

MARKING CRITERIA
MML PART IA = USE OF LANGUAGE (PAPER A1, *ab initio*)

Mark	Class	Comprehension and Argument	Language	Subdivision/ Comments
80+	I*	Excellent comprehension of the text. Fully coherent and persuasive discussion in response to questions on the text; arguments are very well developed and articulated. Full, clear answers with good and relevant use of detail. Answers are fluent; good sense of style at this level.	Excellent command of grammar and lexis. Good level of linguistic sophistication: mostly accurate use of complex structures, with the occasional error; vocabulary is wide-ranging and largely precise, showing very good use of paraphrasing. Very few basic errors. Few errors of any kind. Assured use of punctuation and spelling. Where relevant, good ability to translate into the language a short passage or a set of sentences, with very good accuracy and a good sense of idiom.	
70-79	I	Very good comprehension of the text. Very coherent and persuasive discussion in response to questions on the text; arguments are well developed and articulated. Full, clear answers with relevant use of detail. Answers are fluent, with some sense of style.	Very good command of grammar and lexis. Fairly good level of linguistic sophistication: generally accurate use of complex structures, with the occasional error; vocabulary is wide-ranging and largely precise, showing good use of paraphrasing. Very few basic errors. Few errors of any kind. Good use of punctuation and spelling. Where relevant, good ability to translate into the language a short passage or a set of sentences, with very good accuracy. Where lexical gaps occur, some attempt at paraphrase is made.	75 – 79: Generally accurate and precise answers, with very few errors. 70 – 74: Good degree of competence but may contain some errors, including a small number of basic ones.
60-69	II.1	Good comprehension of the text. Mostly coherent and persuasive discussion in response to questions on the text; arguments are generally well developed and articulated. Clear answers, though some relevant detail may be missing. Answers are mostly fluent, if at times unidiomatic.	Good command of grammar and lexis. Some level of linguistic sophistication: generally good use of a good range of structures for this level, though errors are present, especially in more complex constructions; adequate range of vocabulary, more limited in the lower range of the scale, with some good use of paraphrasing. Word choice is at times unidiomatic. A number of errors, including some basic ones. Generally good use of punctuation and spelling. Adequate ability to translate into the language a short passage or a set of sentences, with a fairly good level of accuracy.	65 – 69: Competent performance but may contain a number of errors, in particular in more complex areas. Credit should be given for the attempt to use complex structures, even where these are not wholly accurate. 60 - 64: Generally competent but marred by more frequent or more basic errors. Resorts to occasional copying from text instead of using own words.

50-59	II.2	Adequate comprehension of the text. Discussion in response to questions on the text is relevant for the most part, but arguments may not be coherent or well developed. Answers are mostly clear, but often lack focus. May resort to copying from text instead of using own words. Language often lacks fluency; little sense of style and idiom.	Acceptable to poor command of grammar and lexis. Low level of linguistic sophistication for this level: structures are basic and often repetitive; little attempt is made at using complex structures. Very limited range of vocabulary. Many errors are present, including many basic ones. Errors are also present in punctuation and spelling. Where relevant, very poor ability to translate into the language a short passage or a set of sentences, with many errors and lexical gaps. Little or no attempt at paraphrasing.	55 – 59: There are many errors but the overall sense is not impeded. 50 – 54: Performance generally acceptable, but some serious errors result in nonsensical or incomprehensible language. Substantial repetition of words used in text instead of using own words.
40-49	III	Evidence of significant comprehension difficulties. Discussion in response to questions on the text is mostly irrelevant or unintelligible. Arguments are poorly expressed and developed. Answers are often unclear. May often resort to copying from text instead of using own words. Lacks fluency; very little sense of style or idiom.	Poor to very poor command of grammar and lexis. Structures are very basic, often following a repetitive pattern. No attempt at using more complex structures. Very limited range of vocabulary. Many errors are present, including many basic ones. Words are often misspelled. Punctuation is poorly managed. Where relevant, very poor ability to translate into the language a short passage or a set of sentences, with a very large number of errors and lexical gaps. No attempt at paraphrasing.	45-49: Overall competence is poor, but response is adequate in places. 40-44: A very large number of errors. In text-related answers, substantial sections barely comprehensible, but a few relevant points.
15-39	F	Very poor comprehension. Discussion in response to questions is barely comprehensible and/or largely irrelevant. Arguments barely developed. Answers are unclear and many gaps or unfinished sentences are present. Substantial copying from text instead of using own words. Language lacks any sense of fluency or style.	Very to extremely poor command of grammar and lexis. Structures are very basic; sentences are often disjointed or unfinished. No attempt at more complex structures. Very limited range of vocabulary. A very large number of errors are present, most of them basic. Many problems with spelling and punctuation. Where relevant, extremely poor translation of a short passage or a set of sentences. Translation barely makes sense, or there is little attempt to translate at all.	

Approved: 27 11 2017