

## OCR F662

### Marking Bands and Criteria for Task 1

#### Recreative

<b>Band 5</b> 12–15 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• excellent and consistently detailed understanding of original text;</li><li>• consistently fluent and accurate writing in appropriate register in both re-creative passage and commentary;</li><li>• critical terminology used accurately and consistently in commentary;</li><li>• well-structured, coherent and detailed argument consistently developed in commentary.</li></ul>
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• consistently effective re-creative response to stylistic characteristics and thematic concerns of the original text;</li><li>• well-developed and consistently detailed discussion of effects of language, form and structure of re-creative passage, in relation to original text;</li><li>• excellent and consistently effective use of analytical methods in commentary;</li><li>• consistently effective use of quotations and references, critically addressed, blended into discussion.</li></ul>
<b>Band 4</b> 9–11 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• good and secure understanding of original text;</li><li>• good level of coherence and accuracy in writing, in appropriate register in both re-creative passage and commentary;</li><li>• critical terminology accurately used in commentary;</li><li>• well-structured arguments with clear line of development in commentary.</li></ul>
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• developed and appropriate re-creative response to stylistic characteristics and thematic concerns of the original text.</li><li>• developed and good level of detail in discussion of effects of language, form and structure of re-creative passage, in relation to original text.</li><li>• good use of analytical methods in commentary.</li><li>• good use of quotations and references, generally critically addressed.</li></ul>
<b>Band 3</b> 6–8 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• some competent understanding of original text;</li><li>• some clear writing in generally appropriate register in both re-creative passage and commentary;</li><li>• some critical terminology appropriately used in commentary;</li><li>• some straightforward arguments competently structured in commentary.</li></ul>
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• mostly competent re-creative response to stylistic characteristics and thematic concerns of the original text;</li><li>• some developed discussion of effects of language, form and structure of re-creative passage, in relation to original text;</li><li>• competent use of analytical methods in commentary;</li><li>• competent use of illustrative quotations and references to support discussion.</li></ul>
<b>Band 2</b> 3–5 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• limited understanding of original text;</li><li>• limited clear writing, with inconsistencies in register in both re-creative passage and commentary;</li><li>• limited appropriate use of critical terminology in commentary;</li><li>• limited structured argument evident in commentary, lacking development and/or full illustration.</li></ul>
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• limited re-creative response to stylistic characteristics and thematic concerns of the original text;</li><li>• limited discussion of effects of language, form and structure of re-creative passage, in relation to original text;</li><li>• limited attempt at using analytical methods in commentary;</li><li>• limited use of quotations/references as illustration.</li></ul>
<b>Band 1</b> 0–2 marks	AO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• very little or no relevant understanding of selected passage;</li><li>• very inconsistent writing with persistent serious technical errors, very little or no use of appropriate register;</li><li>• persistently inaccurate or no use of critical terminology;</li><li>• undeveloped, very fragmentary discussion.</li></ul>
	AO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• very little or no relevant discussion of effects of language, form and structure.</li><li>• very infrequent commentary; very little or no use of analytical methods;</li><li>• very few quotations (eg one or two) used (and likely to be incorrect), or no quotations used.</li></ul>