



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel GCE
Music (9MU0)
Paper 02: Composing

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 9MU0_02_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

General Introduction

This report has been compiled by the Principal Examiner from information supplied by the examining team responsible for the marking of this unit. As such its emphasis is anecdotal rather than statistical but it is hoped that the comments below will be useful to centres in their future work with students in this subject area.

Popularity of options

Once again, over four fifths of students chose a free composition, for which they set their own style/genre, audience and occasion. Compositions in a broadly tonal idiom, based on Baroque, Classical or Romantic styles were the most common, with Film or video game scores and music in popular idioms only slightly less popular.

Students attempting one of the set brief options were most likely to have chosen the 'Superhero' Film music brief but the 'Slow movement' instrumental brief was also attempted by a reasonable number. Other set brief options received much less attention.

For the Briefs assessing technique the Bach Chorale option was again attempted by around three quarters of students, a roughly similar proportion to 2023. The numbers attempting the Arrangement option had increased slightly and the Remix option continued to be attempted by a solid base of students. Once again, there were a very small number of students who attempted the Two-part counterpoint option.

Free compositions

Most compositions were to briefs provided by the students themselves. Although it is sufficient to outline the brief in terms of style, purpose, genre and audience and occasion on the Composing Authentication Sheet (CAS), many students also included a separate commentary on their work. This kind of information was often very useful, even if it is not a requirement, but it was noted by examiners that some commentaries went well beyond what was needed to clarify the composer's intentions in terms of both length and detail. Similarly, screenshots from DAW pieces can be informative, especially in terms of clarifying the structure of a piece, as can lead sheets and lyric/chord sheets for pop songs. Strong submissions were quite common and were often related to or modelled on one of the current set briefs or one from a previous year. Students continued to choose genres or styles with which they were familiar or perhaps ones related to the set works in 9MU0/03, where their detailed knowledge of the working of the music enhanced the quality of the end product in their own composition. Where the students' own briefs were rather vague the music tended to follow suit, often lacking focus and direction. Conversely there were some briefs, mostly for Film music, which were simply too complex, and which produced pieces which struggled to maintain coherence through simply having too many ideas to express. Once again there were some highly successful submissions in all genres and styles, with several examples of full marks awarded for pieces which were outstanding in their maturity, assurance and imagination from composers still so early in their development.

The requirement to submit a composition lasting at least four minutes was met by most students, with several examples of very successful pieces lasting up to and over twice that time. However, pieces much beyond eight minutes tended to lose direction

and were sometimes unable to maintain the interest of the listener, suggesting that some editing could have been beneficial. There were a few examples of multi-movement pieces or sets of short pieces being submitted. Centres are reminded that the specification expectation is that Free compositions should be in one, continuous movement.

Composition 1 (Free or to a set brief) Importance of the Assessment Criteria

A good understanding of the Assessment criteria plays an important part in a successful submission. Students should be encouraged to consult the Assessment criteria at all stages of their composing work, from planning through to final realisation. This is particularly true of the necessity to 'build-in' the possibility of expressive contrast into pieces in order to fulfil the requirements of Grid 2: too many pieces seemed to miss the opportunity to access higher levels of this criterion by choosing briefs that led to limited opportunities in this respect.

Grid 1 Creating and developing musical ideas with coherence.

This grid can earn a maximum of 13/40 of the marks for Composition 1. The majority of the marks were in levels 3 or 4 of the assessment criteria. Students' work sometimes reached the top of level four (11/13), but level 5 marks were, as in 2023, comparatively rare. At the lower end there were some marks in level 2 (3-5/13) and a very few in level 1 (1-2/13). This criterion assesses not only the overall coherence and shape of a piece, and its fluency and variety, but also the shape, organisation and balance of individual sections, and the bar-to-bar coherence of the music in terms of a sense of direction. Higher marks are available to those pieces that manage the balance of unity and variety carefully, whatever the musical structure chosen, and in which a sense of wholeness can be felt. The creation of, and development of, distinctive and varied musical ideas is also key to success here. Work scoring highly again included some strong examples of well-handled Sonata Form, vibrant Film music scores where the sections had been skilfully linked, some Pop music where popular song forms had been matched with stylish material and production skills, and some imaginative 20th century style pieces. There were also, of course, weaker examples of pieces in all the above genres. One examiner commented on the management of some pop song structures as follows:

