

The International Baccalaureate
Diploma Programme: Referencing
selected IB DP English, French,
German, and Spanish subjects to the
Common European Framework of
Reference for Languages (CEFR)

APPENDICES

Submitted to the International Baccalaureate Organisation
by Ecctis

Commercial in confidence

August 2023

Contents

Appendix 1: Overviews of IB DP Language subjects	6
Overview of Language A: language and literature	6
Aims.....	6
Course content and intended learning outcomes	7
Assessment objectives, methods and marking.....	12
Overview of Language A: literature.....	29
Aims.....	29
Content and intended learning outcomes.....	30
Learning outcomes	34
Assessment methods and marking	35
Overview of Language B	52
Aims.....	52
Course content	52
Assessment objectives, methods and marking.....	53
Appendix 2: English Language B Review and Comparative Analysis	68
Reading.....	68
Standard Level.....	68
Higher Level.....	77
Listening.....	80
Standard Level.....	80
Higher Level.....	92
Writing.....	100
Standard Level.....	100
Higher Level.....	110
Speaking and Interactive skills	119
Standard Level.....	119
Higher Level.....	128
Appendix 3: French Language B Review and Comparative Analysis	136
Reading.....	136
Standard Level.....	136
Higher Level.....	141

Listening.....	148
Standard Level.....	148
Higher Level.....	152
Writing.....	158
Standard Level.....	158
Higher Level.....	163
Speaking and Interactive skills	168
Standard Level.....	168
Higher Level.....	173
Appendix 4: German Language B Review and Comparative Analysis.....	179
Reading.....	179
Standard Level.....	179
Higher Level.....	185
Listening.....	190
Standard Level.....	190
Higher Level.....	195
Writing.....	198
Standard Level.....	198
Higher Level.....	203
Speaking and Interactive skills	208
Standard Level.....	208
Higher Level.....	210
Appendix 5: Spanish Language B Review and Comparative Analysis	214
Reading.....	214
Standard Level.....	214
Higher Level.....	220
Listening.....	226
Standard Level.....	226
Higher Level.....	230
Writing.....	233
Standard Level.....	233
Higher Level.....	237
Speaking and Interactive skills	242
Standard Level.....	242

Higher Level.....	247
Appendix 6: IB Grade Descriptors Analysis.....	252

Tables

Table 1: IB DP Language A: language and literature aims SL and HL	6
Table 2: IB DP Language A: language and literature ‘areas of exploration’ SL and HL	8
Table 3: IB DP Language A: language and literature examples of different text types SL and HL	10
Table 4: IB DP Language A: language and literature assessment objectives SL and HL	12
Table 5: IB DP Language A: language and literature Assessment Methods for SL and HL .	14
Table 6: Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL	17
Table 7: Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL	20
Table 8: Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature	23
Table 9: Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL	27
Table 10: IB DP Language A: literature aims SL and HL	29
Table 11: IB DP Language A: literature ‘areas of exploration’ SL and HL	31
Table 12: IB DP Language A: literature examples of different text types SL and HL	33
Table 13: IB DP Language A: literature assessment objectives	35
Table 14: IB DP Language A: literature Assessment Methods for HL and SL	37
Table 15: Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL	40
Table 16: Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL	43
Table 17: Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature	46
Table 18: Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL	50
Table 19: IB DP Language B and Language ab initio aims	52
Table 20: IB DP Language B and Language ab initio themes	53
Table 21: IB DP Language B and Language ab initio assessment objectives for both SL and HL	54
Table 22: IB DP Language B Assessment Methods for SL and HL	55
Table 23: Paper 1 (Writing) Assessment Criteria for Language B SL and HL	57
Table 24: Structure of Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) for Language B SL and HL	62
Table 25: Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B SL	64
Table 26: Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B HL	66
Table 27: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A (1st set of questions).....	137
Table 28: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A (2nd set of questions).....	138
Table 29: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A (3rd set of questions)	140
Table 30: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (1st set of questions)	142
Table 31: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (2nd set of questions)	144
Table 32: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (3rd set of questions).....	145
Table 33: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (4th set of questions)	147
Table 34: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B (1st set of questions).....	149
Table 35: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B (2nd set of questions).....	151
Table 36: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B (1st set of questions)	153
Table 37: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B (2nd set of questions)	156
Table 38: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL writing (Sample 2)	161
Table 39: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL writing (Sample 4).....	165
Table 40: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL internal assessment (Sample 8).	171

Table 41: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL internal assessment (Sample 12)	176
Table 42: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (1st Set of Questions)	181
Table 43: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (2nd Set of Questions)	182
Table 44: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (3rd Set of Questions)	182
Table 45: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (4th Set of Questions)	183
Table 46: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (5th Set of Questions)	184
Table 47: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (1st Set of Questions)	187
Table 48: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (2nd Set of Questions)	187
Table 49: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (3rd Set of Questions)	188
Table 50: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (4th Set of Questions)	189
Table 51: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (5th Set of Questions)	189
Table 52: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text C (1st Set of Questions)	192
Table 53: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text C (2 nd Set of Questions)	193
Table 54: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C	197
Table 55: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 2	201
Table 56: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 5	206
Table 57: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C (1st and 2nd Set of Questions)	215
Table 58: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C (3rd and 4th Set of Questions)	217
Table 59: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B (1st Set of Questions)	221
Table 60: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B (2nd Set of Questions)	222
Table 61: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B (3rd and 4th Set of Questions)	224
Table 62: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text B (1st and 2nd Set of Questions)	227
Table 63: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text C (1st and 2nd Set of Questions)	231
Table 64: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 2	235
Table 65: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 5	240
Table 66: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Internal assessment (Speaking) Student sample 9	245
Table 67: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Internal assessment (Speaking) Student sample 11	250
Table 68: Grade alignment indications of the Group 1 IB subject grades to CEFR levels	252
Table 69: Grade alignment indications of the Group 2 SL IB subject grades to CEFR levels	255
Table 70: Grade alignment indications of the Group 2 HL IB subject grades to CEFR levels	257

Appendix 1: Overviews of IB DP Language subjects

Overview of Language A: language and literature

Language A: language and literature constitutes one of three subjects in the IB Language and Literature subject group.¹ The Diploma Programme (DP) contains a mandatory language and literature component requiring students to take one of the three subjects in this cluster. The subject is offered at Standard Level (SL) and Higher Level (HL): the former requires 150 teaching hours and the study of at least four literary texts, the latter entails 240 teaching hours and a minimum of six studied works of literature.² The Language A: language and literature guide includes information about the aims, course content, assessment objectives, criteria and assessment methods and it is identical for all the different languages that the subject is offered. However, the assessment papers and tasks are different across the different language subjects offered at the Language A: language and literature by the IB DP.

In terms of subject content, literary and non-literary texts are included on the course.³ Communicative content from various media outlets is used for analytical purposes, and links to culture and identity are explored through texts.⁴ The approaches to textual analysis are designed to cover a range of methods and theoretical traditions such as: sociolinguistics, media studies, literary theory, and critical discourse analysis. The course also aims to focus on the performative aspects of narrative, dialogue, and texts, as well as on the development of receptive, productive, and interactive language skills.⁵

Aims

The aims of IB DP Language A: language and literature are presented in the following table:

Table 1: IB DP Language A: language and literature aims SL and HL⁶

Number	Aims of IB DP Language A: language and literature SL and HL
1	Engage with a range of texts, in a variety of media and forms, from different periods, styles, and cultures.
2	Develop skills in listening, speaking, reading, writing, viewing, presenting and performing.
3	Develop skills in interpretation, analysis and evaluation.
4	Develop sensitivity to the formal and aesthetic qualities of texts and an appreciation of how they contribute to diverse responses and open up multiple meanings.
5	Develop an understanding of relationships between texts and a variety of perspectives, cultural contexts, and local and global issues and an appreciation of how they contribute to diverse responses and open up multiple meanings.
6	Develop an understanding of the relationships between studies in language and literature and other disciplines.
7	Communicate and collaborate in a confident and creative way.
8	Foster a lifelong interest in and enjoyment of language and literature.

¹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. p.7.

² International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp.18-20.

³ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. p.6.

⁴ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. p.7.

⁵ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. p.27.

⁶ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. p.14.

Course content and intended learning outcomes

Course content is categorised and sorted into three broad syllabus components or areas of exploration. The three broad areas consist of Readers, writers and texts, Time and space and Intertextuality: connecting texts. These three areas are prescribed and must be adhered to in the teaching of the Language A: language and literature subjects.

Each area of exploration focuses on a different approach to the study of a text, includes guiding conceptual questions to demonstrate the content to be addressed and has discernible connections to the IB Theory of Knowledge (TOK). Whilst it is suggested that each of the three areas receive 50 hours of teaching time at SL and 80 hours at HL, this is not prescriptive as the areas of exploration will likely overlap in the study of each text. Therefore, teachers are free to engage with the areas of exploration in a flexible way, organising and structuring learning subjects in a way that best suits the needs of their students.

The three areas of exploration are presented in the table below.

Table 2: IB DP Language A: language and literature ‘areas of exploration’ SL and HL⁷

Syllabus component or area of exploration	Description	Guiding conceptual questions	Examples of links to TOK
Readers, writers, and texts	<p>Non-literary texts are chosen from a variety of sources and media to represent as wide a range of text types as possible, and literary works are chosen from a variety of literary forms.</p> <p>The study of the non-literary texts and literary works focuses on the nature of language and communication and the nature of literature and its study. This study includes the investigation of how texts themselves operate as well as the contexts and complexities of production and reception.</p> <p>Focus is on the development of personal and critical responses to the particulars of communication.</p>	<p>Why and how do we study language and literature? How are we affected by texts in various ways? In what ways is meaning constructed, negotiated, expressed, and interpreted? How does language use vary amongst text types and amongst literary forms? How does the structure or style of a text affect meaning? How do texts offer insights and challenges?</p>	<p>What do we learn about through the study of a literary text? How is this different from what we learn through the study of a non-literary text? In what ways is the kind of knowledge we gain from the study of language and literature different from the kind we gain through the study of other disciplines? Can the study of language and of literature be considered scientific? How much of the knowledge we construct through reading a text is determined by authorial intention, by the reader’s cultural assumptions and by the purpose valued for a text in a community of readers? Are some interpretations of a text better than others? How are multiple interpretations best negotiated? In what ways do interpretive strategies vary when reading a literary work and when reading a non-literary text?</p>
Time and space	<p>Non-literary texts and literary works are chosen from a variety of sources, literary forms and media that reflect a range of historical and/or cultural perspectives.</p> <p>Their study focuses on the contexts of language use and the variety of ways literary and non-literary texts might both reflect and shape society at large.</p> <p>The focus is on the consideration of personal and cultural perspectives, the development of broader perspectives, and an awareness of the ways in which context is tied to meaning.</p>	<p>How important is cultural or historical context to the production and reception of a text? How do we approach texts from different times and cultures to our own? To what extent do texts offer insight into another culture? How does the meaning and impact of a text change over time? How do texts reflect, represent, or form a part of cultural practices? How does language represent social distinctions and identities?</p>	<p>How far can a reader understand a text that was written in a context different from their own and which may have addressed a different audience? Is not sharing a world view with an author an obstacle to understand their text? What is lost in translation from one language to another? How might the approaches to a given time and place of a poet, a cartoonist or a diary-writer and a historian differ? Is the notion of a canon helpful in the study and understanding of literature? How does a canon get established? What factors influence its expansion or change over time?</p>

⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p.18.

Syllabus component or area of exploration	Description	Guiding conceptual questions	Examples of links to TOK
<p>Intertextuality: connecting texts</p>	<p>Non-literary texts and literary works are chosen from a variety of sources, literary forms and media in a way that allows students an opportunity to extend their study and make fruitful comparisons.</p> <p>Their study focuses on intertextual relationships with possibilities to explore various topics, thematic concerns, generic conventions, modes or literary traditions that have been introduced throughout the course.</p> <p>The focus is on the development of critical response grounded in an understanding of the complex relationships among texts.</p>	<p>How do texts adhere to and deviate from conventions associated with literary forms or text types?</p> <p>How do conventions and systems of reference evolve over time?</p> <p>In what ways can diverse texts share points of similarity?</p> <p>How valid is the notion of a classic text?</p> <p>How can texts offer multiple perspectives of a single issue, topic or theme?</p> <p>In what ways can comparison and interpretation be transformative?</p>	<p>What are the boundaries between a literary text and a non-literary text, and how are these boundaries determined?</p> <p>What kind of knowledge about a text is gained when compared and contrasted with other texts?</p> <p>Does knowledge of conventions of form, text type and of literary and rhetorical techniques allow for a better and deeper understanding of a text?</p> <p>How are judgements made about the merit of a text?</p> <p>What makes a text better than others?</p> <p>Is the study of texts better approached by means of a temporal perspective, grouping texts according to when they were written, or by means of a thematic approach, grouping them according to the theme or concern they share?</p> <p>What impact does each one of them have on knowledge of the discipline?</p> <p>How useful are classifications of texts according to form, text type and period?</p> <p>How do they contribute to the understanding of communication and its development?</p>

At least four literary works should be studied at SL and at least six studied at HL; there are certain requirements regarding the texts to be selected at each level. At SL, a minimum of one text must be written originally in the language being studied and another must be translated from a different language into the language of study; both of these texts must be written by an author on the prescribed reading list. The other two works can be chosen more freely and may be translated into the language of study. In addition, there should be a minimum of one work that falls into each of the three areas of exploration, covering two literary forms, two periods, two places and two continents. At HL, a minimum of two texts must be written originally in the language being studied and two others must be translated from a different language into the language of study; all of these texts must be written by an author on the prescribed reading list. In addition, there should be a minimum of two works that fall into each of the three areas of exploration, covering three literary forms, three periods, three places and two continents. In terms of non-literary texts, for both SL and HL, as wide a range of non-literary text types as possible must be selected, ensuring that any authors from the prescribed reading list are not included. Furthermore, texts originally written in a different language from that studied can still be used, as long as a published translation is employed.

The time allocated to the study of non-literary texts and literary works should be equal, either within each area of exploration or in the course as a whole. However, there are no further stipulations as to the specific text types that must be studied in each of the three areas. There are also no restrictions concerning the assessment components to be covered in each area of exploration, meaning that students have the freedom to select the works used for their assessment tasks.

An inexhaustive list of literary and non-literary text types, and those falling into both categories, is presented in the table below.

Table 3: IB DP Language A: language and literature examples of different text types SL and HL⁸

Literary text types	Non-literary text types	Text types that could be literary or non-literary depending on the specific text
Graphic novel Novella Novel Play Poem Short story Song-lyrics	Advertisement Appeal Blog Brochure/ leaflet Cartoon Diagram Electronic text (for example, social media posts) Encyclopaedia entry Film/ television Guidebook Infographic Interview Music video Photograph Radio broadcast Report Screenplay for TV or film Set of instructions Textbook Work of art	Autobiography/ biography Diary entry Essay Letter Magazine article Manifesto Memoir Opinion column Parody Pastiche Speech Travelogue

⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p.18.

Although not formally assessed or moderated by the IB, another compulsory element of the Language A: language and literature subjects is the learner portfolio. Students are required to collate their work throughout the two-year course, in a format dictated by learner preference. The learner portfolio is a designated space for reflection on the literary and non-literary texts studied, for compilation of formal and informal responses to the aforementioned texts, as well as a resource to evidence a student's learning and personal development. It is suggested that learners may include the following, among others: reflections on text connections and guiding conceptual questions, explorations of texts and insights, evaluations and critical analysis, creative writing tasks, independent research and inquiry, evidence of feedback received, textual extracts, additional reading, and self-assessment. In particular, learners should use the aforementioned tasks to continue to make links between texts, the areas of exploration and other elements of the course, considering a range of perspectives and helping to draw conclusions concerning culture and wider contexts. Subsequently, the learner portfolio also forms a basis for the preparation of internal and external assessment. Having selected works, compared, and contrasted them, whilst collating additional research, students are aided in making decisions about the texts to select for use in the assessment components. Within the learner portfolio, students are required to include a 'works studied form', evidencing texts covered in their studies, as well as details regarding how the works have contributed to the assessment components.

By following any one of the three studies in language and literature subjects, at either SL or HL, students are expected to use and develop a range of linguistic skills: receptive skills, productive skills, and interactive skills.⁹

Firstly, it is anticipated that receptive skills will be evidenced as students focus on textual detail, evaluating, interpreting, analysing, and comparing a range of texts. In addition, students will consider textual conventions and deduce meaning, including that which is beyond the literal. Secondly, students will have opportunities to develop productive skills in oral and written formats. Specifically, students will present and develop their ideas and opinions, construct and support complex arguments, whilst also demonstrating a range of other skills, including description, narration, persuasion, and evaluation. In addition to exploring existing texts, students will also be encouraged to engage in written and performative activities in order to transform and re-create existing works.¹⁰ Finally, students are also expected to develop interactive skills in oral and written formats. In the context of speaking, students should demonstrate the ability to use and adjust language, tone of voice, body language and gesture, appropriate to audience, purpose, and the opinions of others. Regarding written contexts, students will be able to maintain written conversation, engaging with texts and using different registers and platforms.

As in all IB programmes, conceptual understanding is a key learning outcome of all DP language programme subject groups; the development of linguistic skills and conceptual understanding of language are considered complimentary. There are seven concepts which, although not independently assessed, help to provide structure to the teaching and learning

⁹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. p.27.

¹⁰ Ibid.

of the subjects, continuity in relation to the three areas of exploration and are relevant to the study of both literary and non-literary texts. The seven concepts are as follows: identity, culture, creativity, communication, perspective, transformation, representation.

The concept of identity requires students to consider how the different perspectives, voices and characters encountered may differ from the opinions of the writer and how the identity of the reader is also relevant when considering interpretation. The concept of culture encourages students to consider the values, beliefs and attitudes present in a text and the manner in which a text is positioned within its cultural and literary context. The concept of creativity is applicable to both the act of reading and the act of writing; students should consider the role of imagination from both perspectives, as well as the importance of textual originality. The concept of communication requires students to examine how the relationship between writer and reader is established through the style and structure of the text. In addition, students should consider how levels of communication, engagement and meaning are influenced by different audiences. The concept of perspective encourages students to consider the multitude of views reflected within a text, and whether they relate to those of the writer. Furthermore, the student should also consider the different perspectives that readers may possess and the impact of these different perspectives on the interpretation of a text. The concept of transformation is applicable to both the act of writing and the act of reading; students are inspired to identify the connections among texts, including intertextual references and appropriation from one text to another. Students must also consider the transformative act of reading, such as readers altering text meaning through personal interpretations, as well as the transformative impact of a text on the reader. Finally, the concept of representation examines the relationship between language, literature, and reality, including how the form and structure of a text relate to its meaning.

Assessment objectives, methods and marking

Assessment objectives are statements that refer to the knowledge, skills, and competences that individuals are expected to be able to demonstrate when they are assessed for a course. The assessment objectives of the Language A: language and literature course are the same for both SL and HL. The assessment objectives of IB DP Language A: language and literature are presented in the following table:

Table 4: IB DP Language A: language and literature assessment objectives SL and HL¹¹

Number	Assessment Objectives of IB DP Language A: language and literature SL and HL	Paper that assesses this Assessment Objective
1	Know, understand and interpret: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of texts, works and/or performances, and their meanings and implications • contexts in which texts are written and/or received • elements of literary, stylistic, rhetorical, visual and/or performance craft • features of particular text types and literary forms. 	Paper 1 – writing Paper 2 – writing Internal Assessment HL essay
2	Analyse and evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ways in which the use of language creates meaning • uses and effects of literary, stylistic, rhetorical, visual or theatrical techniques • relationships among different texts 	Paper 1 – writing Paper 2 – writing Internal Assessment HL essay

¹¹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 16-17.

Number	Assessment Objectives of IB DP Language A: language and literature SL and HL	Paper that assesses this Assessment Objective
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ways in which texts may offer perspectives on human concerns. 	
3	Communicate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ideas in clear, logical and persuasive ways • in a range of styles, registers and for a variety of purposes and situations • (for literature and performance only) ideas, emotion, character and atmosphere through performance. 	Paper 1 – writing Paper 2 – writing Internal Assessment HL essay

Additionally, the Ecctis reviewed the assessment methods used in the Language A: language and literature subject for both HL and SL. The objective of the review of the assessment methods is to identify whether the methods of assessment provide an adequate evaluation of the key skills that the course aims to assess. Assessment in the IB DP Language A: language and literature subject consists of both external and internal assessment. External assessment focuses on assessing a written guided textual analysis of non-literary passage(s) and a written comparative essay of two literary works studied in the course. Internal assessment is comprised of an individual oral examination, assessing the analysis of a global issue of the student's choice in both a non-literary body of work and a literary work.

The table below presents a summary of the assessment methods for both SL and HL.¹²

¹² International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. p. 34.

