



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel GCE
Music Technology
8MT0/01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2024

Publications Code 8MT0_01_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

AS Music Technology Component 1: 8MT0-01
Recording – June 2025

Similarly to previous years, the recordings this year showed a wide range of responses. Most centres and candidates had followed the 'spirit' of the task in their choice of song, instrumental arrangement, processing and mixing choices. Across the cohort, all the artists from the list of 10 were covered. Many centres displayed good practice, with each candidate recording a different song and having full control over their choice of mic and placement. It is not good practice to have many candidates all recording the same song.

There were a lot of centres who had encouraged the candidates to take ownership of their work and produce their own arrangements of the song. The combination of the instrumental requirements and providing a list of artists led to most candidates making suitable choices for their work. This meant that most of the work submitted was appropriate for AS level and all candidates were being assessed on a level playing field. There were a small number of candidates who attempted more complex mixes, which were generally less successful as they made the task too difficult for an AS level candidate who has been studying recording for less than a year. The intention of the AS recording task is for an acoustic arrangement, with the mix focussed on the compulsory instruments. There were a lot of candidates this year who produced successful recordings based on simple musical arrangements. Some candidates attempted mixes which were too complex, and the end result was less successful as they do not have the skills yet to manage a complex, dense mix.

Once again this year, examiners found that most centres and candidates produced recordings based on viable musical arrangements that met the time and instrumentation requirements of the specification.

The recordings achieved scores across the full range of the mark scheme, from below 20 to some candidates producing well-crafted recordings scoring high marks. It is worth noting that where recordings scored low marks, this was often due to specification infringement rather than poor work. Centres must pay attention to the requirements of the recording component and ensure they advise and guide their students towards meeting these.

A candidate who does not meet these minimum requirements will not be able to access the full range of the mark scheme. Most candidates submitted work which fitted the requirement, which was encouraging.

The mark scheme allows examiners to differentiate candidates, with more marks spread across capture and processing. The mark scheme is also focused more on the way candidates had handled acoustic guitar and lead vocal.

When organising a recording, candidates should consider a few things. Firstly, the recording should be of a viable and appropriate musical arrangement. The musical ensemble is required to be: acoustic guitar, bass or double bass, lead vocals and two other *different* instruments from backing vocal, electric guitar, acoustic melody instrument, keyboard. Two keyboard parts (e.g. piano and organ) does *not* count as two different parts. Whilst it is acceptable to include two keyboard parts in the arrangement, in order to meet the requirements of the specification, the candidate would also need to record another different type of instrument (i.e. backing vocals, acoustic melody instrument or electric guitar).

Also, candidates should consider the playing style of their instruments. Some recordings had parts that were stylistically mis-matched (for example a light acoustic recording which then had heavy slap bass,

or choosing synth timbres that don't blend well with acoustic guitar), which made the task of mixing the recording unnecessarily challenging for the candidate.

Teachers and candidates are reminded of the importance of accuracy and clarity in the Logbooks. The purpose of the Logbook is to tell the examiner about the work the candidate has done to create their mix. If a log is not fully completed, the candidate may not be fully credited for the work they have done. Some were very detailed and included a good description of the candidates mix choices, either through well-chosen screen shots of plug in settings or through a description of the settings used (for example giving the frequency, boost/cut level and Q value for EQ settings). Contrary to this, there were also too many logbooks which were either incomplete, or had no useful information (for example simply writing 'Reverb' under FX). Some candidates simply drew a 'squiggle' to represent the EQ settings with no scale or labelling to give any indication of the frequency or the amount of boost/cut. It is much more helpful for the examiner to insert a screenshot of the plug in, clearly showing the settings, with a brief explanation of the reasons for the settings used. The track sheet in the Logbook is for the candidate to explain what settings they have used in their recording, not to tell the examiner what a plug in does (for example a lot of candidates had written something along the lines of "a compressor is used to control the dynamics of a recording" but not given any further detail about how they had edited the settings for each track).

It is also important that the photographs the candidate submits match the audio and assist the examiner in assessing the recording work. Also, the musician/singer must be in the photograph so the examiner can judge the mic placement relative the sound source. Photographs must be taken at the time of recording. It is not appropriate to 'stage' photographs after the event as this is not an accurate record of the candidates' mic and placement choices.

Some candidates this year made use of AI tools. It was really exciting to see centres and candidates embracing this new technology and incorporating it into their work. Music Technology is a subject which is constantly developing new technologies. From an assessment point of view, examiners treat AI plug ins the same way as any other plug in. In other words, they are assessing how the candidate has controlled and edited the plug in, and how successful the candidate's work has been in the context of the overall recording. Whilst working with AI tools, centres must ensure candidates are working within the general guidelines for ethical use of AI.

Administration

All centres submitted their work by the May 15th deadline. It is, of course, perfectly acceptable to upload your candidates' submissions before the deadline. LWT can be very busy around the deadline day.