Some pop songs have struggled to make the chorus stand out. The verse melodies on two or three pitches are popular but some songs fail to develop significantly enough for the chorus to be memorable. Second verses are often direct repeats in weaker submissions whereas stronger pieces will change the texture adding instrumental or vocal layers interacting with the main melody.

At the lower end of the mark range pieces often employed rather modest material, perhaps involving repetition of one or perhaps two melodic ideas or chord sequences or presented music that lost direction and coherence as the result of an over-abundance of ideas.

Grid 2 Creating and developing musical ideas with expressive control.

This criterion carries 14/40 of the marks and is an opportunity for the student's music to be rewarded for its creativity, ambition, artistic and emotional impact. This grid

rewards not only the effectiveness of the student's response to the brief but also their ability to use the musical elements to create and sustain contrasting moods and atmosphere in the service of the audience and occasion selected for the music.

Some students attempting the Pearson set briefs had taken careful notice of the detail and were therefore often able to access the higher levels of the mark scheme in their work. In these submissions, particularly Music for Film, there was some excellent work not only in the creation of mood in the first place, but also in ensuring that a good level of emotional contrast was achieved as the piece progressed. Some students opting for the 'Superhero' brief, for example, created a balancing 'villain' which gave scope not only for vivid contrasts but also for the depiction of some kind of conflict. Other students also included a 'love interest' for this option, which gave further expressive opportunities.

Students setting their own brief often made a good attempt at living up to their aims, but there continued to be quite a few examples of very vague briefs indeed ('piece for a school concert') where it was difficult for examiners to find the focus required in the music to allow students to access the higher range of the Assessment Criteria. That said, there were some very imaginative briefs indeed this year, often making connections into other art forms, such as Art, Dance or drama. Some students had also submitted a brief synopsis of the ideas behind their free composition, while a few pages of analytical detail were supplied by others. All of this was very helpful in the assessment process, even if not required, and all was read, although not marked. There continued to be some examples of Film music, for example, where little or no indication of plot/action had been included, either on the score or in a separate document. Although this is not required, it does when included give the examiner more evidence to work with in the allocation of a fair mark to the composition. At the other end of the spectrum in this respect some students annotated their scores with frequent descriptions of action, and although often useful, sometimes the result of this was music that changed course far too often in its attempt to mirror every plot event.

Another requirement of this criterion is the creation of 'contrasted and well-paced moods and atmospheres'. As mentioned above, these kind of contrasts need to be planned for from the beginning and it is concerning to see that some students have chosen genres and styles that make emotional contrast very difficult indeed, such as popular songs lacking any kind of contrasting bridges or 'drop' sections. Here, what is needed is not only some different musical material, but material that has a different impact on the listener. Changes of key, texture, speed, metre, rhythmic style can all help to achieve this. As one examiner commented:

The demands of grid 2 are still not clearly understood – how the use of the elements affects the emotional impact of the piece. Even dynamic contrasts were limited in many submissions.

Grid 3 Creating and developing musical ideas with technical control.

This criterion supplies a maximum of 13/40 of the marks for Composition 1. This grid covers the organisation of pitch, tonality, tempo, rhythm and metre, dynamics, as well as use of stylistic conventions, instrumentation and control of texture. With so many features to be considered here the marks given once again reflected a careful balance of positive and negative features, with examiners weighing for example the relative merits of good use of instruments and textures against weaker melodic shape or poor

rhythmic flow. Most students continued to be relatively adept at selecting and using their chosen forces (although the common problems remained – instruments placed in weak registers, cluttered textures, low tessitura chords in Piano left hand) and sometimes were also comfortable in using conventions of the musical style they had chosen. For example, one examiner commented:

.. there were numerous John Williams / Zimmer-esque features heard (swelling strings, brass fanfares, timpani rolls etc.) and also some extremely creative choices made in, for example, the use of unusual timbres, instrumental effects or harmonic devices ...