Table 5: IB DP Language A: language and literature Assessment Methods for SL and HL¹³

Language A: language and literature Assessment Methods SL and HL			
HL		SL	
Assessment component	Weighting	Assessment component	Weighting
External assessment (4 hours)	Total weighting of external assessment: 80%	External assessment (3 hours)	Total weighting of external assessment: 70%
Paper 1 (2 hours 15 minutes) Guided textual analysis — writing (40 marks) The paper consists of two non-literary passages, from two different text types, each accompanied by a question. Students write an analysis of each of the passages.	35%	Paper 1 (1 hour 15 minutes) Guided textual analysis — writing (20 marks) The paper consists of two non-literary passages, from two different text types, each accompanied by a question. Students choose one passage and write an analysis of it.	35%
Paper 2 (1 hour 45 minutes) Comparative essay — writing (30 marks) The paper consists of four general questions. In response to one question students write a comparative essay based on two literary works studied in the course.	25%	Paper 2 (1 hour 45 minutes) Comparative essay — (30 marks) The paper consists of four general questions. In response to one question students write a comparative essay based on two literary works studied in the course.	35%
HL Essay Students submit an essay on one non-literary body of work, or a literary work studied during the course. (20 marks). The essay must be 1,200-1,500 words in length.	20%		
Internal assessment (15 minutes)	Total weighting of internal assessment: 20%	Internal assessment (15 minutes)	Total weighting of internal assessment: 30%

¹³ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 34 – 35.

Language A: language and literature Assessment Methods SL and HL

HL		SL	
Assessment component	Weighting	Assessment component	Weighting
<p>This component consists of an individual oral which is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB at the end of the course.</p> <p>Supported by an extract from both one non-literary body of work and one from a literary work, students will offer a prepared response of 10 minutes, followed by 5 minutes of questions by the teacher, to the following prompt: Examine the ways in which the global issue of your choice is presented through the content and form of one of the works and one of the bodies of work that you have studied. (40 marks)</p>	20%	<p>This component consists of an individual oral which is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB at the end of the course.</p> <p>Supported by an extract from one non-literary body of work and one from a literary work, students will offer a prepared response of 10 minutes, followed by 5 minutes of questions by the teacher, to the following prompt: Examine the ways in which the global issue of your choice is presented through the content and form of one of the works and one of the bodies of work that you have studied. (40 marks)</p>	30%

External Assessment

In both Language A: language and literature SL and HL, external assessment consists of Paper 1 which assesses students' non-literary textual analysis and Paper 2 which assesses students' comparative analysis of two literary works. Students sitting the HL examination are required to submit an additional essay, which contributes to the body of external assessment.

The aim of Paper 1 is to evaluate students' knowledge and understanding of text types, their ability to interpret a text and draw conclusions about the content. In addition, Paper 1 aims to gauge students' ability to analyse and evaluate the choices of the writer and the subsequent impact on the meaning of the passage. Furthermore, Paper 1 also allows students to be assessed on their ability to use the conventions of a formal essay, including appropriately selected language and a well-organised response.¹⁴ In both SL and HL, Paper 1 constitutes 35% of the external assessment, yet at SL Paper 1 carries a maximum mark of 20, whereas at HL Paper 1 carries a maximum mark of 40. The duration of Paper 1 at SL and HL, also differs; in SL the duration is one hour and 15 minutes, whereas in HL the duration of Paper 1 is two hours and 15 minutes. Another difference between Paper 1 at SL and HL is the requirements of the task; at SL, students are required to select one of two non-literary passages to analyse, whereas HL students must analyse both of the two passages provided.

There are four assessment criteria for Paper 1 which are common for both SL and HL. These include Criterion A: Understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus and organisation and Criterion D: Language. The mark allocation and level descriptors are identical for both SL and HL, in each criterion. Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to demonstrate an understanding of the literal meaning of a text, to interpret its implications and use appropriate references to a text to support their argument. Criterion B aims to assess students' ability to analyse features of the text and the choices of the author, whilst evaluating the impact of these aspects on the meaning of the text. Criterion C aims to evaluate the relevance and coherency of the student's response. Finally, Criterion D aims to assess the clarity, variety and accuracy of the language used, as well as the appropriateness of the register and style.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for Paper 1, with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level.

¹⁴ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 16-17.

Table 6: Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL¹⁵

Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 mark The response demonstrates little understanding of the literal meaning of the text. References to the text are infrequent or are rarely appropriate.	1 mark The response is descriptive and/or demonstrates little relevant analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices.	1 mark Little organization is apparent in the presentation of ideas. No discernible focus is apparent in the response.	1 mark Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.
2 marks The response demonstrates some understanding of the literal meaning of the text. References to the text are at times appropriate.	2 marks The response demonstrates some appropriate analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices but is reliant on description.	2 marks Some organization is apparent in the presentation of ideas. There is little focus in the response.	2 marks Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.
3 marks The response demonstrates an understanding of the literal meaning of the text. There is a satisfactory interpretation of some implications of the text. References to the text are generally relevant and mostly support the student's ideas.	3 marks The response demonstrates a generally appropriate analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices.	3 marks The presentation of ideas is adequately organized in a generally coherent manner. There is some focus in the response.	3 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.
4 marks The response demonstrates a thorough understanding of the literal meaning of the text. There is a convincing interpretation of many implications of the text. References to the text are relevant and support the student's ideas.	4 marks The response demonstrates an appropriate and at times insightful analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices. There is a good evaluation of how such features and/or choices shape meaning.	4 marks The presentation of ideas is well organized and mostly coherent. The response is adequately focused.	4 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.

¹⁵ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 37-39.

Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
<p>5 marks The response demonstrates a thorough and perceptive understanding of the literal meaning of the text. There is a convincing and insightful interpretation of larger implications and subtleties of the text. References to the text are well-chosen and effectively support the student's ideas.</p>	<p>5 marks The response demonstrates an insightful and convincing analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices. There is a very good evaluation of how such features and/or choices shape meaning.</p>	<p>5 marks The presentation of ideas is effectively organized and coherent. The response is well focused.</p>	<p>5 marks Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.</p>

Paper 2, at both SL and HL, focuses on the students' ability to analyse literary texts. Specifically, students must demonstrate their understanding of each text and their skills of interpretation. At the same time, students are required to present the similarities and differences between the two extracts, in relation to a specific focus. In addition, Paper 2 evaluates the students' ability to successfully structure a coherent essay, which provides a balanced comparison of the two extracts, considering the specific examination question. In both SL and HL, Paper 2 is assigned a total of 30 marks and has a duration of one hour 45 minutes. On the contrary, the weighting of the examination differs between SL and HL; at SL Paper 2 contributes 35% to the total for external assessment, whereas at HL Paper 2 contributes only 25% towards external assessment.

There are four assessment criteria for Paper 2 which are common for both SL and HL. These include Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus and organisation and Criterion D: Language. The mark allocation and level descriptors are identical for both SL and HL, in each criterion.

Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the literary works, to interpret their implications and suggest similarities and differences between the two works, all the while relating their ideas to the examination question. Criterion B aims to assess students' ability to analyse features of each text and the choices of the author, evaluate the impact of these aspects on the meaning of the text and compare and contrast the two works throughout. Criterion C aims to evaluate the focus and coherency of the student's response, whilst examining the balance between discussion of the two literary works and the development of ideas. Finally, Criterion D aims to assess the clarity, variety and accuracy of the language used, as well as the appropriateness of the register and style.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for Paper 2, with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level.

Table 7: Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL¹⁶

Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 – 2 marks There is little knowledge and understanding of the works in relation to the question answered. There is little meaningful comparison and contrast of the works used in relation to the question.	1 – 2 marks The essay is descriptive and/or demonstrates little relevant analysis of textual features and/or the broader authorial choices.	1 mark The essay rarely focuses on the task. There are few connections between ideas.	1 mark Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.
3 – 4 marks There is some knowledge and understanding of the works in relation to the question answered. There is a superficial attempt to compare and contrast the works used in relation to the question.	3 – 4 marks The essay demonstrates some appropriate analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices but is reliant on description. There is a superficial comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.	2 marks The essay only sometimes focuses on the task, and treatment of the works may be unbalanced. There are some connections between ideas, but these are not always coherent.	2 marks Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.
5 – 6 marks There is satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the works and an interpretation of their implications in relation to the question answered. The essay offers a satisfactory interpretation of the similarities and differences between the works used in relation to the question.	5 – 6 marks The essay demonstrates a generally appropriate analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices. There is an adequate comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.	3 marks The essay maintains a focus on the task, despite some lapses; treatment of the works is mostly balanced. The development of ideas is mostly logical; ideas are generally connected in a cohesive manner.	3 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.
7 – 8 marks There is good knowledge and understanding of the works and a sustained interpretation of their implications in relation to the question answered. The essay offers a convincing interpretation of the similarities	7 – 8 marks The essay demonstrates an appropriate and at times insightful analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices. There is a good evaluation of how such features and/or choices shape meaning.	4 marks The essay maintains a mostly clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the works is balanced. The development of ideas is logical; ideas are cohesively connected.	4 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.

¹⁶ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 39-42.

Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
and differences between the works used in relation to the question.	There is a good comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.		
<p>9 – 10 marks</p> <p>There is perceptive knowledge and understanding of the works and a persuasive interpretation of their implications in relation to the question answered. The essay offers an insightful interpretation of the similarities and differences between the works used in relation to the question.</p>	<p>9 – 10 marks</p> <p>The essay demonstrates a consistently insightful and convincing analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices. There is a very good evaluation of how such features and/or choices contribute to meaning. There is a very good comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.</p>	<p>5 marks</p> <p>The essay maintains a clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the works is well-balanced. The development of ideas is logical and convincing; ideas are connected in a cogent manner.</p>	<p>5 marks</p> <p>Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.</p>

Higher Level Essay

The Higher Level Essay is a fourth assessment component, which is unique to the HL external assessment. The essay comprises a written coursework task of approximately 1,200 to 1,500 words. Over an extended period, students explore a line of inquiry of their choice, in relation to a non-literary body of work or a literary work that they have studied in class; both choices must be stated at the beginning of the essay. When selecting the text, students cannot use the same texts used in the internal assessment or the texts that they plan to discuss in Paper 2. In the case of short literary texts, such as short stories or poems, the student should refer to more than one work by the same author, where only one needs to have been studied in class; the same applies to the selection of non-literary texts. Although not mandatory, the student may wish to refer to the seven course concepts to help them develop their line of inquiry.

Depending on the nature of the body of work selected, the objective of the HL essay is to demonstrate a deeper understanding of the nature of linguistic or literary study. Students are required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the work selected, in the context of their line of inquiry. The essay should present a focused and analytical argument, examining the work in its entirety, from a broad perspective, rather than a narrow stylistic commentary of a specific section of the text. The HL essay must adhere to conventions of a formal essay, including a well-structured piece of writing, which uses relevant citations and references to support the line of inquiry. The task is assigned 20 marks and contributes 20% to the overall external assessment mark.

There are four assessment criteria for the HL Essay. These include Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus, organisation and development, and Criterion D: Language.

Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the literary works or non-literary works, and to interpret their implications in relation to the line of inquiry that they have selected. In addition, the student is also evaluated for their use of relevant citations and references to the text, and how these are utilised to support the argument in their line of inquiry. Criterion B aims to assess students' ability to analyse features of each text and the choices of the author and evaluate the impact of these aspects in relation to their line of inquiry. Criterion C aims to evaluate the cohesiveness and organisation of the student response, in addition to the development of the line of inquiry. Furthermore, the student is expected to integrate examples from the text to support their line of inquiry. Finally, Criterion D aims to assess the clarity, precision and accuracy of the language used, including grammatical structures and vocabulary selection. Students are also evaluated for the appropriateness of the register and style.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for the HL essay, with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level.

Table 8: Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature¹⁷

Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus, organisation and development	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 mark There is little knowledge and understanding of the work or body of work shown through the essay in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work or body of work are infrequent or are rarely appropriate in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	1 mark The essay is descriptive and/or demonstrates little relevant analysis of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	1 mark Little organization is present. No discernible line of inquiry is apparent in the essay. Supporting examples are not integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.	1 mark Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.
2 marks There is some knowledge and understanding of the work or body of work shown through the essay in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work or body of work are at times appropriate in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	2 marks The essay demonstrates some appropriate analysis of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry, but is reliant on description.	2 marks Some organization is apparent. There is little development of a line of inquiry. Supporting examples are rarely integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.	2 marks Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.
3 marks There is satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the work or body of work shown through the essay and an interpretation of its implications in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work or body of work are generally relevant and mostly support the student's ideas in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	3 marks The essay demonstrates a generally appropriate analysis and evaluation of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	3 marks The essay is adequately organized in a generally cohesive manner. There is some development of the line of inquiry. Supporting examples are sometimes integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.	3 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.
4 marks There is good knowledge and understanding of the work or body of work shown through	4 marks The essay demonstrates an appropriate and at times insightful analysis and evaluation of textual	4 marks The essay is well organized and mostly cohesive. The line of inquiry is adequately developed. Supporting	4 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence

¹⁷ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 50-53.

Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus, organisation and development	Criterion D: Language
<p>the essay and a sustained interpretation of its implications in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work or body of work are relevant and support the student's ideas in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>examples are mostly well integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.</p>	<p>construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.</p>
<p>5 marks There is excellent knowledge and understanding of the work or body of work shown through the essay and a persuasive interpretation of their implications in relation to the chosen line of inquiry. References to the work or body of work are well-chosen and effectively support the student's ideas in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>5 marks The essay demonstrates a consistently insightful and convincing analysis and evaluation of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>5 marks The essay is effectively organized and cohesive. The line of inquiry is well developed. Supporting examples are well integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.</p>	<p>5 marks Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.</p>

Internal Assessment

Internal assessment is compulsory for both SL and HL students studying Language A: language and literature subjects and is in the form of an individual oral examination. The aim of internal assessment in Language A: language and literature, for both SL and HL, is to assess students' ability to respond to a prompt, by presenting and discussing the representation of a global issue in one literary work and one non-literary body of work; the global issue and works are to be selected by the student. At both levels, 40 marks are allocated to the oral assessment. However, at SL, the oral assessment constitutes 30% to the final assessment of the SL course, whereas at HL, the oral assessment only constitutes 20%.

The individual oral can take place at any time in the course, as long as a significant number of texts have been studied in class; the recommendation states that the last part of the first year, or first part of the second, may be most appropriate. The duration of both the SL and HL oral assessment is 15 minutes; students must deliver a prepared oral response of 10 minutes, with a subsequent 5 minutes of further questioning from the examiner. When selecting the non-literary body of work and the literary work, any text studied up until the time of the exam can be selected, but subsequently cannot be used in any other assessments. Students must select an extract of no more than 40 consecutive words, in which they feel that the global issue is particularly present. Students are encouraged to consider certain fields of inquiry when selecting their global issues, including culture, identity and community, beliefs, values and education, politics, power and justice, art creativity and the imagination, and science, technology, and the environment.

The objective of the individual oral is for the student to present a well-supported argument, demonstrating knowledge and understanding of the works and about the ways in which the extracts represent and explore the global issue chosen. In particular, the student is encouraged to consider style, devices and techniques used by the authors and to evaluate how these authorial choices contribute to the representation of the global issue. The student response must also be well-organised, coherent, convincing, and balanced.

There are four identical assessment criteria for the SL and HL oral assessment. These assessment criteria include Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus and organisation and Criterion D: Language. The mark allocation and level descriptors are identical for both SL and HL, in each criterion.

Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to position the literary and non-literary works in the context of the global issue selected for discussion. In particular, the students must use evidence from the texts to support their ideas, in order to structure a convincing interpretation of the stimuli. Criterion B aims to assess students' analysis and evaluation skills. In particular, the students are expected to present relevant and insightful thoughts regarding the way in which the author has presented the global issue in question. Criterion C aims to evaluate the level of focus maintained by the student and their ability to discuss both works in a balanced way. In addition, Criterion C assesses coherence in the development of ideas and the extent to which the ideas are logically connected. Finally, Criterion D assesses students' ability to use vocabulary and grammatical structures accurately, including a variety of vocabulary and structures in order to create impactful language. Furthermore, students are also assessed on their ability to use tone and register appropriate to the specific task.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for the internal oral assessment with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level of the SL and HL.

Table 9: Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL¹⁸

Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 – 2 marks There is little knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the work and body of work in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the work and body of work are infrequent or are rarely appropriate.	1 – 2 marks The oral is descriptive or contains no relevant analysis. Authorial choices are seldom identified and, if so, are poorly understood in relation to the presentation of the global issue.	1 – 2 marks The oral rarely focuses on the task. There are few connections between ideas.	1 – 2 marks The language is rarely clear or accurate; errors often hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are imprecise and frequently inaccurate. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are inappropriate to the task and detract from the oral.
3 – 4 marks There is some knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the work and body of work in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the work and body of work are at times appropriate.	3 – 4 marks The oral contains some relevant analysis, but it is reliant on description. Authorial choices are identified but are vaguely treated and/or only partially understood in relation to the presentation of the global issue.	3 – 4 marks The oral only sometimes focuses on the task, and treatment of the extracts, and of the work and body of work, may be unbalanced. There are some connections between ideas, but these are not always coherent.	3 – 4 marks The language is generally clear; errors sometimes hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are often imprecise with inaccuracies. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are often inappropriate to the task and detract from the oral.
5 – 6 marks There is satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the work and body of work and an interpretation of their implications in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the work and body of work are generally relevant and mostly support the student's ideas.	5 – 6 marks The oral is analytical in nature, and evaluation of the extracts and their work and body of work is mostly relevant. Authorial choices are identified and reasonably understood in relation to the presentation of the global issue.	5 – 6 marks The oral maintains a focus on the task, despite some lapses; treatment of the extracts and work and body of work is mostly balanced. The development of ideas is mostly logical; ideas are generally connected in a cohesive manner.	5 – 6 marks The language is clear; errors do not hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are appropriate to the task but simple and repetitive. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are appropriate to the task and neither enhance nor detract from the oral.
7 – 8 marks There is good knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the work and body of work and a sustained	7 – 8 marks Analysis and evaluation of the extracts and their work and body of work are relevant and at times insightful. There	7 – 8 marks The oral maintains a mostly clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the extracts and work and body of work	7 – 8 marks The language is clear and accurate; occasional errors do not hinder

¹⁸ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 59-62.

Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: language and literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
<p>interpretation of their implications in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the work and body of work are relevant and support the student's ideas.</p>	<p>is a good understanding of how authorial choices are used to present the global issue.</p>	<p>is balanced. The development of ideas is logical; ideas are cohesively connected in an effective manner.</p>	<p>communication. Vocabulary and syntax are appropriate and varied. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are appropriate to the task and somewhat enhance the oral.</p>
<p>9 – 10 marks There is excellent knowledge and understanding of the extracts and of the work and body of work and a persuasive interpretation of their implications in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the work and body of work are well-chosen and effectively support the student's ideas.</p>	<p>9 – 10 marks Analysis and evaluation of the extracts and their work and body of work are relevant and insightful. There is a thorough and nuanced understanding of how authorial choices are used to present the global issue.</p>	<p>9 – 10 marks The oral maintains a clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the extracts and work and body of work is well-balanced. The development of ideas is logical and convincing; ideas are connected in a cogent manner.</p>	<p>9 – 10 marks The language is clear, accurate and varied; occasional errors do not hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are varied and create effect. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are appropriate to the task and enhance the oral.</p>

Overview of Language A: literature

Language A: literature constitutes one of three courses in the IB Language and Literature subject group.¹⁹ The Diploma Programme (DP) contains a mandatory language and literature component requiring students to take one of the three subjects in this cluster. Language A: literature is offered at SL and HL: the former requires 150 teaching hours and the study of at least nine literary texts, the latter entails 240 teaching hours and a minimum of 13 studied works of literature.²⁰ The Language A: literature guide includes information about the aims, course content, assessment objectives, criteria and assessment methods and it is identical for all the different languages that the subject is offered. However, the assessment papers and tasks are different across the different language subjects offered at the Language A: literature by the IB DP.

Only literary texts and works of literature are used on the Language A: literature course.²¹ The subject focuses on the aesthetic features of literary language, the performative aspects of texts, and materialist approaches to literary criticism. The selection of texts is based on facilitating a cross-cultural and diachronic analyses of literary works where students can consider the processes of negotiating meaning within particular cultural-historical conjunctures.²² The course also aims to focus on the development of receptive, productive, and interactive language skills.²³

Aims

The aims of IB DP Language A: literature are presented in the following table:

Table 10: IB DP Language A: literature aims SL and HL²⁴

Number	Aims of IB DP Language A: literature SL and HL
1	Engage with a range of texts, in a variety of media and forms, from different periods, styles, and cultures.
2	Develop skills in listening, speaking, reading, writing, viewing, presenting and performing.
3	Develop skills in interpretation, analysis and evaluation.
4	Develop sensitivity to the formal and aesthetic qualities of texts and an appreciation of how they contribute to diverse responses and open up multiple meanings.
5	Develop an understanding of relationships between texts and a variety of perspectives, cultural contexts, and local and global issues and an appreciation of how they contribute to diverse responses and open up multiple meanings.
6	Develop an understanding of the relationships between studies in language and literature and other disciplines.
7	Communicate and collaborate in a confident and creative way.
8	Foster a lifelong interest in and enjoyment of language and literature.