Most centres had clearly named the candidates' files, making it easy to identify who had completed the work. Not all centres had submitted work in the correct format; centres are urged to read the ASG before candidates bounce their work to ensure that the correct file type is used. Candidates should check their files before submission to make sure they are correct, including that the start and end points for their bounce have been set correctly. It is essential that files are labelled as detailed in the ASG. DAW files must be submitted as a folder, which must be zipped before uploading.

General Advice

AG1-4 are split into 3 columns – acoustic guitar, lead vocal and other parts. Under 'Other Parts' examiners are considering how all the parts work together – such as distribution of frequencies across the whole mix or the consistency of how reverb has been applied.

AG1: Capture

Examiners consider choice and positioning of microphones or other capture method used. For some sound sources there are a range of appropriate and acceptable capture methods, for example a bass could be DI'd or the bass amp could be mic'd (or both and then the two signals blended in the final mix); keyboard parts can be mic'd, DI'd or MIDI sequenced. The examiner will assess how successfully the instruments have been recorded and the clarity of the capture. No capture method is considered to be the 'right' way, and examiners heard some good examples of all capture methods in the recordings this year.

Most centres have a range of microphones, giving the candidates the opportunity to select the mic of their choice for capture. Most candidates selected appropriate mics for vocals and electronic instruments.

Most candidates used a pair of mics (sometimes a pair of small diaphragm condenser, occasionally a condenser and a dynamic) for acoustic guitar, which results in successful capture. This year very few candidates chose to double track their acoustic guitar. This approach is strongly advised. A properly double tracked acoustic guitar (not ADT) fills out a mix, gives the acoustic guitar part more 'body' and depth, helps to fill the stereo field. Double tracking at the capture stage takes very little extra time but will reap benefits in the overall mix. There were a lot of candidates who placed two mics on the acoustic guitar and panned these quite extreme in the mix. This does not give the same effect as double tracking, and can introduce unwanted phasing issues.

Overall, capture was successful this year. Most candidates captured a range of instruments with a range of techniques.

DI's were appropriately used for keyboard parts and occasionally for electric guitar (usually successfully, making use of amp simulators in the mix to good effect). This year candidates captured bass using either DI or a mic on the cab – both methods created some good recordings. There was a move this year towards more use of acoustic instruments – trumpets, saxophone, acoustic piano and violins were all recorded to good effect, with much less use of software synthesizer/keyboard parts. It is good that the candidates are being given the opportunity to experience recording such a wide range of instruments.

Sometimes good capture was hindered by poor or inconsistent playing. Whilst it is appreciated that centres do not always have a wide pool of musicians to call upon for their recordings, this should be taken into consideration when deciding on the additional instruments that are recorded. A poorly played instrument can result in a lot of extra work needed in the mixing process.

As part of the capture process, candidates are expected to ensure that the instrument parts are in time and in tune.

AG2: Processing of EQ

The most successful candidates demonstrated a real understanding of the purpose of EQ within the context of the whole mix, and how it was used to help with balance and blend. The intention was for processing which followed modern practice. Most candidates were aiming for this.

Most candidates were successful in creating a general EQ profile that covered the full spectrum but also allowed each part to have its own space.

Common errors were: hi-mid biased or harsh vocals, in particular not really dealing with unpleasant sibilance; acoustic guitars that were thin and tinny or with a pronounced low-mid bias; muddy basses with little definition; and pianos that had exaggerated hi-mids. If a centre does not have a good acoustic piano for recording, it is perfectly acceptable to use a VST/AU piano plug in for this part. Most modern DAWs have a good range of good sounding piano instruments.

In contrast, those candidates who were successful had considered the song as a whole as well as each individual track to craft their EQ. When marking, the examiners are considering the EQ of each instrument and also the range of EQ across the whole mix and how the instruments sit together. Candidates should be guided to consider this when mixing their recordings.

Whilst it is often necessary for logistical purposes for candidates to work on headphones in the classroom, centres are strongly encouraged to invest in studio reference headphones with a flatter frequency response and that all recordings should be monitored on your studio speakers before submitting the work to your examiner.

AG3: Dynamic Processing

Again here, the most successful candidates were those who understood the purpose of compression in the wider context of the overall mix.

Dynamic processing always differentiates well at AS level.

Most candidates compressed the vocals at the very least, although many seemed to just insert a compression plug-in and leave it on its default settings. The most common errors were under compression, over compression and attack times too long meaning transients (particularly on acoustic guitar) were quite 'pokey' in many recordings. There was evidence in some recordings and their supporting logbooks that some candidates knew they had to insert a compression plug in but didn't really understand what it did or how to edit the settings. In particular, candidates need a better understanding of how threshold needs to be used in compression – many candidates had compression plug ins that were having no effect on the sound because the settings had not been edited.

The candidates who understood dynamics processing had attempted the high compression sound common in modern recordings, putting some compression on all parts and also, sometimes, some compression (sometimes multiband) on the stereo out to 'glue' the song together. Some candidates over compressed the stereo out resulting in pumping that wasn't usually appropriate for the acoustic style of the musical arrangement.