Another commented that:

Many candidates wrote parts that were playable but were not entirely native to the instrument

The weaker areas remained, all too often, the most basic ones: melodic shape, rhythmic flow and harmonic coherence and variety. Just as a solid performing technique is based on practice and rehearsal it is to be hoped that the compositions submitted for this component will be the end point of a process involving the development and practice of compositional technique honed through research and exercises.

Composition 2

Briefs assessing technique (BAT)

In this part of the component students could choose to spend their six hours working on a technical composition -Bach Chorales or Two-part counterpoint- or on an Arrangement or a Remix. Despite the wide range of styles here, three quarters of the marks came from three common assessment grids, although not all descriptors are used for all options here, with the fourth being individual to each option. The total mark here was out of 20, meaning that this component contributes a third of the marks in this component. In addition to the published Assessment criteria for these briefs, students and centres are encouraged to consult the document 'Guidance Notes on Briefs Assessing Technique' and the exemplars for each option, available on the Pearson A level Music website.

Bach Chorales

This was by far the most popular option, being attempted by over three-quarters of students. The two Chorales set contained a selection of common melodic shapes found in J.S.Bach's Chorale output and students will have encountered many of them in their preparations for this paper. On the whole examiners were pleased with the responses to this brief in 2024. Although still showing a very wide range of marks (from 4 to 20) it was felt that the overall standard had improved on 2023. One or two examiners did however still remark that some students, whose other composition showed good Music technology skills, might have been better attempting another option rather than the Chorales.

As an aid to centres, our Chorale setter has once again created exemplars of

harmonisations for each of this year's Chorales. This material is contained in the Appendix to this report. For each Chorale there are two harmonisations; Exemplar A and Exemplar B. Each is intended to show a submission that might have received full marks, but with differing approaches to the challenges of the given melodic lines. It must be stressed that these are simply examples, and that alternative solutions are (and were) possible, submitted and rewarded accordingly.

Chorale 1 was in D major and required the student to complete seven phrases. The initial leap of a fourth in the given part, also as an anacrusis, did cause some problems as any attempt to harmonise this with a perfect cadence would result in either parallel octaves (V-I) or exposed octaves (Vb-I). Viable solutions included a move between inversions of the tonic chord or a move from the tonic down to the submediant. The rest of the phrase was treated by most students as a perfect cadence in D major, perhaps due to the following given passage also being in the tonic key, although there were also attempts to finish the phrase on B major or even F# major chords. Modulation is an integral part of J S Bach's Chorale harmonisations and the management of key is one of the features covered by Grid 1 of the BAT assessment grids. The cadence in bar 6 can be interpreted as a modulation to B minor or perhaps as an Imperfect cadence in A major, preparing for the clear perfect cadence in A major at bar 8. The minim supertonic B at bar 8 requires some crotchet movement and ideally two chords, although a suspension would also work. The cadences at bars 10,12 and 14 would work in variety of keys – G major, A minor, E minor and C major were all chosen by students – although there were many who chose unwisely to remain in G major throughout this passage. The final cadence clearly led back to the tonic, D major, where the descent of the given Soprano line to a low D did cause some part-writing problems.