¹⁹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.7.

²⁰ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.7; International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.18.

²¹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.7.

²² International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.20.

²³ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.27.

²⁴ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.14.

Content and intended learning outcomes

Course content is categorised and sorted into three broad syllabus components or areas of exploration. The three broad areas consist of Readers, writers and texts, Time and space and Intertextuality: connecting texts. These three areas are prescribed and must be adhered to in the teaching of the Language A: literature courses.²⁵

Each area of exploration focuses on a different approach to the study of a text, includes guiding conceptual questions to demonstrate the content to be addressed and has discernible connections to the IB TOK. Whilst it is suggested that each of the three areas receive 50 hours of teaching time at SL and 80 hours at HL, this is not prescriptive as the areas of exploration will likely overlap in the study of each text. Therefore, teachers are free to engage with the areas of exploration in a flexible way, organising and structuring learning courses in a way that best suits the needs of their students.²⁶

The three areas of exploration are presented in the table below.

²⁵ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.18.

²⁶ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 22-25.

Table 11: IB DP Language A: literature ‘areas of exploration’ SL and HL²⁷

Syllabus component or area of exploration	Description	Guiding conceptual questions	Examples of links to TOK
Readers, writers, and texts	<p>Works are chosen from a variety of literary forms.</p> <p>The study of the works could focus on the relationships between literary texts, readers and writers as well as the nature of literature and its study. This study includes the investigation of the response of readers and the ways in which literary texts generate meaning.</p> <p>The focus is on the development of personal and critical responses to the particulars of literary texts.</p>	<p>Why and how do we study literature? How are we affected by literary texts in various ways? In what ways is meaning constructed, negotiated, expressed and interpreted? How does language use vary among literary forms? How does the structure or style of a literary text affect meaning? How do literary texts offer insights and challenges?</p>	<p>What do we learn about through literature? What role does literature fulfil? What is its purpose? In what ways is the kind of knowledge we gain from literature different from the kind we gain through the study of other disciplines? How certain can we be of the knowledge constructed through reading literary texts? How much of the knowledge we construct through reading a literary text is determined by the writer’s intention, the reader’s cultural assumption and by the purpose valued for the text in a community of readers? Are some interpretations of a literary text better than others? How are multiple interpretations best negotiated? What constitutes good evidence in explaining a response to literature?</p>
Time and space	<p>Works are chosen to reflect a range of historical and/or cultural perspectives.</p> <p>Their study focuses on the contexts of literary texts and the variety of ways literary texts might both reflect and shape society at large.</p> <p>The focus is on the consideration of personal and cultural perspectives, the development of broader perspectives, and an awareness of the ways in which context is tied to meaning.</p>	<p>How important is cultural or historical context to the production and reception of a literary text? How do we approach literary texts from different times and cultures to our own? To what extent do literary texts offer insight into another culture? How does the meaning and impact of a literary text change over time? How do literary texts reflect, represent or form a part of cultural practices? How does language represent social distinctions and identities?</p>	<p>How far can a reader understand a literary text that was written in a context different from his or her own? To what extent is it necessary to share a writer’s outlook to be able to understand his or her work? What is lost in translation from one language to another? How might the approaches to a given time and place of a poet, a playwright or a novelist and a historian differ? Is the notion of a canon helpful in the study and understanding of literature? How does a canon get established? What factors influence its expansion or change over time?</p>

²⁷ Ibid.

Syllabus component or area of exploration	Description	Guiding conceptual questions	Examples of links to TOK
Intertextuality: connecting texts	<p>Works are chosen so as to provide students with an opportunity to extend their study and make fruitful comparisons.</p> <p>Their study focuses on intertextual relationships between literary texts with possibilities to explore various topics, thematic concerns, generic conventions, literary forms or literary traditions that have been introduced throughout the course.</p> <p>The focus is on the development of critical response grounded in an understanding of the complex relationships among literary texts.</p>	<p>How do literary texts adhere to and deviate from conventions associated with literary forms?</p> <p>How do conventions and systems of reference evolve over time?</p> <p>In what ways can diverse literary texts share points of similarity?</p> <p>How valid is the notion of a 'classic' literary text?</p> <p>How can literary texts offer multiple perspectives of a single issue, topic or theme?</p> <p>In what ways can comparison and interpretation be transformative?</p>	<p>How do literary texts adhere to and deviate from conventions associated with literary forms?</p> <p>How do conventions and systems of reference evolve over time?</p> <p>In what ways can diverse literary texts share points of similarity?</p> <p>How valid is the notion of a 'classic' literary text?</p> <p>How can literary texts offer multiple perspectives of a single issue, topic or theme?</p> <p>In what ways can comparison and interpretation be transformative?</p>

At least nine literary works should be studied at SL and at least thirteen studied at HL; there are certain requirements regarding the texts to be selected at each level.²⁸ At SL, a minimum of four texts must be written originally in the language being studied and a minimum of three must be translated from a different language into the language of study; all of these texts must be written by an author on the prescribed reading list. The other two works can be chosen more freely and may be translated into the language of study. In addition, there should be a minimum of two works that fall into each of the three areas of exploration, covering three literary forms, three periods, three countries or regions and at least two continents.²⁹ At HL, a minimum of five texts must be written originally in the language being studied and four others must be translated from a different language into the language of study; all of these texts must be written by an author on the prescribed reading list. The other four works can be chosen more freely and may be translated into the language of study. In addition, there should be a minimum of three works that fall into each of the three areas of exploration, covering four literary forms, three periods, four countries or regions and at least two continents.³⁰ In order to facilitate adherence to the aforementioned requirements, teachers should endeavour to include a balance of literary forms, periods, and places.

An inexhaustive list of literary and non-literary text types, and those falling into both categories, is presented in the table below.

Table 12: IB DP Language A: literature examples of different text types SL and HL³¹

Literary text types	Non-literary text types	Text types that could be literary or non-literary depending on the specific text
Graphic novel Novella Novel Play Poem Short story Song-lyrics	Advertisement Appeal Blog Brochure/ leaflet Cartoon Diagram Electronic text (for example, social media posts) Encyclopedia entry Film/ television Guidebook Infographic Interview Music video Photograph Radio broadcast Report Screenplay for TV or film Set of instructions Textbook Work of art	Autobiography/ biography Diary entry Essay Letter Magazine article Manifesto Memoir Opinion column Parody Pastiche Speech Travelogue

Although not formally assessed or moderated by the IB, another compulsory element of the Language A: Literature courses is the learner portfolio.³² Students are required to collate their

²⁸ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p. 20.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 21-22.

³¹ Ibid.

³² International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.25.

work throughout the two-year course, in a format dictated by learner preference. The learner portfolio is a designated space for reflection on the literary texts studied, for compilation of formal and informal responses to the aforementioned texts, as well as a resource to evidence student learning and personal development. It is suggested that learners may include the following, among others: reflections on text connections and guiding conceptual questions, explorations of texts and insights, evaluations and critical analysis, creative writing tasks, independent research and inquiry, evidence of feedback received, textual extracts, additional reading, and self-assessment.³³ In particular, learners should use the aforementioned tasks to continue to make links between texts, the areas of exploration and other elements of the course, considering a range of perspectives and helping to draw conclusions concerning culture and wider contexts. Subsequently, the learner portfolio also forms a basis for the preparation of internal and external assessment. Having selected works, compared, and contrasted them, whilst collating additional research, students are aided in making decisions about the texts to select for use in the assessment components. Within the learner portfolio, students are required to include a 'works studied form', evidencing texts covered in their studies, as well as details regarding how the works have contributed to the assessment components.³⁴

Learning outcomes

By following any one of the three studies in language and literature courses, at either SL or HL, students are expected to use and develop a range of linguistic skills: receptive skills, productive skills, and interactive skills.³⁵

Firstly, it is anticipated that receptive skills will be evidenced as students focus on textual detail, evaluating, interpreting, analysing, and comparing a range of texts. In addition, students will consider textual conventions and deduce meaning, including that which is beyond the literal. Secondly, students will have opportunities to develop productive skills in oral and written formats. Specifically, students will present and develop their ideas and opinions, construct and support complex arguments, whilst also demonstrating a range of other skills, including description, narration, persuasion, and evaluation. In addition to exploring existing texts, students will also be encouraged to engage in written and performative activities to transform and re-create existing works.³⁶ Finally, students are also expected to develop interactive skills in oral and written formats. In the context of speaking, students should demonstrate the ability to use and adjust language, tone of voice, body language and gesture, appropriate to audience, purpose, and the opinions of others. Regarding written contexts, students will be able to maintain written conversation, engaging with works and using different registers and platforms.

As in all IB programmes, conceptual understanding is a key learning outcome of all DP language programme subject groups; the development of linguistic skills and conceptual understanding of language are considered complimentary.³⁷ There are seven concepts which, although not independently assessed, help to provide structure to the teaching and learning

³³ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.26.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p.27.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p. 27.

of the courses, continuity in relation to the three areas of exploration and are relevant to the study of both literary and non-literary texts. The seven concepts are as follows: identity, culture, creativity, communication, perspective, transformation, representation.³⁸

The concept of identity requires students to consider how the different perspectives, voices and characters encountered may differ from the opinions of the writer and how the identity of the reader is also relevant when considering interpretation. The concept of culture encourages students to consider the values, beliefs and attitudes present in literary works and the manner in which a work is positioned within its cultural and literary context. The concept of creativity is applicable to both the act of reading and the act of writing; students should consider the role of imagination from both perspectives, as well as the importance of textual originality. The concept of communication requires students to examine how the relationship between writer and reader is established through the style and structure of the text. In addition, students should consider how levels of communication, engagement and meaning are influenced by different audiences. The concept of perspective encourages students to consider the multitude of views reflected within a text, and whether they relate to those of the writer. Furthermore, the student should also consider the different perspectives that readers may possess and the impact of these different perspectives on the interpretation of a text. The concept of transformation is applicable to both the act of writing and the act of reading; students are inspired to identify the connections among texts, including intertextual references and appropriation from one text to another. Students must also consider the transformative act of reading, such as readers altering text meaning through personal interpretations, as well as the transformative impact of a text on the reader. Finally, the concept of representation examines the relationship between language, literature, and reality, including how the form and structure of a text relate to its meaning.³⁹

Assessment methods and marking

Assessment objectives are statements that refer to the knowledge, skills, and competences that individuals are expected to be able to demonstrate when they are assessed for a course. The assessment objectives of the Language A: literature courses are the same for both SL and HL. The assessment objectives of Language A: literature are presented in the following table:

Table 13: IB DP Language A: literature assessment objectives⁴⁰

Number	Assessment Objectives of IB DP Language A: literature	Paper that assesses this Assessment Objective
1	Know, understand and interpret: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of texts, works and/or performances, and their meanings and implications • contexts in which texts are written and/or received • elements of literary, stylistic, rhetorical, visual and/or performance craft 	Paper 1 – writing Paper 2 – writing Internal Assessment HL essay

³⁸ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 28-29.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 15-17.

Number	Assessment Objectives of IB DP Language A: literature	Paper that assesses this Assessment Objective
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • features of particular text types and literary forms. 	
2	Analyse and evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ways in which the use of language creates meaning • uses and effects of literary, stylistic, rhetorical, visual or theatrical techniques • relationships among different texts • ways in which texts may offer perspectives on human concerns. 	Paper 1 – writing Paper 2 – writing Internal Assessment HL essay
3	Communicate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ideas in clear, logical and persuasive ways • in a range of styles, registers and for a variety of purposes and situations • (for literature and performance only) ideas, emotion, character and atmosphere through performance. 	Paper 1 – writing Paper 2 – writing Internal Assessment HL essay

Additionally, Ecctis reviewed the assessment methods used in the Language A: literature subject for both HL and SL. The objective of the review of the assessment methods is to identify whether the methods of assessment provide an adequate evaluation of the key skills that the course aims to assess. Assessment in the Language A: Literature courses consists of both external and internal assessment. External assessment focuses on assessing a written guided literary analysis of literary passage(s) and a written comparative essay of two literary works studied in the course, with an additional Higher Level essay for HL students. Internal assessment is comprised of an individual oral examination, assessing the analysis of a global issue of the student’s choice in two literary works.

The table below presents a summary of the assessment methods for both HL and SL.

Table 14: IB DP Language A: literature Assessment Methods for HL and SL⁴¹

Language A: literature Assessment Methods			
HL		SL	
Assessment component	Weighting	Assessment component	Weighting
External assessment (4 hours)	Total weighting of external assessment: 80%	External assessment (3 hours)	Total weighting of external assessment: 70%
Paper 1 (2 hours 15 minutes) Guided literary analysis — writing (40 marks) The paper consists of two literary passages, from two different literary forms, each accompanied by a question. Students write an analysis of each of the passages.	35%	Paper 1 (1 hour 15 minutes) Guided literary analysis — writing (20 marks) The paper consists of two passages from two different literary forms, each accompanied by a question. Students choose one passage and write an analysis of it.	35%
Paper 2 (1 hour 45 minutes) Comparative essay — writing (30 marks) The paper consists of four general questions. In response to one question students write a comparative essay based on two works studied in the course.	25%	Paper 2 (1 hour 45 minutes) Comparative essay — (30 marks) The paper consists of four general questions. In response to one question students write a comparative essay based on two works studied in the course.	35%
HL Essay Students submit an essay on one work studied during the course. (20 marks). The essay must be 1,200-1,500 words in length.	20%		
Internal assessment (15 minutes)	Total weighting of internal assessment: 20%	Internal assessment (15 minutes)	Total weighting of internal assessment: 30%

⁴¹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Language and Literature Guide*. pp. 34-36.

Language A: literature Assessment Methods

HL		SL	
Assessment component	Weighting	Assessment component	Weighting
<p>This component consists of an individual oral which is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB at the end of the course.</p> <p>Supported by an extract from one work written originally in the language studied and one from a work studied in translation, students will offer a prepared response of 10 minutes, followed by 5 minutes of questions by the teacher, to the following prompt: Examine the ways in which the global issue of your choice is presented through the content and form of two of the works that you have studied. (40 marks)</p>	20%	<p>This component consists of an individual oral which is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB at the end of the course.</p> <p>Supported by an extract from one work written originally in the language studied and one from a work studied in translation, students will offer a prepared response of 10 minutes, followed by 5 minutes of questions by the teacher, to the following prompt: Examine the ways in which the global issue of your choice is presented through the content and form of two of the works that you have studied. (40 marks)</p>	30%

External Assessment

In both Language A: literature SL and HL, external assessment consists of Paper 1 which assesses students' guided literary analysis and Paper 2 which assesses students' comparative analysis of two literary works. Students sitting the HL examination are required to submit an additional essay, which contributes to the body of external assessment.

The aim of Paper 1 is to evaluate students' knowledge and understanding of literary forms, their ability to interpret a text or extract and to draw conclusions about the content. In addition, Paper 1 aims to gauge students' ability to analyse and evaluate the choices of the writer and the subsequent impact on the meaning of the literary passage. Furthermore, Paper 1 also allows students' to be assessed on their ability to use the conventions of a formal essay, including appropriately selected language and a well-organised response.⁴² In both SL and HL, Paper 1 constitutes 35% of the external assessment, yet at SL Paper 1 carries a maximum mark of 20, whereas at HL Paper 1 carries a maximum mark of 40. The duration of Paper 1 at SL and HL, also differs; in SL the duration is one hour and 15 minutes, whereas in HL the duration of Paper 1 is two hours and 15 minutes. Another difference between Paper 1 at SL and HL is the nature of the task; at SL, students are required to select and analyse one of two passages, from two different literary forms, whereas HL students must analyse both of the two literary passages provided.

There are four assessment criteria for Paper 1 which are common for both SL and HL. These include Criterion A: Understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus and organisation and Criterion D: Language. The mark allocation and level descriptors are identical for both SL and HL, in each criterion.⁴³

Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to demonstrate an understanding of the literal meaning of a text, to interpret its implications and use appropriate references to a text to support their argument. Criterion B aims to assess students' ability to analyse features of the text and the choices of the author, whilst evaluating the impact of these aspects on the meaning of the text. Criterion C aims to evaluate the relevance and coherency of the student response. Finally, Criterion D aims to assess the clarity, variety, and accuracy of the language used, as well as the appropriateness of the register and style.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for Paper 1, with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level.

⁴² International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 16-17.

⁴³ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 38-40; International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 47-49.

Table 15: Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL⁴⁴

Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL			
Criterion A: Understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 mark The response demonstrates little understanding of the literal meaning of the text. References to the text are infrequent or are rarely appropriate.	1 mark The response is descriptive and/or demonstrates little relevant analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices.	1 mark Little organization is apparent in the presentation of ideas. No discernible focus is apparent in the response.	1 mark Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.
2 marks The response demonstrates some understanding of the literal meaning of the text. References to the text are at times appropriate.	2 marks The response demonstrates some appropriate analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices but is reliant on description.	2 marks Some organization is apparent in the presentation of ideas. There is little focus in the response.	2 marks Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.
3 marks The response demonstrates an understanding of the literal meaning of the text. There is a satisfactory interpretation of some implications of the text. References to the text are generally relevant and mostly support the student's ideas.	3 marks The response demonstrates a generally appropriate analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices.	3 marks The presentation of ideas is adequately organized in a generally coherent manner. There is some focus in the response.	3 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.
4 mark The response demonstrates a thorough understanding of the literal meaning of the text. There is a convincing interpretation of many implications of the text. References to the text are relevant and support the student's ideas.	4 marks The response demonstrates an appropriate and at times insightful analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices. There is a good evaluation of how such features and/or choices shape meaning.	4 marks The presentation of ideas is well organized and mostly coherent. The response is adequately focused.	4 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.

⁴⁴ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 47-49.

Paper 1 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
<p>5 marks The response demonstrates a thorough and perceptive understanding of the literal meaning of the text. There is a convincing and insightful interpretation of larger implications and subtleties of the text. References to the text are well-chosen and effectively support the student's ideas.</p>	<p>5 marks The response demonstrates an insightful and convincing analysis of textual features and/or authorial choices. There is a very good evaluation of how such features and/or choices shape meaning.</p>	<p>5 marks The presentation of ideas is effectively organized and coherent. The response is well focused.</p>	<p>5 marks Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.</p>

Paper 2, at both SL and HL, focuses on the students' ability to analyse literary works. Specifically, students must demonstrate their understanding of each text and their skills of interpretation. At the same time, students are required to present the similarities and differences between the two extracts, in relation to a specific focus. In addition, Paper 2 evaluates the students' ability to successfully structure a coherent essay, which provides a balanced comparison of the two extracts, considering the specific examination question.⁴⁵ In both SL and HL, Paper 2 is assigned a total of 30 marks and has a duration of one hour 45 minutes. On the contrary, the weighting of the examination differs between SL and HL; at SL Paper 2 contributes 35% to the total for external assessment, whereas at HL Paper 2 contributes only 25% towards external assessment.

There are four assessment criteria for Paper 2 which are common for both SL and HL. These include Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus and organisation and Criterion D: Language. The mark allocation and level descriptors are identical for both SL and HL, in each criterion.⁴⁶

Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the literary works, to interpret their implications and suggest similarities and differences between the two works, all the while relating their ideas to the examination question. Criterion B aims to assess students' ability to analyse features of each text and the choices of the author, evaluate the impact of these aspects on the meaning of the text and compare and contrast the two works throughout. Criterion C aims to evaluate the focus and coherency of the student's response, whilst examining the balance between discussion of the two literary works and the development of ideas. Finally, Criterion D aims to assess the clarity, variety, and accuracy of the language used, as well as the appropriateness of the register and style.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for Paper 2, with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level.

⁴⁵ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 16-17.

⁴⁶ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 40-43; International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 49-52.

Table 16: Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL⁴⁷

Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL			
Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 – 2 marks There is little knowledge and understanding of the works in relation to the question answered. There is little meaningful comparison and contrast of the works used in relation to the question.	1 – 2 marks The essay is descriptive and/or demonstrates little relevant analysis of textual features and/or the broader authorial choices.	1 mark The essay rarely focuses on the task. There are few connections between ideas.	1 mark Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.
3 – 4 marks There is some knowledge and understanding of the works in relation to the question answered. There is a superficial attempt to compare and contrast the works used in relation to the question.	3 – 4 marks The essay demonstrates some appropriate analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices but is reliant on description. There is a superficial comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.	2 marks The essay only sometimes focuses on the task, and treatment of the works may be unbalanced. There are some connections between ideas, but these are not always coherent.	2 marks Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.
5 – 6 marks There is satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the works and an interpretation of their implications in relation to the question answered. The essay offers a satisfactory interpretation of the similarities and differences between the works used in relation to the question.	5 – 6 marks The essay demonstrates a generally appropriate analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices. There is an adequate comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.	3 marks The essay maintains a focus on the task, despite some lapses; treatment of the works is mostly balanced. The development of ideas is mostly logical; ideas are generally connected in a cohesive manner.	3 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.
7 – 8 marks There is good knowledge and understanding of the works and a sustained interpretation of their implications in relation to the question answered. The essay offers a convincing interpretation of the	7 – 8 marks The essay demonstrates an appropriate and at times insightful analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices. There is a good evaluation of how such features and/or choices shape meaning.	4 marks The essay maintains a mostly clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the works is balanced. The development of ideas is logical; ideas are cohesively connected.	4 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.

