

HL ORAL CRITERIA

Criterion A: How successfully does the candidate command spoken language?

1–3	Command of the language is limited. - Vocabulary is sometimes appropriate to the task. - Some basic grammatical structures are used, with some attempts to use more complex structures. - Language contains errors in both basic and more complex structures. Errors interfere with communication. - Pronunciation and intonation are generally clear but sometimes interfere with communication.
4–6	Command of the language is partially effective. - Vocabulary is generally appropriate to the task, and varied. - A variety of basic and some more complex grammatical structures is used. - Language is mostly accurate for basic structures, but errors occur in more complex structures. Errors at times interfere with communication. - Pronunciation and intonation are generally clear.
7–9	Command of the language is effective and mostly accurate. - Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic expressions. - A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used effectively. - Language is mostly accurate. Occasional errors in basic and in complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication. - Pronunciation and intonation are mostly clear and do not interfere with communication.
10–12	Command of the language is mostly accurate and very effective. - Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and nuanced and varied in a manner that enhances the message, including the purposeful use of idiomatic expressions. - A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used selectively in order to enhance communication. - Language is mostly accurate. Minor errors in more complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication. - Pronunciation and intonation are very clear and enhance communication.

Criterion B1: How relevant are the ideas to the literary extract?

1–2	The presentation is mostly irrelevant to the literary extract. The candidate makes superficial use of the extract. Observations and opinions are generalized, simplistic and mostly unsupported.
3–4	The presentation is mostly relevant to the literary extract. The candidate makes competent use of the literary extract. Some observations and opinions are developed and supported with reference to the extract.
5–6	The presentation is consistently relevant to the literary extract and is convincing. The candidate makes effective use of the extract. Observations and opinions are effectively developed and supported with reference to the extract.

Criterion B2: How relevant are the ideas in the conversation?

1–2	The candidate consistently struggles to address the questions. - Some responses are appropriate and are rarely developed. - Responses are limited in scope and depth.
3–4	The candidate's responses are mostly relevant to the questions. - Most responses are appropriate and some are developed. - Responses are mostly broad in scope and depth.
5–6	The candidate's responses are consistently relevant to the questions and show some development. - Responses are consistently appropriate and developed. - Responses are broad in scope and depth, including personal interpretations and/or attempt to engage the interlocutor.

Criterion C: To what extent does the candidate understand and interact?

1–2	Comprehension and interaction are limited. - The candidate provides limited responses in the target language. - Participation is limited. Most questions must be repeated and/or rephrased.
3–4	Comprehension and interaction are mostly sustained. - The candidate provides responses in the target language and mostly demonstrates comprehension. - Participation is mostly sustained.
5–6	Comprehension and interaction are consistently sustained. - The candidate provides responses in the target language and demonstrates comprehension. - Participation is sustained with some independent contributions