Chorale 2 was in G minor and contained five phrases to be completed. The first phrase needed not only to establish the tonic key securely, but also to negotiate the potential part-writing problem of the quaver figuration on the second beat of bar 2: these two quavers presented an ideal opportunity for treatment of the A as an accented passing note (with G minor, either in 1st inversion or root position, followed by ii7b –V on beats 3 and 4). Some students omitted the vital raised leading note F# here, resulting in a very unstylistic modal effect and a lack of tonal clarity. In addition, the minim that completed bar 2 should have been harmonised with two crotchet chords to maintain the rhythmic flow. The second phrase was correctly harmonised by stronger students as moving to Bb major, but there were still many that stayed in G minor here, which showed less enterprise. The given phrase that followed moved to D minor, the dominant, as did the phrase ending in bar 10. Weaker submissions often harmonised bars 8 -10 with a succession of tonic and dominant chords (often in root position) and while this was correct at a basic level, there were much more interesting solutions, which gained appropriate credit. The last two phrases strongly telegraphed the keys required by the inclusion of the leading note in the given part and were mostly harmonised securely. Many students made the stylistic choice to include a Tierce de Picardie on the last chord of the chorale.

Chord choice is becoming generally secure for most submissions, but some still overuse root position chords, which, aside from the lack of variety has the effect of making the Bass line rather angular. Students do need to be more confident in their use of inversions – particularly second inversions- and of other effects of chord choice. One examiner noted:

many candidates included inappropriate second inversion chords mid-phrase and many had weak to strong beat errors of repetition. Very few attempted to include harmonic tension in the form of accented passing notes, or diminished 7ths, and a minority were able to successfully include suspensions to access the higher marks

Although chord and key choice is central to this brief, it is only one of four criteria credited with the same number of potential marks. Stylistic features (rewarded under Grid 2) were attempted by many students, for example in the correct treatment of the leading note at cadences, and some had tried to include at least some quaver movement. However, this, as in previous years, had resulted often in unwanted part-writing errors. The tessitura of the tenor part works best if most of the notes are at the top of, or above the bass staff, and this was recognised by some students, but not all. Some of the strongest students were able to successfully incorporate both suspensions and chromaticism into their Chorales this year and to make smooth and secure links in and out of the given material. On the less positive side, there were also some examples of suspensions being resolved during a pause chord, an effect that should be used only once in any chorale, and of a leading note descending via a passing note to the dominant, which should not be used at all.

Although examiners did comment on some improvement, part-writing (assessed in Grid 3) remains a weak area for some students, the main problem being the large number of parallels in some students' work. When this is between Bass and Soprano, this not only indicates poor part-writing, but also a poor choice of harmony. Overlaps, doubling of the leading note, part-crossing and poor dissonance treatment were also common problems here, as well as the tendency to create exposed 5ths and octaves when the Soprano part leaps – the solution to this is to ensure contrary motion in the Bass at these points. Some weaker submissions omitted the third of the chord and one or two even saw fit to change the given Soprano line. Aside from the technical security of part-writing it is also pleasing to note that some stronger students were also able to include contrary motion between the Bass and Soprano lines and to achieve some rhythmic independence between the parts.

As in 2023, many students understood the importance of a flowing Bass line, with some contrary motion in relation to the Soprano, and there were also some flowing and 'singable' Alto and Tenor lines, which were duly rewarded under Grid 4. Weaker Bass lines often lacked shape, moving either by small intervals rather shapelessly, or with larger leaps, creating an angular feel, possibly as the result of an over-use of root position chords in the harmony. Inner parts occasionally contained rather static or 'oscillating' shapes, while in the minor key chorale, there were many examples of rising augmented seconds or fourths. The consideration of links with given material also had a definite effect on the line at times, with some surprising (and perhaps unintentional) effects.

There were again some very weak attempts at this option where the student seemed to have little grasp of the workings of tonal harmony, and some where the work was incomplete to varying degrees.

Unfortunately, there was some evidence of suspected malpractice for this option, involving possible collusion between students. These were referred to the appropriate Pearson department. Centres are reminded of their responsibility to ensure that examination materials are kept securely between sessions of controlled conditions and that students' conduct during the controlled conditions is appropriate.