⁴⁷ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 49-52.

Paper 2 Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
similarities and differences between the works used in relation to the question.	There is a good comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.		
<p>9 – 10 marks</p> <p>There is perceptive knowledge and understanding of the works and a persuasive interpretation of their implications in relation to the question answered. The essay offers an insightful interpretation of the similarities and differences between the works used in relation to the question.</p>	<p>9 – 10 marks</p> <p>The essay demonstrates a consistently insightful and convincing analysis of textual features and/or broader authorial choices. There is a very good evaluation of how such features and/or choices contribute to meaning. There is a very good comparison and contrast of the authors' choices in the works selected.</p>	<p>5 marks</p> <p>The essay maintains a clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the works is well-balanced. The development of ideas is logical and convincing; ideas are connected in a cogent manner.</p>	<p>5 marks</p> <p>Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.</p>

Higher Level Essay

The Higher Level Essay is a fourth assessment component, which is unique to the HL external assessment. The essay comprises a written coursework task of approximately 1,200 to 1,500 words. Over an extended period, students explore a line of inquiry of their choice, in relation to a literary work that they have studied in class; both choices must be stated at the beginning of the essay. When selecting the text, students cannot use the same texts used in the internal assessment or the texts that they plan to discuss in Paper 2. In the case of short literary texts, such as short stories or poems, the student should refer to more than one work by the same author, where only one needs to have been studied in class. Although not mandatory, the student may wish to refer to the seven course concepts to help them develop their line of inquiry.⁴⁸

The objective of the HL essay is to demonstrate a deeper understanding of the nature of literary study; students are required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the work selected, in the context of their line of inquiry. The essay should present a focused and analytical argument, examining the work in its entirety, from a broad perspective, rather than a narrow stylistic commentary of a specific section of the text. The HL essay must adhere to conventions of a formal essay, including a well-structured piece of writing, which uses relevant citations and references to support the line of inquiry.⁴⁹ The task is assigned 20 marks and contributes 20% to the overall external assessment mark.

There are four assessment criteria for the HL Essay. These include Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus, organisation and development, and Criterion D: Language.⁵⁰

Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the literary work and to interpret its implications in relation to the line of inquiry that they have selected. In addition, the student is also assessed for their use of relevant citations and references to the text, and how these are utilised to support the argument in their line of inquiry. Criterion B aims to assess students' ability to analyse features of the text and the choices of the author and evaluate the impact of these aspects in relation to their line of inquiry. Criterion C aims to evaluate the cohesiveness and organisation of the student's response, in addition to the development of the line of inquiry. Furthermore, the student is expected to integrate examples from the text to support their line of inquiry. Finally, Criterion D aims to assess the clarity, precision and accuracy of the language used, including grammatical structures and vocabulary selection. Students are also evaluated for the appropriateness of the register and style.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for the HL essay, with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level.

⁴⁸ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p. 46.

⁴⁹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 16-17.

⁵⁰ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 52-54.

Table 17: Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature⁵¹

Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature			
Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus, organisation and development	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 mark There is little knowledge and understanding of the work shown through the essay in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work are infrequent or are rarely appropriate in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	1 mark The essay is descriptive and/or demonstrates little relevant analysis of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	1 mark Little organization is present. No discernible line of inquiry is apparent in the essay. Supporting examples are not integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.	1 mark Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction and little sense of register and style.
2 marks There is some knowledge and understanding of the work shown through the essay in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work are at times appropriate in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	2 marks The essay demonstrates some appropriate analysis of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry, but is reliant on description.	2 marks Some organization is apparent. There is little development of a line of inquiry. Supporting examples are rarely integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.	2 marks Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.
3 marks There is satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the work shown through the essay and an interpretation of its implications in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work are generally relevant and mostly support the student's ideas in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	3 marks The essay demonstrates a generally appropriate analysis and evaluation of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.	3 marks The essay is adequately organized in a generally cohesive manner. There is some development of the line of inquiry. Supporting examples are sometimes integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.	3 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.
4 marks There is good knowledge and understanding of the work shown through the essay and a sustained interpretation of	4 marks The essay demonstrates an appropriate and at times insightful analysis and evaluation of textual features and the author's broader	4 marks The essay is well organized and mostly cohesive. The line of inquiry is adequately developed. Supporting examples are mostly well integrated into	4 marks Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence

⁵¹ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 52-54.

Higher Level Essay Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus, organisation and development	Criterion D: Language
<p>its implications in relation to the line of inquiry chosen. References to the work are relevant and support the student's ideas in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.</p>	<p>construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task.</p>
<p>5 marks There is excellent knowledge and understanding of the work shown through the essay and a persuasive interpretation of their implications in relation to the chosen line of inquiry. References to the work are well-chosen and effectively support the student's ideas in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>5 marks The essay demonstrates a consistently insightful and convincing analysis and evaluation of textual features and the author's broader choices in relation to the chosen line of inquiry.</p>	<p>5 marks The essay is effectively organized and cohesive. The line of inquiry is well developed. Supporting examples are well integrated into the structure of the sentences and paragraphs.</p>	<p>5 marks Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.</p>

Internal Assessment

Internal assessment is compulsory for both SL and HL students studying Language A: literature courses and is in the form of an individual oral examination. The aim of internal assessment in Language A: literature, for both SL and HL, is to assess students' ability to respond to a prompt, by presenting and discussing the representation of a global issue in one literary work written originally in the language being studied and one literary work studied in translation; the global issue and works are to be selected by the student.⁵² At both levels, 40 marks are allocated to the oral assessment. However, at SL, the oral assessment constitutes 30% to the final assessment of the SL course, whereas at HL, the oral assessment only constitutes 20%.

The individual oral can take place at any time in the course, as long as a significant number of texts have been studied in class; the recommendation states that the last part of the first year, or first part of the second, may be most appropriate.⁵³ The duration of both the SL and HL oral assessment is 15 minutes; students must deliver a prepared oral response of 10 minutes, with a subsequent 5 minutes of further questioning from the examiner. When selecting both literary works, any text studied up until the time of the exam can be selected, but subsequently cannot be used in any other assessments. Students must select an extract of no more than 40 consecutive lines, from each work, in which they feel that the global issue is particularly present. Students are encouraged to consider certain fields of inquiry when selecting their global issues, including culture, identity and community, beliefs, values and education, politics, power and justice, art creativity and the imagination, and science, technology, and the environment.⁵⁴

The objective of the individual oral is for the student to present a well-supported argument, demonstrating knowledge and understanding of two of the works studied in the course and about the ways in which the extracts represent and explore the global issue chosen. In particular, the student is encouraged to consider style, devices, and other techniques used by the authors and to evaluate how these authorial choices contribute to the representation of the global issue and the audience interpretation. The student's response must also be well-organised, coherent, convincing, and balanced.⁵⁵

There are four identical assessment criteria for the SL and HL oral assessment. These assessment criteria include Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and interpretation, Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation, Criterion C: Focus and organisation and Criterion D: Language. The mark allocation and level descriptors are identical for both SL and HL, in each criterion.⁵⁶

Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to position the literary works in the context of the global issue selected for discussion. In particular, the students must use evidence from the texts to support their ideas, in order to structure a convincing interpretation of the stimuli. Criterion B aims to assess students' analysis and evaluation skills. In particular, the students are expected to present relevant and insightful thoughts regarding the way in which the author

⁵² International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p. 57.

⁵³ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. p. 59.

⁵⁴ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 58-59.

⁵⁵ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 16-17.

⁵⁶ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 60-62.

has presented the global issue in question. Criterion C aims to evaluate the level of focus maintained by the student and their ability to discuss both works in a balanced way. In addition, Criterion C assesses coherence in the development of ideas and the extent to which the ideas are logically connected. Finally, Criterion D assesses students' ability to use vocabulary and grammatical structures accurately, including a variety of vocabulary and structures in order to create impactful language. Furthermore, students are also assessed on their ability to use tone and register appropriate to the specific task.

The table below presents the assessment criteria for the internal oral assessment with the allocated marks and level descriptors for each level of the SL and HL.

Table 18: Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL⁵⁷

Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1 – 2 marks There is little knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the works in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the works are infrequent or are rarely appropriate.	1 – 2 marks The oral is descriptive or contains no relevant analysis. Authorial choices are seldom identified and, if so, are poorly understood in relation to the presentation of the global issue.	1 – 2 marks The oral rarely focuses on the task. There are few connections between ideas.	1 – 2 marks The language is rarely clear or accurate; errors often hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are imprecise and frequently inaccurate. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are inappropriate to the task and detract from the oral.
3 – 4 marks There is some knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the works in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the works are at times appropriate.	3 – 4 marks The oral contains some relevant analysis, but it is reliant on description. Authorial choices are identified but are vaguely treated and/or only partially understood in relation to the presentation of the global issue.	3 – 4 marks The oral only sometimes focuses on the task, and treatment of the extracts, and of the works, may be unbalanced. There are some connections between ideas, but these are not always coherent.	3 – 4 marks The language is generally clear; errors sometimes hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are often imprecise with inaccuracies. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are often inappropriate to the task and detract from the oral.
5 – 6 marks There is satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the works and an interpretation of their implications in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the works are generally relevant and mostly support the student's ideas.	5 – 6 marks The oral is analytical in nature, and evaluation of the extracts and their works is mostly relevant. Authorial choices are identified and reasonably understood in relation to the presentation of the global issue.	5 – 6 marks The oral maintains a focus on the task, despite some lapses; treatment of the extracts and works is mostly balanced. The development of ideas is mostly logical; ideas are generally connected in a cohesive manner.	5 – 6 marks The language is clear; errors do not hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are appropriate to the task but simple and repetitive. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are appropriate to the task and neither enhance nor detract from the oral.
7 – 8 marks There is good knowledge and understanding of the extracts and the works and a sustained interpretation of their implications in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the works are	7 – 8 marks Analysis and evaluation of the extracts and their works are relevant and at times insightful. There is a good understanding of how authorial choices are	7 – 8 marks The oral maintains a mostly clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the extracts and works is balanced. The development of ideas is logical; ideas are	7 – 8 marks The language is clear and accurate; occasional errors do not hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are appropriate and varied.

⁵⁷ International Baccalaureate (2019) *Language A: Literature Guide*. pp. 60-62.

Individual Oral Assessment Criteria for Language A: literature SL and HL

Criterion A: Knowledge, understanding and Interpretation	Criterion B: Analysis and evaluation	Criterion C: Focus and organisation	Criterion D: Language
relevant and support the student's ideas.	used to present the global issue.	cohesively connected in an effective manner.	Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are appropriate to the task and somewhat enhance the oral.
9 – 10 marks There is excellent knowledge and understanding of the extracts and of the works and a persuasive interpretation of their implications in relation to the global issue. References to the extracts and to the works are well-chosen and effectively support the student's ideas.	9 – 10 marks Analysis and evaluation of the extracts and their works are relevant and insightful. There is a thorough and nuanced understanding of how authorial choices are used to present the global issue.	9 – 10 marks The oral maintains a clear and sustained focus on the task; treatment of the extracts and works is well-balanced. The development of ideas is logical and convincing; ideas are connected in a cogent manner.	9 – 10 marks The language is clear, accurate and varied; occasional errors do not hinder communication. Vocabulary and syntax are varied and create effect. Elements of style (for example, register, tone and rhetorical devices) are appropriate to the task and enhance the oral.

Overview of Language B

Language B is designed as one of two language acquisition subjects (Language *ab initio* and Language B) that are offered in several modern foreign languages.⁵⁸ Most Language B subjects are offered at SL and the HL and students are recommended to have had some previous exposure to and knowledge of the target language. For the Language B SL course, prior language learning situated between CEFR levels A2-B2 is advised; CEFR B1-B2 level language skills are suggested for prospective HL students.⁵⁹ Language B is intended as a language acquisition course that develops functional language abilities and intercultural skills.⁶⁰ The subject also aims to target the progression of productive, receptive, and interactive linguistic competences. The Language B guide includes information about the aims, course content, assessment objectives, criteria and assessment methods and it is identical for all the different languages that the subject is offered. However, the assessment papers and tasks are different across the different language subjects offered at the Language B by the IB DP.

Aims

The aims of IB DP Language B and language *ab initio* subjects are presented in the following table:

Table 19: IB DP Language B and Language *ab initio* aims⁶¹

Number	Aims of IB DP Language B and Language <i>ab initio</i>
1	Develop international mindedness through the study of languages, cultures, and ideas and issues of global significance.
2	Enable students to communicate in the language they have studied in a range of contexts and for a variety of purposes.
3	Encourage, through the study of texts and through social interaction, an awareness and appreciation of a variety of perspectives of people from diverse cultures.
4	Develop students' understanding of the relationship between the languages and cultures with which they are familiar.
5	Develop students' awareness of the importance of language in relation to other areas of knowledge.
6	Provide students, through language learning and the process of inquiry, with opportunities for intellectual engagement and the development of critical- and creative-thinking skills.
7	Provide students with a basis for further study, work and leisure through the use of an additional language.
8	Foster curiosity, creativity and a lifelong enjoyment of language learning.

Course content

Course content is categorised and sorted into five prescribed themes. The five prescribed themes consist of, but are not limited to, Identities, Experiences, Human ingenuity, Social organisation, and Sharing the planet. These five themes are prescribed and must be equally included in the Language B subjects and teachers are free to work with the prescribed themes in a flexible way to best support the organisation and planning of the course but also support

⁵⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p.6.

⁵⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p.11.

⁶⁰ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p.6.

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 13.

students' needs and interests in the target language and culture. However, although the themes are prescribed, teachers are free to choose from a number of optional recommended topics which provide them with more flexibility to adjust the prescribed theme to the students' needs and interests. Each prescribed theme is based on a guiding principle and includes some optional topics that teachers are recommended to use. The five prescribed themes and optional recommended topics are presented in the table below.

Table 20: IB DP Language B and Language ab initio themes⁶²

Prescribed Theme	Guiding principle	Optional recommended topics	Possible questions
Identities	Explore the nature of the self and what it is to be human.	Lifestyles Health and well-being Beliefs and values Subcultures Language and identity	What constitutes an identity? How do we express our identity? What ideas and images do we associate with a healthy lifestyle? How do language and culture contribute to form our identity?
Experiences	Explore and tell the stories of the events, experiences and journeys that shape our lives.	Leisure activities Holidays and travel Life stories Rites of passage Customs and traditions Migration	How does travel broaden our horizons? How does our past shape our present and our future? How and why do different cultures mark important moments in life? How would living in another culture affect our worldview?
Human ingenuity	Explore the ways in which human creativity and innovation affect our world.	Entertainment Artistic expressions Communication and media Technology Scientific innovation	How do developments in science and technology influence our lives? How do the arts help us understand the world? What can we learn about a culture through its artistic expression? How do the media change the way we relate to each other?
Social organization	Explore the ways in which groups of people organize themselves, or are organized, through common systems or interests.	Social relationships Community Social engagement Education The working world Law and order	What is the individual's role in the community? What role do rules and regulations play in the formation of a society? What role does language play in a society? What opportunities and challenges does the 21st-century workplace bring?
Sharing the planet	Explore the challenges and opportunities faced by individuals and communities in the modern world.	The environment Human rights Peace and conflict Equality Globalization Ethics Urban and rural environment	What environmental and social issues present challenges to the world, and how can these challenges be overcome? What ethical issues arise from living in the modern world, and how do we resolve them? What challenges and benefits does globalization bring? What challenges and benefits result from changes in urban and rural environments?

Assessment objectives, methods and marking

Assessment objectives are statements that refer to the knowledge, skills, and competences that the students are expected to be able to demonstrate when they are assessed for a

⁶² International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p.18.

course. The assessment objectives of the Language B are the same for both SL and HL. The assessment objectives of Language B and language ab initio are presented in the following table:

Table 21: IB DP Language B and Language ab initio assessment objectives for both SL and HL⁶³

Number	Assessment Objectives of IB DP Language B and Language ab initio	Paper that assesses this Assessment Objective
1	Communicate clearly and effectively in a range of contexts and for a variety of purposes.	Paper 1—writing Internal assessment (Speaking and interactive skills)
2	Understand and use language appropriate to a range of interpersonal and/or intercultural contexts and audiences.	Paper 1—writing Paper 2—listening and Reading Internal assessment (Speaking and interactive skills)
3	Understand and use language to express and respond to a range of ideas with fluency and accuracy.	Paper 1—writing Paper 2—listening and Reading Internal assessment (Speaking and interactive skills)
4	Identify, organize and present ideas on a range of topics.	Paper 1—writing Internal assessment (Speaking and interactive skills)
5	Understand, analyse and reflect upon a range of written, audio, visual and audio-visual texts.	Paper 2—listening and Reading Internal assessment (Speaking and interactive skills)

Additionally, Ecctis reviewed the assessment methods used in the Language B subject for both SL and HL. The objective of the review of the assessment methods is to identify whether the methods of assessment provide an adequate evaluation of the key skills that the course aims to assess. Assessment in the Language B consists of both external and internal assessment components, where external assessment focuses on evaluating students' receptive skills such as reading and listening, as well as writing skills, and the internal assessment focuses on assessing students' speaking and interactive skills. The table below presents a summary of the assessment methods of Language B for both SL and HL.

⁶³ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 14.

Table 22: IB DP Language B Assessment Methods for SL and HL⁶⁴

Language B Assessment Methods			
HL		SL	
Assessment component	Weighting	Assessment component	Weighting
External assessment (3 hours and 30 minutes)	Total weighting of external assessment: 75%	External assessment (3 hours)	Total weighting of external assessment: 75%
Paper 1 (1 hour 30 minutes) Productive skills—writing (30 marks) One writing task of 450–600 words from a choice of three, each from a different theme, choosing a text type from among those listed in the examination instructions.	25%	Paper 1 (1 hour 15 minutes) Productive skills—writing (30 marks) One writing task of 250- 400 words from a choice of three, each from a different theme, choosing a text type from among those listed in the examination instructions.	25%
Paper 2 (2 hours) Receptive skills—separate sections for listening and reading (65 marks) Listening comprehension (1 hour) (25 marks) Reading comprehension (1 hour) (40 marks) Comprehension exercises on three audio passages and three written texts, drawn from all five themes.	50% (Including 25% for listening comprehension and 25% for reading comprehension)	Paper 2 (1 hour 45 minutes) Receptive skills—separate sections for listening and reading (65 marks) Listening comprehension (45 minutes) (25 marks) Reading comprehension (1 hour) (40 marks) Comprehension exercises on three audio passages and three written texts, drawn from all five themes.	50% (Including 25% for listening comprehension and 25% for reading comprehension)
Internal assessment	Total weighting of internal assessment: 25%	Internal assessment	Total weighting of internal assessment: 25%
This component is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB at the end of the course. A conversation with the teacher, based on an extract from one of the literary works studied in class, followed by discussion based on one or more of the themes from the syllabus. (30 marks)	25%	This component is internally assessed by the teacher and externally moderated by the IB at the end of the course. A conversation with the teacher, based on a visual stimulus, followed by discussion based on an additional theme. (30 marks)	25%

⁶⁴ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 29-32.

External Assessment

In both Language B SL and HL, external assessment consists of Paper 1 which assesses students' writing skills and Paper 2 which assesses students' reading and listening comprehension skills.

Writing assessment (Paper 1)

The aim of Paper 1 is to evaluate students' knowledge and skills of written communication for a wide range of purposes, by demonstrating their ability to adapt the text style to the target audience, a variety of contexts and purposes. Paper 1 also aims to assess students' ability to effectively communicate and express their thoughts and opinions in writing, use the language in a variety of interpersonal and intercultural contexts, use the language with fluency and accuracy, and organise and present their opinions, concepts, and ideas in a coherent and consistent way.

In both SL and HL Paper 1 is marked with up to 30 marks, constituting 25% of the external assessment. However, the duration of Paper 1 in SL is one hour and 15 minutes, whereas in HL the duration of Paper 1 is one hour and 30 minutes. Another difference between Paper 1 in SL and HL is that in SL students are required to write an essay of 250-400 words, whereas in HL they are required to write an essay of 450-600 words.

In both HL and SL students may choose one of three text types in which to write the tasks. More specifically, one of these text types is usually viewed as 'most appropriate' for the task, one is seen as 'moderately appropriate' and one is seen as 'least appropriate' for the task. However, this doesn't mean that a student who chooses the 'least appropriate' text type cannot earn high marks – it would just be more difficult to complete the task given the examination time. Although examiners are told which text type is most, moderately, and least appropriate for the task, they do not deduct marks from the students for not choosing the most appropriate text type, but instead they judge the quality of the response in determining if it is appropriate to the context, audience and purpose for that particular question.

