

Holistic Marking Scheme

This holistic marking scheme is recommended as a guideline for marking the *individual* tasks at the examiner's discretion, (and for the overall rounded-up grade of a particular examination paper). Markers are also recommended to use the following descriptors for their final remarks on candidates' papers. This scheme, originally adapted from *Masterclass Cambridge Advanced English*, Oxford: OUP, was agreed in Erlangen, February 2007 and revised in Augsburg, October 2007 and Bamberg, October 2009.

Grade	Task fulfilment	Coherence and Cohesion	Linguistic Range & Stylistic Appropriateness	Accuracy
1,0 1,3	Very positive effect on reader; sophisticated approach, creative with well-developed arguments and highly relevant content and concrete examples.	Reads extremely smoothly. Content excellently-organised. Meaning always clear.	Wide range of vocabulary and syntax; demonstrates keen awareness of complexities (e.g., contradictions, assumptions). Natural use of register.	Minimal errors. Minor problems with lexis, syntax and grammar.
1,7 2,0 2,3	Positive effect on reader; good task fulfilment; relevant content; plausible arguments & concrete examples; only minor omissions	Good organisation, e.g., well-formed paragraphs. Smooth flow. Good use and variety of transitions with minor exceptions. Only occasional lack of clarity.	Mostly successful attempt to vary lexis. Appropriate use of register with minor problems (e.g. inappropriate use of contractions).	Minor problems with lexis, syntax & grammar; occasional unidiomatic expression not necessarily impeding communication; possibly no basic errors at all.
2,7 3,0 3,3	Satisfactory effect on reader; content mostly relevant to the task; arguments sometimes superficial, with only one or two specific details or examples.	Satisfactory coherence and paragraph division, yet organisation not always logical/clear.	A few successful examples of idiomatic language; lexis & syntax less varied. Use of register lacking in awareness at times.	Satisfactory accuracy though isolated basic errors (grammar, syntax and lexis) or L1 interference may occur.
3,7 4,0	Adequate effect on reader; task accomplished, but with omissions. One/two irrelevant passages. Superficial /repetitive argumentation lacking specific details.	Rudimentary but adequate organisation. Some sections lack clarity. Inconsistent paragraphing.	Language basic and verging on elementary at times. Appropriate though limited range of language, e.g., repetitive vocabulary usage. Largely inconsistent use of register	Some error-free lines. Some basic errors which obscure but do not impede communication. Complex structures inaccurately used.
5,0	Negative effect on the reader, with notable omissions in task, e.g. length significantly exceeded or not met or misinterpretation of task. Repetitive/weak argumentation; completely lacks specific details or examples. Several irrelevant passages.	Poor organisation, e.g., incoherence and poor paragraphing. Overuse of and/or inappropriate transitions. Difficult to read due to several sections lacking clarity.	Overly simplistic syntax and lexis. Little awareness of style or register.	Very few error-free lines; presence and repetition of basic errors; defective syntax, distortion of meaning and lack of clarity.

6,0	Very negative effect on reader; totally inadequate attempt at task or task not attempted at all.	Text completely incoherent.	Very narrow range of lexis and syntax. Inappropriate style or register.	Serious lack of linguistic control and/or frequent basic errors.
------------	--	-----------------------------	---	--