Two –part counterpoint

There were again very few attempts at this option with marks ranging from 18 /20 to 5. While some students showed a good sense of harmonic and tonal movement, allied with stylish melodic lines which had shape and direction, weaker students showed little regard for the relationship between the two parts. Examiner comment:

The weakest candidates seemed to have little awareness of dissonant intervals and how they should be treated. Their answers were peppered with unprepared and unresolved fourths, sevenths and ninths.

Students should be comfortable in dealing with compound time signatures at this level but there was some evidence that difficulties had been experienced, not only in interpreting the implied harmonic implications of the given parts, but also in implementing other features implied by them, such as suspensions.

Examiner comment:

The principal stumbling block for all but the best candidates were the tied notes in the bass. These were intended to be treated as suspensions if they were followed by a note one step lower. Failure to recognise this meant that the progression would have the same bass note from a weak to a strong beat, possibly the same harmony as well. Some candidates then tied the above notes in the added part, taking away any possibility of the appropriate tension being created at those moments.

Students are reminded that using some of the given material within their answer is positively encouraged and creates a sense of musical unity within the piece. The use of imitation is also encouraged. This option develops both harmonic, rhythmic and melodic skills at the same time and it would be encouraging to see a rise in the number of students attempting this option in future years.

Arrangement

This was the second most popular of the four BAT options and attracted more students than in 2023, perhaps due to the familiarity of the stimulus. The aim of the arrangement option is for the student to present the given melody in a new setting which is relevant to the audience and occasion stated in the brief. In this case 'My Bonnie..' was to be used in the soundtrack of a documentary about marine pollution. Some students did attempt to reflect the environmental issues in their music, using everything from minor tonalities to clashing dissonance and atonality. However, many students simply presented a straightforward arrangement of the melody, mostly still in its original key and normally still in 6/8.

Harmonisation of the stimulus in its original key was common, and mostly capably done, but some students' work went no farther than this in harmonic terms and other attempts to be more creative failed due to technical shortcomings. There were also some highly creative uses of both harmony and of modulation, which were duly rewarded. The 6/8 rhythm was often maintained throughout (although some students notated this in $\frac{3}{4}$ without appearing to know the difference), ignoring the creative possibilities that a change of meter would offer.

Establishing a clear sense of style quickly is essential for this brief and a key skill to be worked on. Most students opted, almost as a default, to the lilting folky style of the original melody, but with varying degrees of success. One examiner commented:

Many candidates seem not to have a clear idea of the style of music they wish to write and so the result is often pale, lacking the vividness a well-thought-through style can bring to an arrangement in terms of melodic, rhythmic, harmonic and instrumental features.

However, there were some very imaginative approaches to the style, as experienced by another examiner:

I had the pleasure of listening to one very noteworthy submission; a characterful reggae version not dissimilar to "Ghost Town" as recorded by The Specials... Both the musical and background elements of this resonated strongly and it was good to see a student really putting their stylistic stamp on the music.

Structure is also important, even in a short piece. There were many efforts that included an introduction to the main melody, perhaps a contrasting section between verses, ending with a brief coda, in a simple but effective pattern. Others took a more narrative approach, based on the pollution theme, with the music following the plotline of the documentary. Sadly, too many seemed to take a rather random approach to structure, with a resulting lack of clarity of shape and often a lack of direction in the music as a whole.

The brief specified the use of two voices and most students complied with this, although the level of skill in the vocal writing varied widely. In some weaker submissions one voice was allocated the given melody and the other tracked this as a lower or upper part, often in rhythmic unison. Not all students chose to set the words supplied and while some use of a wordless vocalise is doubtless a valid musical tool amongst a setting, it is limiting in expressive terms. There were also some submissions, accompanied by DAW screenshots, where synthesised (wordless) voice parts gave the examiner no information whatsoever of the student's intentions for the lyrics. Many submissions added one chordal and one melody instrument to the vocal parts, with popular choices being piano, violin and harp. The writing for these instruments ranged from idiomatic and effective through functional but dull to unplayable.