There are three assessment criteria for Paper 1 which are common for both SL and HL. These include Criterion A: Language, Criterion B: Message and Criterion C: Conceptual understanding. Criterion A aims to assess students' ability to effectively use a variety of grammatical and vocabulary structures and examine the extent to which the language used by the student is accurate and contributes towards effective communication. Criterion B aims to assess the thematic development, relevance, and organisation of ideas that the student uses in order to deliver the message that they want to achieve. Criterion C aims to evaluate students' ability to adjust their language and message to the target audience, the tone they use to achieve the successful delivery of the purpose of the task, and the use of appropriate conventions based on the selected text type. These criteria are common in both SL and HL writing assessment, however, the marks and level descriptors in each criterion differ between SL and HL. The table below presents the assessment criteria for Paper 1 with their allocated marks and level descriptors for each level.

Table 23: Paper 1 (Writing) Assessment Criteria for Language B SL and HL⁶⁵

Paper 1 (Writing) Assessment Criteria for Language B SL and HL

SL			HL		
Criterion A: Language	Criterion B: Message	Criterion C: Conceptual Understanding	Criterion A: Language	Criterion B: Message	Criterion C: Conceptual Understanding
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-3 marks Command of the language is limited. Vocabulary is sometimes appropriate to the task. Basic grammatical structures are used. Language contains errors in basic structures. Errors interfere with communication.	1-3 marks The task is partially fulfilled. Few ideas are relevant to the task. Ideas are stated, but with no development. Ideas are not clearly presented and do not follow a logical structure, making the message difficult to determine.	1-2 marks Conceptual understanding is limited. The choice of text type is generally inappropriate to the context, purpose or audience. The register and tone are inappropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task. The response incorporates limited recognizable conventions of the chosen text type.	1-3 marks 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.	1-3 marks The task is partially fulfilled. Few ideas are relevant to the task. Ideas are stated, but with no development. Ideas are not clearly presented and do not follow a logical structure, making the message difficult to determine.	1-2 marks Conceptual understanding is limited. The choice of text type is generally inappropriate to the context, purpose or audience. The register and tone are inappropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task. The response incorporates limited recognizable conventions of the chosen text type.
4-6 marks Command of the language is partially effective. Vocabulary is appropriate to the task. Some basic grammatical structures are used, with	4-6 marks The task is generally fulfilled. Some ideas are relevant to the task. Ideas are outlined but are not fully developed. Ideas are generally	3-4 marks Conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated. The choice of text type is generally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience. The register and tone, while occasionally	4-6 marks Command of the language is partially effective. Vocabulary is generally appropriate to the task and varied.	4-6 marks The task is generally fulfilled. Some ideas are relevant to the task. Ideas are outlined, but are not fully developed. Ideas are generally clearly presented and the response	3-4 marks Conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated. The choice of text type is generally appropriate to the

⁶⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 33-39.

Paper 1 (Writing) Assessment Criteria for Language B SL and HL

SL			HL		
Criterion A: Language	Criterion B: Message	Criterion C: Conceptual Understanding	Criterion A: Language	Criterion B: Message	Criterion C: Conceptual Understanding
some attempts to use more complex structures. Language is mostly accurate for basic structures, but errors occur in more complex structures. Errors at times interfere with communication.	clearly presented and the response is generally structured in a logical manner, leading to a mostly successful delivery of the message.	appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task, fluctuate throughout the response. The response incorporates some conventions of the chosen text type.	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.	is generally structured in a logical manner, leading to a mostly successful delivery of the message.	context, purpose and audience. The register and tone, while occasionally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task, fluctuate throughout the response. The response incorporates some conventions of the chosen text type.
7-9 marks Command of the language is effective and mostly accurate. Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied. A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used. Language is mostly accurate. Occasional errors in basic and in complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication.	7-9 marks The task is fulfilled. Most ideas are relevant to the task. Ideas are developed well, with some detail and examples. Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical manner, supporting the delivery of the message.	5-6 marks Conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated. The choice of text type is appropriate to the context, purpose and audience. The register and tone are appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task. The response fully incorporates the conventions of the chosen text type.	7-9 marks 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.	7-9 marks The task is fulfilled. Most ideas are relevant to the task. Ideas are developed well, with some detail and examples. Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical manner, supporting the delivery of the message.	5-6 marks Conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated. The choice of text type is appropriate to the context, purpose and audience. The register and tone are appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task. The response fully incorporates the conventions of the chosen text type.
10-12 marks	10-12 marks The task is fulfilled effectively.		10-12 marks Command of the language is mostly	10-12 marks The task is fulfilled effectively.	

Paper 1 (Writing) Assessment Criteria for Language B SL and HL

SL			HL		
Criterion A: Language	Criterion B: Message	Criterion C: Conceptual Understanding	Criterion A: Language	Criterion B: Message	Criterion C: Conceptual Understanding
<p>Command of the language is mostly accurate and very effective.</p> <p>Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic expressions.</p> <p>A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used effectively.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate. Minor errors in more complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication.</p>	<p>Ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are fully developed, providing details and relevant examples.</p> <p>Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical and coherent manner that supports the delivery of the message.</p>		<p>accurate and very effective.</p> <p>Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and nuanced and varied in a manner that enhances the message, including the purposeful use of idiomatic expressions.</p> <p>A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used selectively in order to enhance communication.</p> <p>Language is mostly accurate. Minor errors in more complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication.</p>	<p>Ideas are relevant to the task.</p> <p>Ideas are fully developed, providing details and relevant examples.</p> <p>Ideas are clearly presented and the response is structured in a logical and coherent manner that supports the delivery of the message.</p>	

Paper 2 in both SL and HL aims to assess students' listening and reading comprehension. In both SL and HL Paper 2 there are 65 marks in total, including 40 marks for reading comprehension and 25 marks for listening comprehension. However, the duration of Paper 2 differs between SL and HL; the duration of Paper 2 in SL is one hour and 45 minutes, including one hour for the reading assessment and 45 minutes for the listening assessment. On the contrary, the duration of Paper 2 in HL is two hours, including one hour for the reading assessment and one hour for the listening assessment.

Listening comprehension assessment (Paper 2)

The listening assessment aims to assess students' understanding of conversations and dialogues between two people, lectures, and presentations on a variety of prescribed themes and optional recommended topics, the meaning of audio recordings, conversations or monologues. In the listening comprehension assessment, the students' use of grammatical structures and vocabulary are only assessed to the extent that misunderstanding would have an impact on the meaning of the message and the words. The majority of the assessment tasks in the listening comprehension assessment aim to assess the students' understanding of the message of the audio recording and not the students' ability to identify grammatical structures within the audio recording. However, the listening comprehension assessment aims to assess if students have understood particular details or aspects of the audio recording which may be tested through the understanding and awareness of grammatical structures that make a difference to the meaning of the message.

The mark scheme for the listening component of Paper 2 for both SL and HL provides general instruction and questions specific guidelines. Listed in the general marking instructions are criteria such as:

- For questions where short answers are required, the answer must be clear. Do not award the mark if the answer does not make sense or if the additional information makes the answer ambiguous, incorrect or incomprehensible.
- Allow spelling mistakes so long as they do not hinder comprehension or do not change the sense of the phrase.
- For true or false questions, students may use a tick or a cross to indicate their intended response but usage must be consistent. If a student writes two ticks or two crosses for the same answer award [0]. If a student answers with a cross and a tick for the same answer, mark the tick and ignore the cross.
- For questions where the student has to write a letter in a box (for example, multiple choice questions), if a student has written two answers – one in the box and one outside – only mark the answer inside the box.
- The total number of marks for the question paper is 25.

Reading comprehension assessment (Paper 2)

The reading assessment aims to evaluate students' reading comprehension, their ability to understand the main information and key arguments presented in reading material, their ability to understand the meaning of reading material, their ability to read for orientation and to identify and effectively use grammatical structures and vocabulary.

The mark scheme for the reading component of Paper 2 for both SL and HL provides general instructions and question specific guidelines.⁶⁶ Listed in the general marking instructions are criteria such as:

- Answers need to be intelligible to be allocated marks; ambiguous, incorrect, or incomprehensible responses are to be discounted
- Orthographic errors are permitted to the extent that they do not affect comprehension
- For true or false questions, a tick or a cross can be used to indicate an intended response, but usage must be consistent
- For multiple choice questions, only mark answers written inside of the designated textbox.
- For each assessment item, the question specific guidelines outline a target solution, an acceptable answer, and a number of possible responses that do not qualify for marks.

Internal Assessment

Internal assessment is compulsory for both SL and HL students studying Language B. The aim of internal assessment in Language B for both SL and HL is to assess students' speaking and interactive skills. More specifically, SL students are required to deliver an oral presentation of a visual stimulus providing clear links to the target culture(s). On the contrary, HL students are asked to deliver an oral presentation of a literary extract. At both levels the presentation is followed by an interactive discussion between the student and the teacher, who asks questions based on the topic of the visual stimuli or the literary extract, before continuing the conversation to cover a wide range of prescribed themes and optional recommended topics from those outlined in the Language B syllabus. In both levels, oral assessment constitutes 25% of the overall assessment and up to 30 marks are available.

The duration of SL speaking and interactive skills assessment is 12 to 15 minutes with an additional 15 minutes for students' preparation of a presentation related to the visual stimuli. The entire presentation should last between 3-4 minutes. The description of the stimulus itself must be brief. The student should briefly describe the stimulus and continue to make clear links to the theme and the target culture(s) as well as express their views and perceptions about the visual stimulus. Following the presentation, the teacher asks follow-up questions to students based on what they presented, to elicit students' meaning and understanding and expand on the topics covered by the student during the presentation, ask clarification questions regarding the presentation and encourage students to interpret their ideas presented. This interactive discussion between the teacher and the student usually lasts between four to five minutes. The last part of the oral assessment includes a general discussion, of five to six minutes, between the teacher and the student during which the teacher asks questions about at least one more theme taken from the five prescribed Language B themes. The ultimate objective of the general discussion is to encourage the student to engage in an authentic, interactive, and spontaneous conversation where they can demonstrate their ability to understand and interact with the interlocutor, demonstrate their oral comprehension, production and interaction, their ability to engage in a conversation, and to explore and develop themes and ideas accurately and fluently.

⁶⁶ International Baccalaureate (2020) Mark Scheme: *Standard Level Paper 2 Reading Comprehension*.

The duration of the HL oral assessment is 12 to 15 minutes with an additional 20 minutes for students to prepare a presentation in relation to the literary extract. The length of the literary extract is up to approximately 300 words. Once the student has prepared their presentation, they are asked to describe and present the key points relating to the literary extract, including the main message, the key arguments, the purpose of the extract, the context, and the topic of the extract, in approximately three to four minutes. During this stage, the student is encouraged to summarise the extract, provide their subjective interpretations of the literary extract, express their personal views on the story, the characters, and the events of the story, show their intercultural understanding, and identify the key message and arguments outlined in the literary extract.

Following the presentation, the teacher asks follow-up questions to students based on what they presented, to elicit students' understanding, expand on the topics covered by the student during the presentation, ask clarification questions regarding the presentation and encourage students to interpret their ideas presented. This follow-up, and interactive conversation, between the teacher and the student usually lasts approximately four to five minutes. The final part of the speaking assessment includes a general discussion, of five to six minutes, between the teacher and the student where the teacher asks questions about at least one more theme taken from the five prescribed Language B themes. The ultimate objective of the general discussion is to encourage the student to engage in an authentic, interactive, and spontaneous conversation where they can demonstrate their ability to understand and interact with the interlocutor, their oral comprehension and production, their ability to engage in a conversation, and their ability to explore and develop themes and ideas accurately and fluently. The table below presents the structure of the internal oral assessment for both SL and HL.

Table 24: Structure of Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) for Language B SL and HL⁶⁷

Structure of Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) for Language B SL and HL			
SL		HL	
Stage and time allocation	Description of the task	Stage and time allocation	Description of the task
Supervised preparation time (15 minutes)	The student is shown two visual stimuli, each relating to a different theme from the course. Each visual stimulus must be labelled in the target language with the theme to which it relates. The student chooses one of the visual stimuli and prepares a presentation directly related to the stimulus. During this time, the student is allowed to make brief working notes.	Supervised preparation time (20 minutes)	The student is shown two extracts of up to approximately 300 words each: one from each of the two literary works studied during the course. The student chooses one of the extracts and prepares a presentation focused on the content of the extract. During this time, the student is allowed to make brief working notes.
Part 1: Presentation (3-4 minutes)	The student describes the visual stimulus and relates it to the relevant theme and the target culture(s).	Part 1: Presentation (3-4 minutes)	The student presents the extract. The student may place the extract in relation to the literary work, but must spend the majority of the presentation discussing the events, ideas and messages in the extract itself.

⁶⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 43 and 50.

Structure of Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) for Language B SL and HL

Part 2: Follow-up discussion (4-5 minutes)	The teacher engages the student on the theme presented in part 1, expanding on what the student has provided in the presentation.	Part 2: Follow-up discussion (4-5 minutes)	The teacher engages with the student on the content of the extract that the student has presented, expanding on observations that the student has provided in the presentation.
Part 3: General discussion (5 to 6 minutes)	The teacher and student have a general discussion on at least one additional theme taken from the five themes around which the course is based.	Part 3: General discussion (5 to 6 minutes)	The teacher and student have a general discussion using one or more of the five themes of the syllabus as a starting point.

There are four assessment criteria for both SL and HL speaking and interactive skills assessment. The assessment criteria for SL include Criterion A: Language, Criterion B1: Message-visual stimulus, Criterion B2: Message-conversation, and Criterion C: Interactive skills-communication. The assessment criteria for HL include Criterion A: Language, Criterion B1: Message- literary extract, Criterion B2: Message-conversation and Criterion C: Interactive skills-communication.

Criterion A aims to assess students' language skills when speaking and more specifically their ability to use vocabulary and grammatical structures accurately, the level in which the student is using the language accurately and effectively to achieve communication, and their pronunciation and intonation skills. Criterion B1 aims to evaluate ability to engage with the visual stimulus in SL and the literary extract in HL, their ability to develop a presentation to summarise the stimulus, and at SL only their ability to make connections between the target culture(s). Criterion B2 aims to assess the level of detail, depth, relevance, and appropriateness of student responses. Criterion C aims to evaluate students' ability to express their ideas and opinions regarding a specific topic and their ability to maintain a conversation with another person. The tables below present the assessment criteria for the internal assessment (speaking and interactive skills) with their allocated marks and level descriptors for each level for SL and HL.

Table 25: Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B SL⁶⁸

Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B SL

Criterion A: Language	Criterion B1: Message-Visual Stimulus	Criterion B2: Message-Conversation	Criterion C: Interactive Skills-Communication
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-3 marks Command of the language is limited. Vocabulary is sometimes appropriate to the task. Basic grammatical structures are used. Language contains errors in basic structures. Errors interfere with communication. Pronunciation and intonation are influenced by other language(s). Mispronunciations are recurrent and interfere with communication.	1-2 marks The presentation is mostly irrelevant to the stimulus. The presentation is limited to descriptions of the stimulus, or part of it. These descriptions may be incomplete. The presentation is not clearly linked to the target culture(s).	1-2 marks The student consistently struggles to address the questions. Some responses are appropriate and are rarely developed. Responses are limited in scope and depth.	1-2 marks Comprehension and interaction are limited. The student provides limited responses in the target language. Participation is limited. Most questions must be repeated and/or rephrased.
4-6 marks Command of the language is partially effective. Vocabulary is appropriate to the task. Some basic grammatical structures are used, with some attempts to use more complex structures. Language is mostly accurate in basic structures, but errors occur in more complex structures. Errors at times interfere with communication. Pronunciation and intonation are influenced by other language(s), but mispronunciations do not often interfere with communication.	3-4 marks The presentation is mostly relevant to the stimulus. With a focus on explicit details, the student provides descriptions and basic personal interpretations relating to the stimulus. The presentation is mostly linked to the target culture(s).	3-4 marks The student's responses are mostly relevant to the questions. Most responses are appropriate and some are developed. Responses are mostly broad in scope and depth.	3-4 marks Comprehension and interaction are mostly sustained. The student provides responses in the target language and mostly demonstrates comprehension. Participation is mostly sustained.
7-9 marks Command of the language is effective and mostly accurate. Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied. A variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures is used. Language is mostly accurate. Occasional errors in basic and in complex grammatical	5-6 marks The presentation is consistently relevant to the stimulus and draws on explicit and implicit details. The presentation provides both descriptions and personal interpretations relating to the	5-6 marks The student'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 attempts to engage the interlocutor.	5-6 marks Comprehension and interaction are consistently sustained. The student provides responses in the target language and demonstrates comprehension. Participation is sustained with some independent contributions.

⁶⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 46-49.

Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B SL

Criterion A: Language	Criterion B1: Message-Visual Stimulus	Criterion B2: Message-Conversation	Criterion C: Interactive Skills-Communication
<p>structures do not interfere with communication. Pronunciation and intonation are easy to understand.</p> <hr/> <p>10-12 marks Command of the language is mostly accurate and very effective. 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. Minor errors in more complex grammatical structures do not interfere with communication. Pronunciation and intonation are easy to understand and help to convey meaning.</p>	<p>stimulus. The presentation makes clear links to the target culture(s).</p>		

Table 26: Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B HL⁶⁹

Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B HL

Criterion A: Language	Criterion B1: Message-Literary extract	Criterion B2: Message-Conversation	Criterion C: Interactive Skills-Communication
0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.	0 marks The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-3 marks 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.	1-2 marks The presentation is mostly irrelevant to the literary extract. The student makes superficial use of the extract. Observations and opinions are generalized, simplistic and mostly unsupported.	1-2 marks The student consistently struggles to address the questions. Some responses are appropriate and are rarely developed. Responses are limited in scope and depth.	1-2 marks Comprehension and interaction are limited. The student provides limited responses in the target language. Participation is limited. Most questions must be repeated and/or rephrased.
4-6 marks 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.	3-4 marks The presentation is mostly relevant to the literary extract. The student makes competent use of the literary extract. Some observations and opinions are developed and supported with reference to the extract.	3-4 marks The student's responses are mostly relevant to the questions. Most responses are appropriate and some are developed. Responses are mostly broad in scope and depth.	3-4 marks Comprehension and interaction are mostly sustained. The student provides responses in the target language and mostly demonstrates comprehension. Participation is mostly sustained.
7-9 marks 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.	5-6 marks The presentation is consistently relevant to the literary extract and is convincing. The student makes effective use of the extract. Observations and opinions are	5-6 marks The student'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	5-6 marks Comprehension and interaction are consistently sustained. The student provides responses in the target language and demonstrates comprehension. Participation is sustained with some independent contributions.

⁶⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 54-56.

Internal Assessment (Speaking and Interactive skills) Criteria for Language B HL

Criterion A: Language	Criterion B1: Message-Literary extract	Criterion B2: Message-Conversation	Criterion C: Interactive Skills-Communication
<p>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.</p> <hr/> <p>10-12 marks 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.</p>	<p>effectively developed and supported with reference to the extract.</p>	<p>attempts to engage the interlocutor.</p>	

Appendix 2: English Language B Review and Comparative Analysis

Reading

Standard Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL English B reading comprehension examination of November 2020 (N20) and November 2022 (N22) to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

N20

Text A

Input text A is a 357-word discursive article adapted from an authentic source on an online news outlet.⁷⁰ The extract treats the concrete topic of home schooling, corresponding to the CEFR public and educational domains of language use. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the Language B syllabus, such as social organisation, as well as optional topics like education.⁷¹

Input text and CEFR analysis

Paper 2 of the reading comprehension examination includes twelve assessment items relating to the content of input text A. These include question types such as: short answer open response (questions one to three), multiple choice (questions four to six and ten to twelve), and sentence completion (questions seven to nine).

Linguistically, the input text of text A contains lexical categories such as: adverbs of frequency ('usually'), prepositions ('in each class'), intensifiers ('very restricting'), modal verbs ('you can learn'), and adjectives ('amazing experience'). In terms of morphosyntax, the extract includes finite verbs in present simple ('you learn'), past simple ('I left school'), and present perfect ('I have been all over the world') tenses. Subordinate clauses, such as adverbial clauses of condition ('If you don't pass the next year'), are also used in the input text. The language functions contained in text A include the description of habits and routines; descriptions of past experiences and objects; expressing likes, dislikes, opinions, agreement, and disagreement; and comparison.

The assessment items corresponding to text A generally align with CEFR A2+ descriptors. For example, the short answer open response questions ('Why did the writer decide to stop attending school?') require the ability to scan the text to locate and acquire a selective comprehension of the relevant sections. This is consistent with the A2+ level descriptors of

⁷⁰ Kervitsky, E. (2012) *The True Story of Homeschooling* [online]. Available from: <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/elena-kervitsky/the-true-story-of-homesch_b_1689629.html> [Accessed 22/11/2022].

