

CONTENT – GRADING SCALE

The candidate is rated on the scale described below when answering each of these 4 questions:

1. British culture & history
2. American culture & history
3. British literature
4. American literature

The candidate can therefore receive a maximum of 20 points for content.

5	<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.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● valid argumentation, with fairly effective use of context (e.g. philosophical, historical, cultural etc.), quite insightful, yet at times lacking precision; ● complex analysis of the notion, supported by a few relevant examples and a fair amount of personal feedback; ● the response does not contain any content-related errors or lapses; ● 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.
3	<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 may contain 1 minor content-related error, which does not obstruct the coherence of the response and does 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.
2	<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.

1	<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.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● vague argumentation with no contextualization, lacking analysis; no personal reflections; ● the answer points to a lack of knowledge regarding the topic OR ● 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;

If the response of the candidate fulfills the criteria for a given grade only partially (e.g. 3 or 4 out of 5 criteria), the candidate receives the lower grade.

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 / historical event;
- the candidate confuses insignificant details concerning national symbols, geography, customs (e.g. 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.)