

Content – grading scale

The candidate is rated on the above scale when answering each of these 5 questions:

1. General question (e.g. health, media, science & technology etc.)
2. British culture & history
3. American culture & history
4. British literature
5. American literature

The candidate can therefore receive a maximum of 50 points for content.

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● rich, multi-faceted argumentation, deepened by the inclusion of various contexts (e.g. philosophical, historical, cultural etc.);● insightful analysis of the notion, supported by an adequate number of relevant examples and personal feedback;● the response does not contain any content-related errors or lapses;● proficient use of a variety of linking devices contributing to the natural flow of the answer;● well-structured answer, including introduction, argumentation and conclusion which constitute a coherent, well-rounded response.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● the response fulfills all the criteria of Grade 10 but includes 1 minor content-related slip (e.g. confusing a date or a name of a character / historical figure).
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● valid argumentation, with fairly effective use of context (e.g. philosophical, historical, cultural etc.), quite insightful, yet lacking precision;● complex analysis of the notion, supported by some relevant examples and personal feedback;● the response does not contain any content-related errors (1 minor slip allowed, e.g. confusing a date or a name of a character / historical figure);● advanced use of a variety of linking devices contributing to an overall flow of the answer;● well-structured answer, including introduction, argumentation and conclusion which constitute a coherent, well-rounded response.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● the response fulfills all the criteria of Grade 8 but it lacks coherence and an effective use of a variety of linking devices;● the flow of speech is mostly fluent, occasionally disrupted by hesitation and hedging.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● satisfactory argumentation with a relevant use of context, yet lacking depth and analysis; no personal reflections; the response resembles a memorized speech delivered with a high degree of efficiency (<u>the response must not be read</u>);● the response contains a few content-related errors, which do not obstruct the coherence of the response and do not lead to the distortion of facts;● uses linking devices, which are rather repetitive, yet contribute to the overall natural flow with instances of hesitation / disruption;● the structure includes argumentation and either introduction or conclusion, the other one being non-existent.

5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● satisfactory argumentation with a scarce use of context (merely one out of many possibilities), lacking depth and analysis; no personal reflections; the response resembles a memorized speech delivered with a varying degree of efficiency (<u>the response must not be read</u>); ● the response contains 2-3 minor content-related errors, which might point to a lack of understanding of certain aspects of the topic; ● a scarce use of linking devices, contributing to the unnatural, choppy flow; ● the structure includes argumentation and either introduction or conclusion, the other one being non-existent.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the response fulfills all the criteria of Grade 5 but it lacks coherence and an effective use of a variety of linking devices; ● the flow of speech is quite often disrupted by hesitation, pauses and hedging.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● listing arguments without supporting them with examples or context; no personal reflections or analysis; the response seems as if it either has been learnt by heart or is being read; ● the response contains 4-5 minor or 1-2 major content-related errors, which might point to a lack of understanding of certain aspects of the topic; ● a scarce use of linking devices, contributing to the unnatural, choppy flow with a few pauses; ● the structure includes only argumentation, with introduction and conclusion non-existent.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● vague argumentation with no contextualization, lacking analysis; no personal reflections; ● the response contains more than 5 minor or more than 2 major content-related errors, which might point to a lack of understanding of certain aspects of the topic; ● a scarce use of linking devices, contributing to the unnatural, choppy flow with many pauses; ● the structure includes only argumentation, with introduction and conclusion non-existent.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● attempts at answering the question, characterized by mostly invalid argumentation; ● the response contains mostly errors and misrepresentation of facts, creating a chaotic, mostly incoherent presentation containing a number of filler utterances; ● very poor flow, long pauses; ● the answer lacks structure.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● no answer provided OR ● the answer points to a lack of knowledge regarding the topic.

Examples of **minor** content-related errors:

- the candidate confuses a less significant date, e.g. can provide the dates of the beginning and the end of the Civil War, but confuses the year in which a particular battle in that war took place
- the candidate confuses a name of a minor character in the novel or the name (not surname!) of the book's author
- the candidate confuses the chronology of minor events in the novel
- the candidate confuses insignificant details concerning national symbols, geography, customs (e.g. fails to name the animals on the British national emblem, misplaces less significant states, cities)

Examples of **major** content-related errors:

- the candidate confuses the century in which a given historical event took place, e.g. claims the Civil War took place in the 18th century
- the candidate confuses the name of the main characters in the novel or the surname of the book's author
- the candidate confuses the genre of the literary work
- the candidate confuses historical characters or events
- the candidate confuses major national symbols, facts concerning the geography, customs (e.g. claims Welsh flag is included in the Union Jack, places Los Angeles on the east coast etc.)