When students chose to develop the original melody there were often quite interesting results, although there were some examples where this process had been taken to extreme lengths to the detriment of musical sense, as noted by one examiner:

Some centres took the brief as more of a composition task rather than an arrangement task, using little, if any, of the original stimulus, but rather created new settings of the words.

Some submissions added completely new ideas as a contrast to the stimulus material, while some wrote completely new melodic shapes while maintaining some of the original rhythms.

Remix

This option has a small but stable number of submissions, with many students showing considerable skills in the use of music technology.

This year's stimulus was in Eb major, in a slower, more Ballad-like style. Although some students created a viable accompanying chord sequence that matched the vocal sample well, many produced either a very static set of chords, or perhaps one which seemed to bear very little relation to the stimulus it was meant to accompany. There were examples of carefully created countermelodies but too often another riff was simply overlaid with little regard for the cumulative effect. Rhythmic styles were generally reasonably successful, although getting variety into a drum pattern is more difficult than it seems and was beyond some students here. Centres are reminded that use of drum loops not written by the student should be declared, either on the CAS form or in accompanying documentation to the submission.

A real sense of style was often present in stronger submissions here, as was a suitable structure, whether or not it included a 'drop' or breakdown section. A clear sense of shape, such as a verse/chorus structure, is important in this option, and it was slightly concerning to note the number of submissions in which this clarity was lacking. On examiner noted:

Some weaker candidates lacked a planned structure from the outset, composing as they go along with a rather haphazard end result.

Dance music works by raising and lowering the excitement levels of its audience, and this factor also needs to be built into the structuring of this option. Some weaker students struggled to establish a style here while others found any kind of balance between unity and variety very difficult to achieve, often producing over-repetitive results.

The use of music technology was central to this task, and many students had used technology not only to produce a clear, balanced recording, but also as a creative tool to enhance the end product. In this respect there were many skilled uses of effects, signal processing and digital editing, as well as much creativity in the choice of appropriate timbres, synthesised, sampled and occasionally live.

The sample this year was a male voice. Weaker submissions sometimes left the original sample virtually unaltered, or perhaps failed to synchronise it successfully with the added accompaniment. There were more submissions this year in which the sample had been radically fragmented and re-ordered and while some of these were very effective some were taken to such a degree that the music lacked direction and shape. Students are required by the brief to use the whole stimulus at least once, and there were more examples this year of submissions where this had not been done with marks lost accordingly.

Once again, examiners were pleased at the overall standard of attempts at this option, and at the variety and musicality shown.

Underlength submissions

Following a decision by Ofqual in March 2019, Pearson adopted a system of scaled reductions of the overall mark on a sliding scale where the total length of the submission did not reach the required 6 minutes: this matches with a similar process in the Performing option. There were only a very few underlength submissions this year, but the process was still monitored and checked by Team Leaders and the Principal examiner for accuracy of timings. There were also some submissions where the free composition failed to reach the required four minutes or where the BAT was less than one minute, but where the whole folio still reached six minutes in total. These were also referred to senior examiners for checking and advice. Centres are reminded that the timings must be accurately recorded, and that the time 'allowance' for Chorales and 2-parts is fixed each year and cannot be altered by submitting a recording that lasts longer than these.

There were still a few examples where students had left significant sections of the Chorale option incomplete. In such cases examiners were instructed to mark as if the missing sections were incorrect, often leading to marks in the lowest two levels of the assessment grids.

Administration

Most of submissions were uploaded to the LWT site by the 15 May deadline, with the correct accompanying paperwork, scores and recordings. Examiners then returned submissions to centres if anything was omitted or not correct, the most common omissions being lack of recordings for the BATs or missing signatures on the CAS forms. Centres are reminded that they should follow the file naming format outlined in the ASG and that it is important that the files themselves work, are in the correct format, and that scans of Chorale workings can be easily read. Some centres submitted separate recordings and scores for each Chorale, while others uploaded one score file with a single recording. Centres are reminded to adhere to the acceptable audio file formats outlined in the current ASG and that MIDI or Sibelius files are not acceptable. Centres are asked to keep copies securely of all submissions in case of loss or damage, and this once again proved vital to the assessment process for a few students during the marking period.

