Marking Criteria for Question **1**

**Table A, Reading: Use the following table to give a mark out of 15 for Reading**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Band 1 13–15 | The response reveals a thorough reading of the passage. A wide range of ideas is applied. There is sustained use of supporting detail, which is well integrated into the response, contributing to a strong sense of purpose and approach. Developed ideas are well related to the passage. All three bullets are well covered. |
| Band 2 10–12 | There is evidence of a competent reading of the passage. Some ideas are developed, but the ability to sustain them may not be consistent. There is frequent supporting detail. The response answers all three bullets, though perhaps not equally well. |
| Band 3  7–9 | The passage has been read reasonably well, but the response may not reflect the range or complexity of ideas in the original. There may be some mechanical use of the passage. Supporting detail is used occasionally. Opportunities for development are rarely taken and ideas are simply expressed. There is uneven focus on the bullets. |
| Band 4  4–6 | Some brief, straightforward reference to the passage is made. There is some evidence of general understanding of the main ideas, although the response may be thin or in places lack focus on the passage or the question. One of the bullets may not be addressed. |
| Band 5  1–3 | The response is either very general, with little reference to the passage or the question, or a reproduction of sections of the original. Content is insubstantial, or there is little realisation of the need to modify material from the passage. |
| Band 6, 0 | There is very little or no relevance to the question or to the passage, or the response copies unselectively or directly from the passage. |

**Table B, Writing: Structure and order, style of language: Use the following table to give a mark out of 5 for Writing.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Band 1  5 | The language of the response sounds convincing and consistently appropriate. Ideas are firmly expressed in a wide range of effective and/or interesting language. Structure and sequence are sound throughout. |
| Band 2  4 | Language is mostly fluent and there is clarity of expression. There is a sufficient range of vocabulary to express ideas with subtlety and precision. The response is mainly well structured and well sequenced. |
| Band 3  3 | Language is clear but comparatively plain and/or factual, expressing little opinion. Ideas are rarely extended, but explanations are adequate. Some sections are quite well sequenced but there may be flaws in structure. |
| Band 4  2 | There may be some awkwardness of expression and some inconsistency of style. Language is too limited to express shades of meaning. There is structural weakness and there may be some copying from the passage. |
| Band 5  1 | Expression and structure lacks clarity. Language is weak and undeveloped. There is very little attempt to explain ideas. There may be frequent copying from the original. |
| Band 6  0 | The response cannot be understood. |