⁷¹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

the CEFR scales of Overall Reading Comprehension and Reading for Information and Argument descriptors that specify the ability to ‘understand short, simple texts on familiar matters of a concrete type’ and ‘pick out the main information in short news reports or simple articles’.⁷² The skills required for the short answer open response tasks also correspond to A2+ level criteria on the Reading for Orientation scale where the capacity to ‘find specific information in practical, concrete, predictable texts’ is referred to.⁷³

Text B

Input text B is a 346-word expository article adapted from an authentic source (a wire service text).⁷⁴ The excerpt discusses the concrete topic of a survey conducted on gendered pay differentials, corresponding to the CEFR public and occupational domains of language use. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the Language B syllabus, such as social organisation, as well as the optional topics like social relationships and the working world.⁷⁵

Input text and CEFR analysis

Twelve assessment items in Paper 2 reading comprehension examination correspond to input text B. These include question types such as: multiple choice (questions 13 and 21 to 24), matching synonymous words and phrases (questions 14 to 16), and short answer open response (questions 17 to 20).

The lexical categories included in the input text of text B include cardinal determiners (‘62 years’), possessive determiners (‘their children’), intensifiers (‘very early age’), prepositions as postmodifiers (‘children in the UK’), and adjectives (‘confident and independent adults’). The extract contains morphosyntactic features such as finite verbs in present simple (‘girls receive’), past simple (‘the report said’), present perfect (‘we have discovered’), and simple future (‘it will take’) tenses. Participle clauses (‘managing money on the girls’ behalf’) and adverbial clauses of concession (‘but parents were more likely to buy things for them’) are used in complex sentence forms. The language functions in text B concern understanding and using numbers; describing past experiences; comparison; reporting facts and actions; describing past, present, and future events; and exemplifying an issue.

The assessment items relating to text B are broadly consistent with the CEFR B1+ level descriptors. For example, the short answer open response questions (‘To whom or to what do the underlined words refer? ‘We have discovered’) involve comprehending pro-forms, in particular, anaphoric references. Deducing the meaning of the anaphor requires the ability to semantically comprehend the preceding text where the antecedent / referent is located. This corresponds to the B1+ level descriptors in the CEFR scale of Identifying Cues and Inferring which outline the ability of the student to ‘extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words / signs from the context and deduce sentence meaning’.

⁷² Overall Reading Comprehension [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.54]; Reading for Information and Argument [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.57].

⁷³ Reading for Orientation [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.56].

⁷⁴ Mis, M. (2017) *Britain’s Gender Pay Gap Starts with Pocket Money – Survey* [online]. Available from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-children-money-idUSKBN1581WF> [Accessed 23/11/2022].

⁷⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

Text C

Extract C is a 405-word persuasive text adapted from an authentic source (an NGO volunteering webpage).⁷⁶ The text references the concrete topic of volunteering in Africa, corresponding to the CEFR public and occupational domains of language use. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the Language B syllabus, such as social organisation, as well as optional topics like community, social engagement, and education.⁷⁷

Input text and CEFR analysis

Paper 2 of the reading comprehension examination contains 14 assessment items relating to text C. These include question types such as: short answer open response (questions 25 to 27), True / False (questions 28 to 30), multiple choice (questions 31 to 34), and closed response gap fill (questions 35 to 38).

In terms of lexical categories, the input text of text C contains parts of speech that include possessive determiners ('your role'), modal verbs ('can participate'), prepositions as postmodifiers ('learners in schools'), demonstrative pronouns ('those wishing'), adjectives ('exciting and interesting'), adverbs of manner ('to effectively plan'), and intensifiers ('very relaxed'). The morphosyntactic features of text C include finite verbs in present simple ('like to make') and future simple ('you will explore') tenses. Adverbial clauses of condition ('If your answer is yes'), adverbial clauses of time ('while simultaneously working'), and passive clauses ('these will be published and highlighted') are also used in the extract. The language functions contained in the input text of text C include asking questions for confirmation, identification, and information; describing; reporting actions; requests; and persuading.

The assessment items concerning text C generally align with the B1+ CEFR level descriptors. For example, True / False questions ('Volunteers in schools will give learners the chance to interact with each other: True / False') require the ability to skim read the extract to locate the relevant sections, scan the input text to obtain a selective comprehension of specific details, and cross-reference these components with the propositions stated in the questions. This is consistent with the CEFR B1+ level descriptors of the Reading for Orientation scale which refer to skills such as the capacity to 'scan longer texts in order to locate desired information, and gather information from different parts of a text, or from different texts in order to fulfil a specific task'.⁷⁸

N22

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL English B reading comprehension examination of N22 to CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

⁷⁶ Community Action Africa (n.d.) *Call for Volunteers from Retired Teachers for English, Maths and Science* [online]. Available from: <<https://communityactionafrica.co.za/call-for-volunteers>> [Accessed 16/05/2019].

⁷⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

⁷⁸ Reading for Orientation [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.56].

Text A

Text A is a 250-word article focusing on India's first garbage café. The article is adapted from an authentic source. From the IB documentation this article focuses on the prescribed theme of sharing the planet, and more specifically on the optional recommended topics of urban and rural environment and the climate. The CEFR domain covered in this text is the public domain.⁷⁹ More specifically, text A of Paper 2 of the reading comprehension examination involves 13 assessment items in total included in four sets of questions. Text A includes four sets of questions, including four multiple choice questions, four matching questions, three closed questions which require students to provide short answers and two additional multiple-choice questions.

To correctly respond to the first set of questions, the student should read the specific lines 1-16 of the text indicated in the beginning of the question and try to identify the meaning and see if the meaning of the phrases included in the questions reflects the information included in the specific lines of the text. Additionally, in the second set of questions the student is required to read the text, identify the words and then find the synonym of those words from the specific list of words included in the question. This set of question also indicates the lines where the words are mentioned within the text where the student should refer to in order to find the correct answers. More specifically, in this set of questions the student should read the lines indicated next to each word, identify and read these specific lines within the context of the whole text, read a line before or after in order to try and understand the context that the word is situated in, and after that try and match the words with their synonyms provided in this set of questions. In the third set of questions the student is asked to read the text and the specific lines that are outlined in the question and identify to whom or to what the underlined words refer to. More specifically, to find the correct answer the student should read the specific lines outlined next to each question but also some lines before or after these specific lines of the text in order to get a contextual understanding and identify to who or to what the underlined words refer to. In addition, in the fourth set of questions the student is asked to read the text and the specific lines to respond to the two multiple choice questions.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text A includes a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as common adjectives (hungry, small, clean, poor), adverbs (enthusiastically, entirely, earlier, mainly), futures (I will, I am going to), passive voice (was set up, will be run by, inspired by), present perfect (has helped, has estimated), past simple (started, brought, said, introduced), present continuous (they are preparing), imperatives (bring plastic waste) and superlatives (one of India's cleanest cities). Furthermore, the input text of text A includes a variety of language functions such as descriptions of places and things, reports of actions and facts, narration and description of past, present and future events, and specific emphasis to points, feelings, and issues.

The CEFR analysis of the first two sets of questions of text A (assessment items 1 to 11) indicated that they correspond to the B1 level descriptors of the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Reading for information and argument, Identifying cues and inferring and Vocabulary range. Regarding Overall reading comprehension, the analysis found that

⁷⁹ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

these assessment items reflect elements of the B1 level descriptor as they require the student to be able to read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to their field of interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension.⁸⁰ Additionally, to correctly respond to the questions the student should be able to understand straightforward factual texts and recognise significant points in news articles, reflecting elements of the B1 level descriptors in the CEFR scale of Reading for information and argument.⁸¹ Additionally, these questions require students' ability to deduce probable meaning of unknown words, follow a line of argumentation by focusing on common and logical connectors, but also have a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations.⁸² For example, the first set of questions corresponds to B1 level descriptors as the student should be able to understand the meaning of the text and have basic grammatical knowledge and vocabulary to understand some synonyms from the text e.g. the phrase 'produce 26,000 tones' has similar meaning to the phrase 'throw away 26,000 tones', and generally infer meaning in order to select the true statements. Additionally, the second set of questions also corresponds to B1 level descriptors as the student is required to find the synonyms of the words within the text which means that they should have good knowledge of vocabulary to understand the words estimate, influence, inspire, dumped, calculate, set up and then try and find their synonyms.

However, the third and fourth sets of questions of text A were found to align with both B1 and B1+ level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Reading for information and argument and Identifying cues and inferring. In the third set of questions also aligns with B1+ level descriptors as the student is asked to identify the meaning of the sentences, identify to whom or to what the underlined word refers to in order to provide the correct answer. For example, the short answer open response questions ('To whom or to what do the underlined words refer? It is run...') involve comprehending pro-forms, in particular, anaphoric references. Deducing the meaning of the anaphor requires the ability to semantically comprehend the preceding text where the antecedent / referent is located. This corresponds to B1+ level descriptors in the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring that outlines the student's ability to 'extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words / signs from the context and deduce sentence meaning'.⁸³ However, the CEFR analysis found that all assessment items included in this set of questions are not higher than B1/B1+ level because the questions indicate the lines of the text that the student should read through to find the correct answers.

The fourth set of questions reflects elements of the B1 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Reading for information and argument, as in order to get the marks the student should be able to recognise the line of argument in relation to the issue and the topic presented in the reading extract and understand straightforward and factual texts on topics that are relevant to students' interests.⁸⁴ Additionally, this set of questions reflects elements of the B1+ level descriptor as in order to select the correct answers the student should be able to extrapolate meaning of sections of the text by taking the text as a whole and identify the meaning of occasionally unknown words from the context of the text and deduce the meaning of the sentences.⁸⁵ For example, in this set of questions the student is required to identify the meaning of the specific

⁸⁰Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.55.

⁸¹Ibid. pp. 56-57.

⁸²Ibid. pp. 60 and 131.

⁸³Ibid. p. 60.

⁸⁴Ibid. pp. 56-57.

⁸⁵Ibid. p.60.

lines but also the text as a whole (e.g. understand that both the garbage cafe and the school offer free food for waste exchange), identify synonyms in the text, understand the meaning of reversed sentences (e.g. understand that the sentence 'the private companies purchase the city's plastic' has the same meaning as the sentence 'the city sells plastic to private companies'). This set of questions also requires students to identify inverting relationships (buying, selling) which is quite difficult for a student who has a level lower than B1/B1+.

Text B

Text B of English B SL of the N22 reading comprehension examination was selected because it targets a wide range of CEFR levels between B1 and B2 level and because in this task the students are required to demonstrate a wide range of skills such as identify synonyms, demonstrate a good knowledge and command of complex vocabulary and complex grammatical structures, and infer meaning from the text. Text B of English B SL Paper 2 of the N22 reading comprehension examination is a 363-word extract from an article focusing on the findings from a study regarding kangaroos.⁸⁶ The article is adapted from an authentic online source. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the IB DP Language B syllabus including sharing the planet, the urban and rural environment, and the climate.⁸⁷ Therefore, the CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and the educational domains.⁸⁸ More specifically, text B includes 13 assessment items included in four sets of questions. The first set of questions involves one multiple choice question, the second set of questions includes four closed questions which require students to provide short answers, the third set of questions which also includes four closed questions which require students to provide short answers and the fourth set of questions which includes four gap fill questions.

To correctly respond to the first set of questions, the student should read the first paragraph of the text, try to identify the meaning of the text and following that, try and answer the multiple-choice question with the information found in the first paragraph of the text. Additionally, in order to find the answers to the second set of questions and get the marks, the student should read the second paragraph of the text and try and identify the words included in this paragraph that are synonyms to the ones included in questions 12 to 15. Similarly, in the third set of questions the student is required to read the third and fourth paragraphs of the text and try and complete the sentences in questions 16 to 19 with the correct words from the text included in these paragraphs. In addition, regarding the fourth set of questions the student should read paragraphs five to seven and try and choose the correct words from these paragraphs to complete the sentences in the questions. All questions in text B indicate the specific paragraphs that the answers to the questions can be found within the text which helps students find the responses to the questions easier as they direct them to the specific paragraphs that the answers are located within the text.

⁸⁶ Singh, N., 2020. The Independent. [online] Available at: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/australasia/kangaroos-communicate-human-study-b1774776.html> [Accessed 30 January 2021]. source adapted. reference redacted. Brooke, E., 2019. Shallow Focus Photo of Kangaroo. [image online] Available at: <https://www.pexels.com/photo/shallow-focus-photo-of-kangaroo-2122423/> [Accessed 24 November 2021].

⁸⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁸⁸ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text B includes a wide range of simple grammatical structures and vocabulary such as past simple ('researchers found', 'looked', 'interpreted') (A1), present perfect ('has found', 'have seen') (A2), modals ('can use body language', 'they couldn't') (A2), and the gerund ('seeking help', 'gazing', 'striving', 'attempting') (A2). Additionally the analysis of the input text indicated that it includes some examples of more complex grammatical structures such as the use of passive voice ('is usually associated with', 'is interpreted as', 'can be learnt') (B1 and B2). Additionally, the input text of text B includes a variety of language functions including describing people and things, reporting facts and actions, developing an argument, providing suggestions, defending a point of view, and emphasising points, feelings and issues.

The CEFR analysis of text B indicated that different sets of questions target different CEFR levels. More specifically, the review and analysis found that the first set of questions aligns with B1 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Reading for information and argument, Vocabulary range and Identifying cues and inferring. This is because the student should be able to read straightforward factual texts on topics relevant to their field of interest with satisfactory level of comprehension but also recognise significant main points in factual texts in order to understand the text and successfully respond to the question.⁸⁹ Additionally, the student should be able to follow a line of argumentation in a narrative focusing on common logical and temporal connectors and identify meaning of occasional unknown words in order to get the mark.⁹⁰ In terms of vocabulary, the student should have knowledge of basic vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations in order to be able to understand that phrases such as 'communicated with humans in a similar way to domesticated animals' is synonym to 'communicate with humans like domesticated animals'.⁹¹ As a result, the first set of questions of text B is not lower than B1 as the student should be able to understand and infer the meaning of the paragraph, understand the meaning of the multiple-choice question, and have a good command of vocabulary and grammar to identify synonyms.

Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the second and fourth sets of questions of text B correspond to B2 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Vocabulary range, Vocabulary control and Identifying cues and inferring. Regarding Overall oral comprehension, the assessment items in both sets of questions reflect elements of B2 level descriptor as in order to select the correct answers the student should be able to read with a large level of independence, adapting style and speed of reading for the purpose of the text.⁹² In terms of vocabulary, to select the correct responses the student should have a broad and active reading vocabulary, and understand the majority of specialist vocabulary, however they might experience challenges in understanding low-frequency idiomatic expressions and figurative language.⁹³ Additionally, the student should be able to use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points by using contextual information and cues in order to select the correct responses.⁹⁴

⁸⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.54.

⁹⁰ Ibid. p.60.

⁹¹ Ibid. p.131.

⁹² Ibid. p.54.

⁹³ Ibid. p.131.

⁹⁴ Ibid. p.60.

For example, the CEFR analysis found that the assessment items in the second set of questions are not lower than B2 level because although the question outlines in which paragraph the answers to the questions are located within the text, the vocabulary of the questions is more complex and the students need to be able to infer and identify meaning of the whole paragraph in order to find the synonyms to the words included in the questions. All the words included in the second set of questions are gerunds and their synonyms located within the text are also gerunds which makes it easier for the student to identify. However, the words included in both the text and the questions are complex ('switching', 'gazing', 'seeking', 'stretching for', 'alternating') requiring a good command of more complex vocabulary from the student as these words are not everyday vocabulary. Additionally, the fourth set of questions requires the student to have good knowledge and command of simple and more complex grammatical structures such as reported speech (B1 and B2), complex modal verbs (B1 and B2), passive voice (B1 and B2), reversed sentence structure and alternating from passive to active voice, as well as knowledge of a wide range of synonyms. Therefore, both sets of questions were found to reflect elements of B2 level descriptors in several CEFR activities, strategies, and competences.

However, regarding the third set of questions of text B the CEFR analysis found that this corresponds to B1+ and B2 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Reading for information and argument, Overall reading comprehension and Identifying cues and inferring. In terms of Reading for information and argument, this set of questions reflects elements of the B1+ level descriptor as the student should be able to recognise the lines of argument, the main conclusions, and points of view but not necessarily in detail in order to correctly answer to the questions.⁹⁵ Additionally, to select the correct responses, the student should be able to extrapolate the meaning of occasionally unknown words, understand the meaning of a section by taking into consideration the whole text but also use a variety of reading strategies to achieve comprehension by identifying main points but also contextual information reflecting elements of both B1+ and B2 levels in the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring.⁹⁶ For example, in this set of questions the student should be able to identify that the phrase 'instead of' is synonym to 'rather than' within the text, and generally identify the meaning of the sentences to complete the questions with the correct response from the text. Additionally, the student should be able to understand the difference between reported and active speech (B1 and B2), have good knowledge of simple and more complex grammatical structures such as passive voice (B1 and B2), modals (B1 and B2) and the gerund (A2).

Text C

Text C of Paper 2 of the N22 reading comprehension examination is a 417-word article focusing on children's need to spend time in nature. The article is adapted from an authentic online source. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the IB DP Language B syllabus such as sharing the planet, and the optional recommended topics of the urban and rural environment, the climate, experiences, and leisure activities. The CEFR domains covered in this text includes the public and educational domains.⁹⁷ More specifically, Text C includes 14 assessment items included in four set of

⁹⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 56-57.

⁹⁶ Ibid. p.60.

⁹⁷ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

questions. The first set of questions includes four true or false questions and the second set of questions includes three matching questions. The third set of questions includes four open questions which require students to provide short answers and the fourth set of questions includes three multiple choice questions.

More specifically, in order to respond to the first set of questions the student should read the whole text, then read each question and try and identify if the statements included in the questions are true or false using information from the text, but also write a phrase, a word or a sentence providing a justification to why the statement is true or false. Additionally, in the second set of questions the student should read the paragraphs 28 to 30, then read the options included in the questions and try and match the correct titles to the relevant paragraphs to get the marks. Furthermore, regarding the third set of questions the student is required to read the lines 25-36 of Text C, find the answers to the open questions and fill in the gaps, with the correct answers from the text. In the fourth set of question, the student is asked to read line 38 but also the whole text, and try and identify the correct answers to the multiple-choice questions referring to the relevant information from Text C.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of Text C includes a wide range of grammatical structures passive voice (is parcelled), future tenses (will learn, they will be able to use), modal verbs (can seem, be able to use, they can see), comparatives and superlatives (more sociable, are happier and more attentive, less anxious than), present continuous (are growing up) and the gerund (letting you child). Additionally, the input text of Text C includes a variety of language functions such as describing of things, expressing opinions, comparing things, giving advice, reporting facts, actions, narrating and describing past, present, and future events, developing an argument, conceding an argument, and defending a point of view.

The CEFR analysis of Text C found that all assessment items of Text C reflect elements of the B2 level descriptor in the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Identifying cues and inferring, Reading for information and argument, Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range. For example, the first set of questions aligns with the B2 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Grammatical accuracy and Overall reading comprehension as the students should have a good knowledge and command of simple and more complex grammatical structures, such as reversed sentence structure, and transferring from passive to active voice, demonstrating a high degree of grammatical control and independence, adapting style and speed of reading.⁹⁸ Additionally, to select the correct answers to this set of questions the student should have a good command of simple and more complex vocabulary and demonstrate their ability to identify synonyms and the meaning of the sentences. For example, the student should be able to understand, infer and identify meaning of the text to understand that the following sentence 'More and more land is being used for housing' has the same meaning as the sentence 'As the suburbs continue to expand'. In the second set of questions the student is asked to match the correct titles to the paragraphs 28 to 30 which require students to be able to identify the overall meaning of the paragraphs, understand simple and complex vocabulary and phrases, and be able to vary the formulation of words and have a

⁹⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 54, 131, 132.

wide range of vocabulary about most general topics.⁹⁹ For example, in order to select the correct answers, the student should be able to understand that the phrases 'letting your child choose' means supporting children's 'personal decision making', and that the sentences 'children will learn what happens if they forget something' and 'entrusting a child to take care' means that the children need to be taught responsible behaviour and how to be responsible.

Furthermore, to get the marks in the third set of questions the students should be able to use a variety of language and reading comprehension strategies to find the correct answers by taking into consideration the main points of the text and contextual information. More specifically, in this set of questions the students should be able to identify synonyms or phrases with similar meaning from the text taking into consideration the context of the text.¹⁰⁰ For example, students should be able to understand that in the context of the text the phrase 'may seem' indicates 'false impressions', the phrase 'minimum activity' has similar meaning with the phrase 'even going for a walk' and that the phrase 'special feeling only nature can bring' has a similar meaning with the phrase 'unique sense of wonder'. Finally, the last set of questions also reflects elements of the B2 level descriptor in the CEFR scales of Identifying cues and inferring, Overall reading comprehension and Vocabulary range. This is because to select the correct answers the students should be able to identify meaning and the message of the whole text, understand the audience that the text is targeted to, and identify synonyms, for example that the phrase 'calmer and at ease' has similar meaning to the phrase 'pleasure and peacefulness'.¹⁰¹ The CEFR analysis of Text C found that all assessment items of Text C do not reflect elements of the C1 or C2 level descriptors as in order to get the mark the students do not need to know very complex language such as idiomatic expressions or specialist and technical vocabulary. Additionally, in some cases the questions indicate where the answer to the questions is located within the text which makes it easier for the student to identify the correct answer and this is another reason why the assessment items of this text do not reflect elements higher than the B2 level.