My thanks go, as ever, to my team of examiners for this component, to my Team Leader, Nick Kerrison, to Michael Nicholas, Chief Examiner, and Graeme Lodge, Chair, for their help and support throughout. At Pearson, Owen Wright has provided calm, efficient support through the entire process. This component requires a wide and deep skillset to teach, learn or assess and its continued success bears witness to the hard work and dedication of all involved.

Principal Examiner
July 2024

Appendix - Chorale Exemplars

Working A

CHORALE 1

VERSION A

Handwritten musical notation for measures 1-5 of Choral 1, Version A. The score is in treble and bass clefs with a key signature of two sharps (F# and C#) and a common time signature (C). A handwritten asterisk is above the first measure. The notation includes various note values, rests, and bar lines.

Handwritten musical notation for measures 6-10 of Choral 1, Version A. The notation continues with similar note values and rests as the previous system.

Handwritten musical notation for measures 11-15 of Choral 1, Version A. The notation continues with similar note values and rests as the previous systems.

* An alternative opening:

Handwritten musical notation for an alternative opening of Choral 1, Version A. It shows measures 1-5 with a different melodic line in the treble clef compared to the main version.

Working B

Chorale 1

Musical notation for measures 1-3 of Chorale 1. The score is in treble and bass clefs, with a key signature of two sharps (F# and C#) and a common time signature (C). The melody in the treble clef begins with a half note G4, followed by quarter notes A4, B4, and C5. The bass line starts with a half note G2, followed by quarter notes A2, B2, and C3. The piece concludes with a final cadence in measure 3, featuring a whole note chord of G4, B4, and C5 in the treble and a whole note chord of G2, B2, and C3 in the bass.

4

Musical notation for measures 4-6 of Chorale 1. The melody in the treble clef continues with quarter notes D5, E5, and F#5, followed by a half note G5. The bass line continues with quarter notes D3, E3, and F#3, followed by a half note G3. The piece concludes with a final cadence in measure 6, featuring a whole note chord of G4, B4, and C5 in the treble and a whole note chord of G2, B2, and C3 in the bass.

7

Musical notation for measures 7-9 of Chorale 1. The melody in the treble clef continues with quarter notes A5, B5, and C6, followed by a half note D6. The bass line continues with quarter notes A3, B3, and C4, followed by a half note D4. The piece concludes with a final cadence in measure 9, featuring a whole note chord of G4, B4, and C5 in the treble and a whole note chord of G2, B2, and C3 in the bass.

10

Musical notation for measures 10-12. The key signature is two sharps (F# and C#). Measure 10 starts with a half note G4 in the treble and a half note G2 in the bass. Measure 11 features a melodic line in the treble: A4, B4, C#5, B4, A4, G4, F#4, E4, D4. The bass line consists of quarter notes: G2, A2, B2, C3, D3, E3, F#3, G3. Measure 12 begins with a half note G4 in the treble and a half note G2 in the bass, followed by a quarter note G4 and a quarter note G2.

13

Musical notation for measures 13-14. Measure 13 has a treble line: A4, B4, C#5, B4, A4, G4, F#4, E4, D4. The bass line has quarter notes: G2, A2, B2, C3, D3, E3, F#3, G3. Measure 14 starts with a half note G4 in the treble and a half note G2 in the bass, followed by a quarter note G4 and a quarter note G2.

15

Musical notation for measures 15-16. Measure 15 has a treble line: A4, B4, C#5, B4, A4, G4, F#4, E4, D4. The bass line has quarter notes: G2, A2, B2, C3, D3, E3, F#3, G3. Measure 16 starts with a half note G4 in the treble and a half note G2 in the bass, followed by a quarter note G4 and a quarter note G2. The piece ends with a double bar line.

