done in expression and dynamics to achieve a musical performance.

# Level 1 Exemplar 1

## **Comments**

### **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. T. Gauger Wellingto 22
- 2. K. Tuck Tribal Beat

### Ensemble:

- 1. Drum Duet
- 2. Percussion Duet

#### Instrument:

- 1. Drums
- 2. Drums & Wood Block

### **Comments**

- 1. Both duets were written in an almost identical style, composed of various, but similar rhythmic patterns for unpitched percussion of drums, drum set and wood block.
- 2. Technique was adequate for the rendition of repeated rhythms, and there was little or no variation, even in tempo.
- 3. The music was almost continuous without any stops, and sounded monotonous at times.
- 4. Expression and dynamics were not apparent nor appealing.
- 5. Marks were deducted both for pieces not being in contrasting styles and incomplete score submission.

# Level 1 Exemplar 2

### **Comments**

## **Pieces Performed:**

- 1. M. Nightingale Who's Afraid of the Big Bad Pike?
- 2. C. V. Stanford Intermezzo No. 2 from Three Intermezzi, Op. 13

### Ensemble:

Clarinet & Piano

## Instrument:

Clarinet

- 1. The clarinet piano duet followed each other cautiously.
- 2. Pitch and rhythm were adequately managed with some dubious phrasing. Embouchure control needs further work to be mature.
- 3. The flow of music was fluent without much agitation.
- 4. There were hints of good understanding of musical styles of the pieces attempted.