Higher Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL English B reading comprehension examination of N20 to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

N20

Text A

Extract A in the reading comprehension section of Paper 2 (HL) is identical to the input text used for Extract C in Paper 2 (SL). As such, the components are the same: a 405-word persuasive text adapted from an authentic source (an NGO volunteering webpage) that refers to the concrete topic of volunteering in Africa.¹⁰² Text A corresponds to public and occupational

⁹⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 131.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. pp. 60, 131.

¹⁰¹ Ibid. pp. 60 and 131.

¹⁰² Community Action Africa (n.d.) *Call for Volunteers from Retired Teachers for English, Maths and Science* [online]. Available from: <<https://communityactionafrica.co.za/call-for-volunteers>> [Accessed 16/05/2019].

domains of language use, whilst the subject matter is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the syllabus, such as social organisation, as well as optional recommended topics like community, social engagement, and education.¹⁰³

Input text and CEFR analysis

Paper 2 includes nine assessment items relating to the content of input text A. These include question types such as: matching words and phrases (questions one to four), multiple choice (question five), and sentence completion / matching subjects with predicates (questions six to nine).

Where input text A is identical to the excerpt included in Extract C (Paper 2 SL), the linguistic features are the same as those previously described (see Text C SL). These include lexical categories such as: possessive determiners ('your role'), modal verbs ('can participate'), prepositions as postmodifiers ('learners in schools'), demonstrative pronouns ('those wishing'), adjectives ('exciting and interesting'), adverbs of manner ('to effectively plan'), and intensifiers ('very relaxed'). The morphosyntactic components of text A include: finite verbs in present simple ('like to make') and future simple ('you will explore') tenses, adverbial clauses of condition ('If your answer is yes'), adverbial clauses of time ('while simultaneously working'), and passive clauses ('these will be published and highlighted'). Text A contains language functions such as: asking questions for confirmation, identification, and information; describing; reporting actions; requests; and persuading.

The assessment items relating to text A are broadly consistent with CEFR B1+ descriptors. For example, task one involves locating a phrase in extract A that has a meaning synonymous with 'cause a change'. The answer can be inferred through syntactic-semantic comprehension of the relevant sentence ('Would you like to make a difference to the lives of young people in your neighbourhood?'), recognising that the root of the term 'difference' ('differ') denotes variation and associating this with 'young people' in the prepositional phrase 'to the lives of young people'. Students could also infer from the context of the article that words in the heading ('volunteers') and subheading ('can help') are semantically linked to the concept of effecting social change. These skills align with CEFR B1+ criteria where the ability to 'extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words / signs from the context and deduce sentence meaning' and 'extrapolate the meaning of a section of a text by taking into account the text as a whole' is referred to.¹⁰⁴

Text B

Input text B is a 369-word persuasive article adapted from an authentic source (uploaded on the website of an educational foundation).¹⁰⁵ The extract discuss the topic of teaching with a degree of abstraction, corresponding to the educational, occupational, and public domains of language use. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the syllabus, such as social organisation and experiences, as well as optional recommended topics like education and the working world.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

¹⁰⁴ Identifying Cues and Inferring [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.60].

¹⁰⁵ Johnson, B. (2013) *Great Teachers Don't Teach* [online]. Available from: <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/great-teachers-do-not-teach-ben-johnson> [accessed 28/11/2022].

¹⁰⁶ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

Input text and CEFR analysis

Text B contains lexical categories such as: possessive determiners ('his enthusiasm'), demonstratives ('these long-term memories'), adjectives ('great performers'), prepositions as postmodifiers ('professor in college'), quantifiers ('a few excellent remarks'), adverbs of manner ('personally experiencing'), and modal verbs ('can develop'). The morphosyntactic features of text B include finite verbs in present simple ('I remember'), past simple ('I concluded'), past perfect ('I had already read'), and future simple ('will devise') tenses. Noun clauses ('[I concluded] that the professor was an effective teacher'), adverbial clauses of reason ('because he had provided experiences'), and restrictive relative clauses ('that created these long-term memories') are used in complex sentence forms. The language functions contained in text B refer to: narrating and describing past, present, and future events; critiquing and reviewing; describing people; expressing opinions; reporting actions; justification; and comparison.

The assessment items relating to text B broadly align with B2+ CEFR descriptors. For example, multiple choice tasks involve locating and comprehending the principal positions that are expounded in the article (for instance, 'The writer believes that the best learning experiences involve...'). This requires the ability to scan the text to selectively comprehend certain sections and intensively read the article to acquire a detailed comprehension of the extract in its entirety. This corresponds to B2+ Reading for Information and Argument criteria that refer to the capacity to 'obtain information, ideas and opinions from highly specialised sources within their field'.¹⁰⁷

Text C

Extract C of the English HL Paper 2 of the N20 reading comprehension examination is a 483-word narrative text adapted from an authentic public domain source and more specifically from a historical novel.¹⁰⁸ The novel is set in the period of post-war Ireland onwards and the excerpt relates the interactions of several characters as they disembark in Dublin. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the syllabus, such as identities and experiences, as well as the optional recommended topics of artistic expressions, life stories, and social relations.¹⁰⁹

Input text and CEFR analysis

In terms of lexical categories, text C contains parts of speech that include personal pronouns ('she would reply') (A1), objective case pronouns ('surprised her'), possessive determiners ('my mother') (A1 and A2), quantifiers ('any in Ballincollig'), comparative adjectives ('darker') (A1 to B1), adverbs of frequency ('occasionally veered') (A1 and A2), adverbs of manner ('looked around anxiously') (B1), intensifiers ('such good friends') (B1), and modal verbs ('might be') (B1). The extract includes morphosyntactic components such as finite verbs in present simple ('sun is out') (A1), present perfect ('has found') (A2), past simple ('it surprised') (A2), past continuous ('we were sitting') (A2), and past perfect ('had been hatched') (B1) tenses. Complex and complex-compound sentences in text C contain subordinate clauses

¹⁰⁷ Reading for Information and Argument [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.57].

¹⁰⁸ Boyne, J. (2017) *The Heart's Invisible Furies*. London, Black Swan.

¹⁰⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

such as: adverbial clauses of contrast ('Where Seán was outgoing and affable to the point of innocence, [Smoot was a darker and more reticent figure]'), adverbial clauses of time ('As the bus arrived in to Dublin'), participle clauses ('smiling at him'), and restrictive relative clauses ('[introspection] that occasionally veered towards despair'). The language functions contained in text C include: expressing opinions; describing emotions, people, places, and past experiences; comparison; narrating past, present, and future events; and introducing self, others, and relatives.

The assessment items relating to text C generally correspond to CEFR C1 level descriptors. For example, question 27 ('To whom or to what do the underlined words refer? 'there's that at least') requires an understanding of pro-forms, specifically, a pro-clause ('the sun is out') that is referenced anaphorically. Recovering the meaning of the anaphor requires the ability to semantically comprehend the preceding text where the antecedent and referent is located. This involves an understanding of two subordinate clauses: one containing two additional anaphors ('she would reply then'), whilst the subject of the second is elliptical ('smiling at him'). These skills are consistent with C1 CEFR Overall reading comprehension descriptors that refer to the ability to 'understand a wide variety of texts including literary writings', as well as C1 Identifying cues and inferring criteria such as the capacity to use 'contextual, grammatical and lexical cues' and 'anticipate what will come next'.¹¹⁰

Listening

Standard Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL English B listening comprehension examination of N20 and N22 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences. Whilst the N20 listening comprehension examination was part of the first batch of papers authored, it was not sat, but it was used as specimen material when the rollout of the examination got delayed.

N20

Text A

In Text A of the SL assessment of listening comprehension the student is asked to listen to a recording of a radio show which is dialogue and discussion between two people. The student is required to listen to the audio recording and select the 5 correct statements in a true or false question.¹¹¹ The topics discussed during the discussion focus on celebrity status, lifestyles, health and wellbeing. From the IB documentation the theme explored in this text is identities, and the topics discussed focus on lifestyles, health and wellbeing, personal attributes, eating and drinking, and physical wellbeing. The CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and educational domains.¹¹² To respond to the questions, the student should carefully listen

¹¹⁰ Overall Reading Comprehension [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.54]; Identifying Cues and Inferring [Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. [pdf]. p.60].

¹¹¹ Ibid. p. 3.

¹¹² Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

to the audio recording, take notes while listening to the audio by paying particular attention to the details of the conversation to be able to use the notes to answer the true or false questions. The total number of marks that are allocated to this task are 5 marks.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of Text A is a conversation and dialogue between two people. The analysis of the input text indicated that the word count of the audio transcript of Text A was 338 words. In terms of pronunciation and accent, in the audio recording both speakers talked in clear language and pronunciations, with one speaker having UK accent and the other speaker having Australian accent. During their dialogue, the speakers used a wide range of basic grammatical structures such as subject personal pronouns (I agree), regular and common irregular plurals (celebrities), possessive pronouns (their influence), common adjectives (younger, short), present continuous (is growing and growing, is increasing), futures (they will sometimes do the wrong thing), past simple in a negative form (I didn't know) and comparatives (more popular than, more careful). The language functions of the input text included asking questions for confirmation, identification, and information, correcting information, describing habits and routines, clarifying, expressing opinions, agreement and disagreement, reporting facts, comparing things and developing an argument. The overall CEFR level of the input text was identified as A2-B1 level.

CEFR analysis findings

The different statements that the student needs to read through and select the true statements from in Text A align with CEFR descriptors ranging from A2+ to B1+ levels. More specifically, the statement B reflects A2+ level descriptor in the CEFR scale of understanding conversation between other people and Overall oral comprehension as the student needs to recognise when people agree or disagree in a conversation in order to get the mark.¹¹³ Additionally, statement E aligns with B1 CEFR descriptors in relation to Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range as the students should be able to know that the phrases 'do the wrong thing' and 'behave badly' are synonyms to respond to the question.¹¹⁴ Also, students should have basic grammatical knowledge of present simple and adverbs in order to get the mark. In addition, statement H reflects elements of B1 CEFR level descriptor in relation to Vocabulary range as the student should be able to recognise that the words 'bad' and 'negative' are synonyms to be awarded the mark. Furthermore, statement I demonstrates elements of A2+ CEFR level descriptors in relation to Overall oral comprehension as the student should know the comparative 'more popular than' in order to respond correctly to this question.¹¹⁵ Additionally, statement J reflects elements of B1/B1+ CEFR level descriptors especially in the scales of Identifying cues and inferring and Overall oral comprehension as that student should be able to extrapolate the meaning of section of the audio recording by taking into consideration the recording as a whole and by understanding the key points made by the speakers in clear language and familiar topics.¹¹⁶ For all the reasons mentioned above, the CEFR analysis of Text A indicated that the overall level of this text is A2+/B1.

¹¹³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48-49.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. p. 131-132.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. p. 48.

¹¹⁶ Ibid. p.48 and 60.

The overall CEFR level of Text A is not lower than A2+ because it would be difficult for a student with knowledge of A1 level to select the true statements as the task requires students to understand meaning and have some knowledge of simple grammatical structures (adverbs, common adjectives, plurals, comparative, present simple affirmative and negative, intensifiers, futures) and vocabulary (mainly synonyms and everyday expressions), understand agreement and disagreement in a conversation, the narrative and the overall argument and meaning of the conversation. The overall CEFR level of Text A is not higher than B1 because the task does not require students to have knowledge or to use complex vocabulary and grammatical structures.

Text B

Text B of SL includes two sets of questions. During the first set of questions the student is asked to listen to a monologue of a vlogger and then based on what they listened to, they have to respond to five open-ended questions which require students to provide short answers. During the second set of questions of text B the student is required to listen to the monologue of a vlogger and based on what they listen to they should respond to five multiple choice questions.¹¹⁷ The topics discussed during the discussion focus on physical and mental health experiences and issues. From the IB documentation, the theme explored is identities, and the topics covered are lifestyles, health and wellbeing, eating and drinking, and physical wellbeing. The CEFR domain covered in this text is the personal domain.¹¹⁸ The total number of marks allocated to this task are 10 marks, five marks are allocated to the first set of questions which includes five open-ended questions, and five marks are allocated to the second set of questions which includes five multiple choice of questions. To respond to the questions, the student should listen carefully to the audio recording of the short monologue and take notes on what they listen to during the audio recording which would help them respond to both the open-ended and multiple-choice questions.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of text B is a short monologue of a vlogger who is sharing her personal experiences around her physical and mental health. The analysis of the input text indicated that the word count of the audio transcript of text B was 374 words and the speaker had Australian accent and she was speaking in clear language and pronunciation. During the monologue, the speaker used a wide range of basic grammatical structures such as regular and common irregular plurals (pictures), subject personal pronouns (I), possessive pronouns (my name is), intensifiers (lucky enough), common adjectives (lucky, healthy, fun-loving, mental, physical, amazing), adverbs (constantly, luckily), present simple in the affirmative and negative form (I still exercise, I don't need), past simple (finished, started), reported speech (Anna said I had to train), futures (I will tell you) and comparatives (I feel better). The language functions of the input text include describing habits and routines, past experiences, people, feelings and emotions; giving personal information; introducing self; expressing likes and dislikes; expressing opinions; reporting facts and actions; narrating past, present and future events. The overall CEFR level of the input text was identifying to correspond to A2 -B1 level.

¹¹⁷ International Baccalaureate. (2020). English Language B November 2020 Specimen Paper Writing and Listening Standard Level. p. 4-6.

¹¹⁸ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

CEFR analysis findings

The first set of questions of text B includes five open-ended questions requiring students to provide short answers. The CEFR analysis found that the five questions included in the first set of questions of text B align with A2+ CEFR level descriptors of the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Grammatical accuracy, and Vocabulary range. Regarding Overall oral comprehension, the A2+ level descriptor outlines that the student can understand enough to be able to meet the needs of a concrete type of recording, given that the people speak clearly and slowly. More specifically, sub-question 2 reflects elements of A2+ in Overall oral comprehension, as the student needs to listen carefully to the beginning of the audio, spot the two adjectives used to describe Samantha, and write only one of those adjectives.¹¹⁹ Additionally, in sub-question 3 the student should be able to understand the narrative and the story, and to have knowledge of basic grammatical structures, such as past simple, and basic vocabulary. For this specific sub-question, the mark scheme allows another correct answer which makes it easier for the student to be awarded the mark and as a result this sub-question reflects also reflects elements of A2+ level. Furthermore, in sub-questions 4, 5 and 6 the student should be able to understand basic and simple grammatical structures such as past simple in both affirmative and interrogative forms, and prepositions of place, reflecting A2 level in Grammatical accuracy and A2+ level in Overall oral comprehension.¹²⁰ For all the reasons mentioned above, the CEFR analysis of the first set of questions of text B indicated that the overall level of this set of questions is A2+. Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the first set of questions of text B is not higher than A2+ because the student must identify the specific wording used in the audio and fill in the blanks with the identical phrases and words used in the audio. So as soon as the student notes down the words and phrases while they listen to the audio, they can easily fill in the blanks with the required wording which is identical to the one in the audio.

The second set of questions of text B includes five multiple choice questions requiring students to select one current answer to each one of the questions. The CEFR analysis found that the five questions included in the second set of questions of Text B align with B1 and B1+ CEFR level descriptors of the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding audio media and recordings, Identifying cues and inferring, and Vocabulary range. More specifically, sub-question 7, 9 and 10 reflect elements of B1 level descriptors on Overall oral comprehension, Understanding audio and Identifying cues and inferring. This is because to select the correct answer, the student should be able to understand the key points made in the audio in a simple and familiar language, understand some important details in narratives and stories, given that they are articulated slowly and clearly, and follow a line of argument and a sequence of events by focusing on logical and familiar connectors.¹²¹ Additionally, sub-questions 8 and 11 reflect elements of B1+ CEFR level descriptor in the Overall oral comprehension and Identifying cues and inferring. This is because to select the correct answer, the student should be able to understand factual information and also being able to identify both general information and meaning but also details and important information in the audio, as well as extrapolate meaning from specific sections of the audio by taking into

¹¹⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

¹²⁰ Ibid. p.48 and 130.

¹²¹ Ibid. pp. 48, 52, and 60.

consideration the audio as a whole.¹²² For all the reasons mentioned above, the CEFR analysis of the second set of questions of Text B indicated that the overall level of this text is B1/B1+. Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions of Text B is not lower than B1/B1+ because in order to respond correctly to the multiple choice questions the student should have a good knowledge of vocabulary to identify synonyms and also have a good Overall oral comprehension in order to be able to understand the overall meaning of the audio, the details, follow the narrative and the story, and be able to identify the main points and arguments in the story.

Text C

Text C of SL includes two sets of questions. During the first set of questions of Text C the student is asked to listen to a discussion between two students in a classroom and choose the one correct option out of the three in each one of the five statements. During the second set of questions of Text C the student is required to listen to the same discussion and complete the gaps with the appropriate words from the audio recording.¹²³ The discussion between the two students focuses on tall buildings in big cities. From the IB documentation, the prescribed themes explored in this text are sharing the planet and human ingenuity and the optional recommended topics covered are the environment, urban and rural environment, climate, environment, global issues, technology, and scientific innovation. More specifically, the students discussed about a wide range of topics including ways of living, urban versus rural life, energy efficiency and eco-friendly solutions related to tall buildings, climate change and the environmental impact of tall buildings. The CEFR domains covered in this text are the public and educational domains.¹²⁴ The total number of marks that are allocated to this task are 10 marks, five marks allocated to the first set of questions which includes the true or false questions, and five marks allocated to the second set of questions which includes gap fill questions. To respond to the first set of questions, the student should listen carefully to the audio recording, take notes during the discussion on the key points, words, themes, and arguments made by each one of the speakers in order to be able to use these notes to identify the true statements included in the first set of questions related to Text C. Additionally, to respond to the second set of questions, the student should be able to listen carefully to the audio recording and take notes on key words used throughout the audio in order to be able to fill in the gaps with the correct words and phrases of the second set of questions related to Text C.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of Text C is a short dialogue between two students in a classroom. The analysis of the input text indicated that the word count of the audio transcript of Text C was 436 words and the speakers used clear language and pronunciation. More specifically, one speaker had UK accent and the other speaker had Australian accent. During the discussion, the speakers used a wide range of basic but also more complex grammatical structures. Some of the basic grammatical structures used during the discussion were subject personal pronouns (I disagree), common prepositions (housing in cities), demonstrative adjectives (that is true),

¹²² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 48, 60.

¹²³ International Baccalaureate. (2020). English Language B November 2020 Specimen Paper Writing and Listening Standard Level. pp.7-8.

¹²⁴ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

present simple (I disagree), common adjectives (expensive, tall, interesting), futures (will continue), and adverbs (certainly). Furthermore, some of the more complex grammatical structures used by the speakers throughout the discussion included passive voice (is restricted, are used), complex adjectives (excessive, affordable) and complex prepositions (between the city's tall buildings). The language functions of the input text included asking questions for confirmation, identification, information; describing places and things; expressing likes, dislikes and opinions; expressing agreement and disagreement; comparing things; reporting facts and actions; developing an argument; defending a point of view; persuading; objecting and emphasizing a point, feeling, or issue. The overall CEFR level of the input text was identified as B1+/B2 level.

CEFR analysis findings

The first set of questions of Text C includes five statements requiring students to select the correct option out of the three possible options in each one of the five statements. The CEFR analysis found that the first set of questions of Text C aligned with B1 and B1+ levels in the CEFR activities of Understanding conversation between other people, Overall oral comprehension, Identifying cues and inferring and in the CEFR competence of Vocabulary range. In terms of Overall oral comprehension, the analysis found that this better reflects B1 and B1+ levels as in order to select the correct options the student needs to be able to understand the key points, ideas and messages in a conversation, but also specific details given that these are clearly articulated.¹²⁵ Additionally, regarding Understanding conversation between other people, the analysis indicated that this reflected A2+, B1 and B1+ levels as the students were required to recognise agreement and disagreement in a conversation, to understand the main points made in a long discussion, given that they are in familiar topics, and they are clearly articulated.¹²⁶ In addition, in terms of Identifying cues and inferring, the analysis found that this set of questions reflected B1 and B1+ levels as in order to select the correct answers the students needed to be able to follow a line of argument by focusing on logical connectors and also to be able to extrapolate meaning of a specific section of the audio recording by taking into consideration the text as a whole.¹²⁷

In terms of vocabulary, the analysis found that this set of questions reflects B1 CEFR level as the student is required to have a good range of vocabulary around familiar topics in order to be able to identify synonyms. More specifically, the student should be able to identify that the words 'attractive' and 'modern, beautiful and amazing' are synonyms and also recognise that the words 'boring' and 'uninteresting' are also synonyms.¹²⁸ Regarding Grammatical accuracy, the CEFR analysis found that the first set of questions of Text C reflects elements of B1 levels as the student should have some knowledge of passive voice and modal verbs in order to understand that the phrases 'height is restricted' and 'buildings can't be taller than 90 feet' have similar meaning. Additionally, to respond correctly to this questions the student should have some grammatical knowledge of comparatives to be able to recognise that the phrases 'the city living becomes less popular' and that 'fewer people will live in cities' have similar

¹²⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 48.