Working A

CHORALE 2

VERSION A

The first system of handwritten musical notation for 'CHORALE 2 VERSION A' consists of two staves. The top staff is in treble clef and the bottom staff is in bass clef. Both staves are in the key of B-flat major (one flat) and common time (C). The music is written in a simple, sketchy style with various note values including quarter, eighth, and sixteenth notes, as well as rests. The system concludes with a double bar line and a fermata over the final note.

The second system of handwritten musical notation continues the piece. It features two staves in treble and bass clefs, maintaining the B-flat major key and common time signature. The notation includes a variety of rhythmic patterns and chordal structures, with some notes beamed together. The system ends with a double bar line and a fermata.

The third and final system of handwritten musical notation for 'CHORALE 2 VERSION A' consists of two staves in treble and bass clefs. The key signature and time signature remain consistent with the previous systems. The notation shows a continuation of the melodic and harmonic ideas, ending with a double bar line and a fermata over the final note.

Working B

Chorale 2

The first system of musical notation for 'Chorale 2' consists of three measures. It is written in a grand staff with a treble clef on the upper staff and a bass clef on the lower staff. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat), and the time signature is common time (C). The melody in the treble clef begins with a half note G4, followed by quarter notes A4, B4, and C5. The bass line starts with a half note G3, followed by quarter notes A3, B3, and C4. The second measure continues the melodic and harmonic patterns. The third measure concludes with a half note G4 in the treble and a half note G3 in the bass, both with fermatas.

The second system of musical notation for 'Chorale 2' consists of three measures, starting with a measure number '4' at the beginning. The notation continues in the same grand staff format. The treble clef melody features a half note G4, followed by quarter notes A4, B4, and C5. The bass line consists of a half note G3, followed by quarter notes A3, B3, and C4. The second measure shows a continuation of the melodic and harmonic structure. The third measure ends with a half note G4 in the treble and a half note G3 in the bass, both with fermatas.

The third system of musical notation for 'Chorale 2' consists of three measures, starting with a measure number '7' at the beginning. The notation continues in the same grand staff format. The treble clef melody begins with a half note G4, followed by quarter notes A4, B4, and C5. The bass line starts with a half note G3, followed by quarter notes A3, B3, and C4. The second measure continues the melodic and harmonic patterns. The third measure concludes with a half note G4 in the treble and a half note G3 in the bass, both with fermatas.

10

Musical notation for measures 10, 11, and 12. The system consists of a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat). Measure 10: Treble clef has a half note chord of G4 and B4, followed by a quarter note G4, and a half note chord of G4 and B4. Bass clef has a half note chord of G2 and B2, followed by a quarter note G2, and a half note chord of G2 and B2. Measure 11: Treble clef has a quarter note G4, followed by an eighth note G4 and an eighth note A4, then a quarter note G4. Bass clef has a quarter note G2, followed by an eighth note G2 and an eighth note A2, then a quarter note G2. Measure 12: Treble clef has a quarter note G4, followed by an eighth note G4 and an eighth note A4, then a quarter note G4. Bass clef has a quarter note G2, followed by an eighth note G2 and an eighth note A2, then a quarter note G2. There are fermatas over the final notes of both staves in measures 10 and 12.

13

Musical notation for measures 13, 14, and 15. The system consists of a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat). Measure 13: Treble clef has a quarter note G4, followed by an eighth note G4 and an eighth note A4, then a quarter note G4. Bass clef has a quarter note G2, followed by an eighth note G2 and an eighth note A2, then a quarter note G2. Measure 14: Treble clef has a quarter note G4, followed by an eighth note G4 and an eighth note A4, then a quarter note G4. Bass clef has a quarter note G2, followed by an eighth note G2 and an eighth note A2, then a quarter note G2. Measure 15: Treble clef has a quarter note G4, followed by an eighth note G4 and an eighth note A4, then a quarter note G4. Bass clef has a quarter note G2, followed by an eighth note G2 and an eighth note A2, then a quarter note G2. There are fermatas over the final notes of both staves in measures 13 and 15.