The most successful candidates had achieved good even results that still had some life. Like with EQ, the examiners are considering how the use of compression has affected the whole mix as well as each individual instrument. Well-crafted compression will have an effect on the balance and on the mastering level.

Logbooks were helpful here, as the information provided helped to confirm what could be heard in the audio and helped the examiner to determine whether, for example, lack of dynamic control was because the candidate had not used compression, or because they had not edited the settings appropriately.

AG4: Use of Effects

Consistency across parts was the key here, with a reminder of the instruction to apply modern standards of processing. The most successful candidates here were those who took a holistic view of effects processing and understood the use of reverb in the context of the overall mix.

Most candidates used some kind of reverb across their tracks.

The most successful made good use of reverb busses to make their recordings coherent and give the impression of all the musicians playing 'in the same place'. These successful candidates had analysed modern recording/mixing practice and produced a tight, but not too dry sound.

On the other hand, some candidates did not put any reverb on anything, scoring 0 for effects. Some candidates had captured some natural room reverb with their acoustic guitar, and where this was well controlled and appropriately balanced, the examiners were able to give credit for this.

Sometimes, acoustic instruments (especially piano) had too much natural room ambience, resulting in very distant sounding parts that were inconsistent with the rest of the recording.

Vocal reverb was very well applied this year, with candidates applying reverb with subtlety to keep the vocals from being dry, without losing any clarity.

In addition to reverb, many candidates experimented with other effects – usually successfully. In particular, there was a lot of good use of electric guitar effects, overdrive and distortion and some good creative use of delays, mostly on vocals.

General note:

The capture and processing of the recording, under the mark scheme, accounts for 80% of the marks for this task; therefore, centres are encouraged to guide their students to spend an appropriate proportion of their time working on these. It was disappointing to see some logs where the candidate had simply written 'None' across EQ, FX and Dynamic Processing – effectively ruling out 60% of the marks available.

When an instrumental part was too quiet in the mix to be able to fully assess processing, this limited the marks a candidate could be awarded in AG1-4 (and affects the balance and blend mark in AG5).

AG5: Balance and Blend

Most candidates understood the process and intention of mixing. Most mixes were sensible with all parts audible, with only minor slips.

A common mistake was to have one part too high in the mix, not masking, but just overpowering the other parts.

Some very good practice was heard this year in the balancing and blending of lead vocals over an instrumental backing. Parts were blended to sit together as a coherent whole, with the lead vocal sitting neatly on top, but without exaggeration. On the whole, candidates seemed to have put some thought into the balance of their mix.

The most successful candidates had considered balance in conjunction with EQ, dynamic processing and panning to produce a well-crafted recording. This holistic approach is a good way to approach the mixing of the AS recording task. Candidates should not under-estimate how long they should spend on their mixing.

If any of the instrument parts was under the required length, no higher than level 2 can be awarded in AG5.

Unsuccessful mixes were muddy and untidy or had one part over dominant and masking other important parts.

It is good practice to listen to the finished mix on a range of speakers and headphones before submission.

AG6: Use of Stereo

Success here was mixed and partly dependent on choice of musical arrangement.

Examiners want to hear the full stereo field being used, without bias or exaggeration. Whilst there are no 'rules' to the use of panning, the expectation is that candidates follow modern practice. Therefore, it is expected that bass and lead vocal will be panned to the centre and that other parts, if panned, should be balanced across the stereo field.

This year, many candidates, through their choice of instrumentation, left themselves few options for much use of stereo. As mentioned in AG1, most did not double track acoustic guitars, meaning three of their five instruments had to be panned centre. Some compensated for this by using stereo keyboard parts, which filled out the stereo field quite well (as did stereo reverbs) or had 2 or 3 backing vocals or electric guitar parts which were spread out across the stereo field. In particular, some very good work on backing vocals was heard, with parts spread evenly across the stereo field to surround the lead vocal.

Candidates would be advised to consider how their choice of instrumentation and capture choices will affect the potential for use of stereo field. Most candidates could have used stereo field more effectively.

AG7: Management of noise, distortion, master level and audio editing

This year, many candidates did not achieve full marks in AG7. A neatly trimmed start and end to the mix, a good overall mastering level and clean edits to the audio (including comping where used) will achieve good marks in this assessment grid.

Common errors were either noisy start/end where individual tracks had not been trimmed correctly or lead in/out which were too long because the bounce range had not been set correctly.

Some good candidates made use of compression and/or limiting on their stereo out channel to help achieve a good overall bounce/mastering level.

This year, most candidates were able to create a recording lasting between 2 and 2½ minutes which was musically satisfying.

There were a small number of recordings that were too long – the musical arrangement should be considered at the planning stage to ensure the recording meets the requirements for length.

Candidates are reminded of the importance of checking their files after they have been bounced to ensure that the work is ready for submission and free from errors.