¹²⁶ Ibid. 49.

¹²⁷ Ibid. 60.

¹²⁸ Ibid. p.131.

meaning.¹²⁹ Overall, the analysis found that the first set of questions of Text C is not lower than B1/B1+ level because in order to respond correctly to the questions the student should have a good knowledge of vocabulary to identify synonyms and also have a good overall oral comprehension in order to be able to understand the overall meaning of the audio, the details, follow the narrative and the story, and be able to identify the main points and arguments in the story.

The second set of questions of Text C includes five questions where the student is required to fill in the gaps with the correct words. The CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions of Text C reflects elements of B1+ level in the CEFR activities of Understanding audio recordings, Understanding conversation between other people, Overall oral comprehension and Identifying cues and inferring. More specifically, this is because the student should have good knowledge of vocabulary to be able to identify synonyms but also have a good knowledge of grammar, such as knowledge of modal verbs, common and complex nouns, and present simple to be able to correctly respond to the questions.¹³⁰ Additionally, this set of questions reflects elements of B1+ level in the CEFR activity of Understanding audio recording as the student should be able to understand the majority of the recorded information given that it is in a familiar topic, and it is delivered in a clear language.¹³¹ Furthermore, in the CEFR activity Understanding conversation between other people, this set of questions reflects elements of B1+ level as the student should be able to follow a discussion between other people when it is focused on familiar topics, and it is articulated in a clear language.¹³² In terms of Overall oral comprehension, this set of question aligns with B1+ level as the student should be able to understand information delivered in a clear language and also be able to identify both general messages and main ideas but also specific details and points made during the discussion.¹³³ In relation to Identifying cues and inferring, this set of questions also reflects B1+ level as in order to correctly respond to the questions the student should be able to extrapolate meaning of unknown words, identify the meaning of some unfamiliar words from the context of the conversation and extrapolate meaning of a section of the audio by taking into consideration the text as a whole.¹³⁴

Overall, this set of questions is not lower than B1+ because the students should demonstrate their ability to understand the meaning of the audio recording and extract specific words used to fill in the sentences in the task, as the marks scheme outlines that only if the student completes the correct word, then they will be rewarded with a mark. The task is not higher than B1+ because all the words that students need to complete in the sentences are mentioned and highlighted in the audio recording, and also the task do not require students to have knowledge of complex grammatical forms. More specifically, all the sentences in this task require students to find nouns to complete the gaps. As a result, as long as students recognise that all sentences require the completion of nouns, and that after the article 'the' they need to complete a noun, they can easily complete the task.

¹²⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.131.

¹³⁰ Ibid. pp. 131-132.

¹³¹ Ibid. p. 52.

¹³² Ibid. p.49.

¹³³ Ibid. p.48.

¹³⁴ Ibid. p. 60.

N22

Text A

In Text A of the N22 English B listening comprehension examination (Paper 2) the student is asked to listen to a short monologue of a police officer and asked to select the five true statements in the true or false question based on what they hear. The students listen to the recording twice. From the IB documentation the topics discussed during the presentation focus on social organization, community, social engagement, education, the working world, and law and order. The CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and occupational domains.¹³⁵ To respond to questions and awarded the marks, the student should listen to the short monologue, take notes during the monologue on the key points, key words, expressions and phrases used, key arguments and main points made to be able to respond to the questions and select the five true statements. Noting down key words that are used throughout the audio can help the student select the five true statements.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of Text A is a short monologue of a police officer. The analysis of the input text indicated that the total wordcount of the audio recording transcript was 277 words. The short monologue was delivered in a clear language and the speaker had American accent. During the monologue, the speaker used a variety of simple and complex grammatical structures such as present perfect (it has been), past simple (I achieved), modals (I would still like to see), phrasal verbs (turn to crime, give back to the society), superlatives (the best way) and conditionals (If your parents had low-paid jobs, then you probably believe you will be poor too). Additionally, the speaker used a wide range of language functions including giving personal information, introducing self, describing past experiences, hopes, and plans, expressing opinions, agreement and disagreement, developing and argument and emphasising a point, feeling and an issue. The overall CEFR level of the input text of Text A was identified as B1/B2.

CEFR analysis findings

The different statements that the student needs to read through and select the true statements from in Text A align with CEFR descriptors ranging from A2+ to B1 levels. More specifically, statements B and C reflect A2+ level descriptors in the CEFR scale of Overall oral comprehension as the students need to understand enough to be able to meet the needs of questions given that the people articulate clearly and slowly.¹³⁶ Additionally, statements B and C reflect A2+ level descriptors in the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring as the students need to be able to exploit known words/signs to deduce the meaning of unfamiliar words and signs in short expressions used in everyday contexts and be able to use an idea and the overall meaning of a short texts on everyday topics to derive the probable meaning of unknown words from the contexts.¹³⁷ More specifically, this two statements reflect elements of A2+ level as the information on those statements is identical to the information included in the recording so as soon as the students take notes of the key information and the actual wording mentioned in the audio recording, they will be able to select the correct statements. The next three correct statements of this question including G, H and J reflect elements of B1 level in the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding audio recordings,

¹³⁵ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

¹³⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

¹³⁷ Ibid. p.60.

Understanding as a member of a live audience, Identifying cues and inferring and Vocabulary range. In terms of Understanding as a member of a live audience, these statements reflect elements of the B1 level descriptor which focuses on students' ability to understand the main points of what is said in a straightforward monologue, provided the delivery is clear and relatively slow.¹³⁸ Additionally, regarding Overall oral comprehension these statements also reflect elements of the B1 level descriptor which outlines students' ability to understand the main points made in clear standard language on familiar matters regularly encountered at work including short narratives.¹³⁹ Furthermore, in terms of Identifying cues and inferring these statements also reflect elements of the B1 level descriptor which outlines students' ability to follow a line of argumentation or the sequence of events in a story, by focusing on common logical connectors (e.g. however, because) and temporal connectors (e.g. after that, beforehand).¹⁴⁰ More specifically, in terms of Vocabulary range these statements were also found to correspond to elements of the B1 level descriptor as the student should be able to infer meaning and recognise synonyms as the sentences in those subtasks are not identical to the recording but they include synonyms.¹⁴¹

The overall CEFR level of Text A was found to be A2+/B1. More specifically, the overall CEFR level of Text A is not lower than A2+/B1 because the student should be able to understand the meaning and the overall message of the recording to respond correctly to the true or false questions. Additionally, Text A is not lower than A2+/B1 because it requires the student to be able to recognise synonyms and has a good knowledge of basic and everyday vocabulary to select the correct answers. Furthermore, the task is not higher than A2+/B1 because the student is not asked to use any complex grammar or vocabulary or any idiomatic expressions to respond to the questions.

Text B

In Text B of the N22 English B listening comprehension examination the student is asked to listen to a short conversation between two people talking about going on holiday and respond to two sets of questions. The first set questions includes five multiple choice questions and the second set of questions includes five gap fill closed questions with open response. The students listen to the recording twice. During the first set of questions the student is asked to listen to the short dialogue and select the correct answers in the five multiple choice questions and in the second set of questions the student is asked to listen to the conversation and fill in the gaps in the holiday booking request for based on the information they heard in the audio recording. From the IB documentation, the topics discussed during the discussion focus on experiences, leisure activities, holidays and travel. The CEFR domain covered in this text is the personal domain.¹⁴² To respond to the first set of questions and get the marks, the student should listen to the conversation, take notes during the discussion, write down key words, key arguments for both hotels mentioned during the discussion, write down a pros and cons list for both hotels as identified by the speakers and then try and select the correct answers. Additionally, to successfully respond to the second set of questions and get the marks the student should listen to the conversation and take notes during the discussion and the details

¹³⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.50.

¹³⁹ Ibid. p.48.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. p.60.

¹⁴¹ Ibid. p.131.

¹⁴² Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

mentioned by the speakers on the time, date, and specific requirements that they have to successfully fill in the booking request form with the correct details.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of Text B is a short conversation and dialogue between two people discussing about where to go on holiday and in which hotel to stay. The analysis of the input text indicated that the word count of the audio transcript of Text B was 331 words. Both speakers have clear accent, pronunciation and intonation, with one having American accent and the other having Australian accent. The difference in the accent allows students to distinguish the two speakers and the points made by each speaker. During the discussion, the speakers use a wide range of simple and complex grammatical structures including common adjectives (spacious), present simple in affirmative and negative forms (doesn't have a garden), futures (I will, I am going to), modal verbs (shall we go, we can take a shore), imperatives (look there are a few restaurants), and expressions (hitting the road). Additionally, both speakers used a variety of language functions including asking questions for confirmation and information, correcting and clarifying information, describing past experiences, places and things, expressing opinions, agreement and disagreement, comparing things, persuading, defending a point of view and emphasising points, feelings and issues. The overall CEFR level of the input text of Text B was identified as B1/B2.

CEFR analysis findings

The first set of questions of Text B includes five multiple choice questions and the second set of questions includes five gap fill questions. The CEFR analysis found that both set of questions of Text B align with the B1 and B1+ level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding conversation between other people, Understanding audio recording, Identifying cues and inferring and Vocabulary range. Regarding Overall oral comprehension, both set of questions reflect elements of B1 level as the students should be able to understand the main points made in clear language in a variety of topics encountered at leisure but also elements of B1+ level as they should also understand straightforward factual information on everyday topics, by identifying both general messages and specific details in a discussion where the speakers articulate clearly.¹⁴³ In terms of the CEFR scale of Understanding conversation between other people, the CEFR analysis found that both sets of questions align with the B1 and B1+ level descriptors as they require the student to follow the main points in a discussion given that it is articulated in standard language and in a familiar subject.¹⁴⁴ Additionally, in terms of Identifying cues and inferring both sets of questions reflect elements of the B1 and B1+ level descriptors as in order to select the correct answers the student should be able to deduce probably meaning of unknown words, follow a line of argumentation and a sequence of events, extrapolate and identify meaning of occasional unknown words from the context, extrapolate the meaning of section of a text by considering the text as a whole, and also exploit different types of connectors and their role in the paragraphs and sections of the audio in the overall organisation of the text to better understand the argument in the text.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. p.49.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid. p.60.

The overall CEFR level of Text B was found to be B1/B1+. The CEFR analysis found that text is not lower than B1/B1+ as the students need to identify the meaning, specific details mentioned during the conversation, identify synonyms, have a good knowledge of simple everyday vocabulary and simple grammatical structures. Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the task is not higher than B1/B1+ because the student is not asked to use and to have knowledge of complex grammar or vocabulary or any idiomatic expressions in order to respond to the questions.

Text C

In text C of the N22 English B listening comprehension examination (Paper 2), the student is asked to listen to a lecture and presentation about fake news. Text C includes two sets of questions. The first set of questions includes five multiple choice questions, and the second set of questions includes five gap fill closed questions which require open responses. From the IB documentation the topics discussed during the presentation focus on human ingenuity, communication, media, and technology.¹⁴⁶ The CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and educational domains.¹⁴⁷ The total number of marks allocated to this task are 10 marks, five marks allocated to the first set of questions and five marks allocated to the second set of questions. To respond to both sets of questions and get the marks, the student should be able to carefully listen to the lecture, take notes on the key words, phrases, arguments, and points made by the speakers, and try and select the correct options in the multiple-choice questions and try to use their notes to complete the sentences in the gap fill questions with the correct wording.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of text C is a short monologue, lecture and presentation about fake news. The analysis found that the total wordcount of the transcript of the audio recording was 416 words. The speaker of the audio recording had American accent and clear pronunciation and intonation. During the presentation the speaker used a wide range of simple and more complex grammatical structures including present perfect ('has travelled') (A2 and B1), modal verbs ('everyone should', 'can't wait', 'we can do') (A2 and B1), passive voice ('fake news is currently circulated', 'are known', 'can be detected') (B1 and B2), conditionals ('they wouldn't have reposted the untruthful content if they'd known that it was fake') (B1), the gerund ('and removing it is a violation') (A2), futures ('political ads will also be included') (A2) and imperatives ('check the publication date', 'think twice before hitting the 'share' button') (A1 and A2). Additionally, the speaker used a variety of language functions including describing things, comparing things, reporting facts and actions, narrating and describing past, present and future events, providing suggestions, reviewing, developing an argument, synthesising and evaluating, defending a point of view, and emphasising a point of view, feelings and issues. The overall CEFR level of the input text of text C was identified as B2.

CEFR analysis findings

The first set of questions of text C includes five multiple choice questions. The CEFR analysis of the first set of questions of text C indicated that this reflects elements of B2 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding as a member of a live

¹⁴⁶ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

¹⁴⁷ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

audience, Identifying cues and inferring, Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range. In terms of Overall oral comprehension, this set of questions aligns with the B2 level descriptor which outlines that the students should be able to follow an extended discourse and complex lines of argument in a familiar topic, provided that the argument is signposted with explicit markers. Additionally, in relation to the scale of understanding as a member of a live audience, this set of questions reflects elements of the B2 level descriptor as in order to correctly respond to the questions the student should be able to recognise the points of view expressed, distinguish between the facts and main themes that are being reported, and follow complex lines of argument clearly articulated in a lecture, provided that the topic is familiar.

Regarding the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring, the analysis found that this set of questions aligns with the B2 level descriptors as to get the mark the students should be able to use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, watch out for main points during the lecture and use contextual cues to achieve comprehension. In addition, in terms of Grammatical accuracy, this set of questions reflects elements of the B2 level descriptors as the student should have a good command of simple but also some complex grammatical structures, although they use complex grammatical structures with some inaccuracy. Additionally, in terms of Vocabulary control, this set of question demonstrated some elements of the B2 level descriptor as the questions required students to have a good range of vocabulary in relation to matters connected to their field but also most general topics. More specifically, to select the correct answers the students should have good knowledge of vocabulary and synonyms (e.g., 'worrying' is synonym to 'alarming' in the context of the text).

Therefore, for all the reasons mentioned above, the CEFR analysis found that the first set of questions of text C aligns with the B2 level. More specifically, the analysis found that the first set of questions of text C is not lower than B2 level because the student should have knowledge of simple and complex grammatical structures and vocabulary such as knowledge of synonyms and be able to identify the general meaning and message of the whole text but also specific sections to respond correctly to the questions. Additionally, the first set of questions of text C was found not higher than B2 because the students are not required to have knowledge of idiomatic expressions and figurative language in order to select the correct answers.

The second set of questions of text C included five gap fill questions which required students to complete the sentences with the correct answers from the audio recording. The CEFR analysis found that the first three sub-questions of this set of questions reflect elements of the B1+ descriptor in the scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding as a member of a live audience and Identifying cues and inferring. In terms of Overall oral comprehension, this set of questions reflects elements of B1+ as the students need to be able to understand straightforward information about everyday subjects and be able to identify the general message and specific details when the speakers talk clearly. Additionally, this sub-questions reflect elements of the B1+ level descriptor of the scale understanding as a member of a live audience as the students should be able to distinguish between main ideas and supporting details and follow a lecture within their own field provided that the subject matter is familiar, and it is presented in a structured and straightforward way to correctly respond to the questions. However, the last two sub-questions of the second set of questions of text C reflect elements of the B2 level descriptor in Overall oral comprehension and Identifying cues and inferring. This is because these two sub-questions require the students to be able to follow an

extended discourse and complex lines of argument, but also use a variety of strategies to achieve understanding, watching out for main points but also contextual cues. Regarding Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range, these two sub-questions also reflect elements of B2 descriptor as the student should have a good command of simple and some complex grammatical structures but also have a good range of vocabulary in the most general topics. As a result, the second set of questions of text C reflects elements of both B1+ and B2 level descriptors.

Higher Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL English B listening comprehension examination of N20 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

N20

Text A

In Text A of the HL the student is asked to listen to a recording of a guided discussion between two students and a teacher in class, about tall buildings in big cities. The student is then provided with incomplete sentences, and they are asked to complete the gaps in these five sentences. The gaps can be filled with up to three words. The accepted answer must be the word on the mark scheme, apart from question where synonyms are accepted. The topics discussed focus on tall buildings in big cities. From the IB documentation, the prescribed themes explored in this text are sharing the planet and human ingenuity and the optional recommended topics covered are the environment, urban and rural environment, climate, environment, global issues, technology and scientific innovation. More specifically, the students discussed about a wide range of topics including ways of living, urban versus rural life, energy efficiency and eco-friendly solutions related to tall buildings, climate change and the environmental impact of tall buildings. The CEFR domains covered in this text are the public and educational domains.¹⁴⁸ The total number of marks that are allocated to this task are five marks. To respond to the questions the student should listen for detail and take notes during the audio recording.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of Text A is a short discussion and debate between two students in a classroom. The analysis of the input text indicated that the word count of the audio transcript of Text A was 423 words. The audio recording included one male and one female speaker who used clear pronunciation and intonation. More specifically one speaker had UK accent and the other speaker had Australian accent, but both had clear pronunciation and intonation. The Australian accent does not add extra challenge to the student but helps them to differentiate the two male voices. The audio recording included some authentic features such as background noise. However, the background noise stops once the dialogue between the two students begins. During their dialogue, the speakers used a wide range of basic grammatical structures such as regular and irregular plurals (cities, buildings), possessive pronouns (their), common

¹⁴⁸ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

adjectives (tall), present simple (houses and apartments are), imperatives (thing about) and common nouns (energy, cost). Additionally, the speakers used some more complex grammatical structures such as passives (the buildings are designed), phrasal verbs (recognised as, thing about), extended sentences with multiple clauses and colloquial language. The language functions of the input text included describing places and things, expressing opinions, providing justification, giving instructions, responding to counter arguments, comparing things (simple), and reporting facts. The overall CEFR level of the input text was B1+/B2.

CEFR analysis findings

The CEFR analysis of Text A found that is capable of testing B1+ level in terms of student's overall oral comprehension, their ability to understand conversations between other people and their ability to identify cues and inferring. In terms of Overall oral comprehension, this task reflects elements of B1+ level as the students need to understand the general messages from the audio recording in order to pick out the specific details needed for the gap fill, as the sentence structure in the questions does not match.¹⁴⁹ More specifically, as the sentence structure in the questions does not match with the sentence structure in the audio recording, the students should have good knowledge of grammar and inferencing to find the correct type of word. Regarding Identifying cues and inferring, this text reflects elements of B1+ as the students need to extrapolate the meaning of a sections of the audio by taking into consideration the audio recording as a whole in order to correctly respond to the question.¹⁵⁰ Additionally, the text aligns to the B1+ descriptor of the CEFR activity understanding conversation between other people as the students should be able to follow a discussion in familiar topics given that they are articulated in a clear language.¹⁵¹ This text is not lower than A2 level because the Vocabulary range in this text goes beyond the expression of basic communicative needs and, in many cases, beyond routine everyday transactions regarding familiar topics. Additionally, this text is not lower than A2 because the students must go beyond identification of text type and meaning by using only text appearance and word position. Furthermore, in terms of Overall oral comprehension, the demands of this task require students to go beyond expressions related to immediate priority. Therefore, it is evident that Text A reflects elements of B1+ level in terms of students' overall oral comprehension, ability to understand conversation between other people and identifying cues and inferring.

Text B

In Text B of HL, the student is asked to listen to a radio programme about a world traveller. In the radio programme, two presenters, one male and one female presenter, discuss the story of a record-breaking world traveller. Subsequently, in the first part of the task, students must select five true statements from a selection of ten based on information they listened to in the audio recording. More specifically, answers to the first set of questions can be heard in the first half of the audio recording. From the second half of the radio transcript about the world traveller, students must find the correct answers to five multiple choice questions. The topics discussed during the discussion focus on life stories and travelling. More specifically, from the IB documentation the prescribed themes explored in this text are experiences and identities, including the topics of holidays and travel, life stories, leisure, lifestyles, and personal

¹⁴⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 60.

¹⁵¹ Ibid. p.49.

attributes. The CEFR domains covered in this text are the public and educational domains.¹⁵² The total number of marks that are allocated to this task are 10 marks, five marks allocated to the first set of questions which includes five true or false questions, and five marks for the second set of questions which includes five multiple choice questions. To respond to the two set of questions, the student should be able to listen for detail and gist and to infer implied meanings.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of Text B is a medium conversation and dialogue between two radio show presenters. The analysis of the input text indicated that the word count of the audio transcript of Text B was 507 words. The audio recording instructions at the beginning of the task mention the topic and contexts of the recording. The audio recording included one male and one female speaker. Both speakers have clear pronunciation and intonation, they speak at a moderate pace and their speech is well articulated. Additionally, the audio recording includes some authentic features such as introductory music to the radio programme and an advertisements break. There are some features of natural, connected speech; for example, one presenter finishes another's sentence, or starts a sentence with 'and'. During the discussion, the speakers use a wide range of basic grammatical structures such as regular plurals (parents, posts, flights), possessive pronouns (her, our), adverbs (now), common adjectives (different), present simple (she is), futures (you are going to hear), imperatives (stay tuned), past simple (her parents emigrated), and intensifiers (very, totally). Additionally, the speakers use some more complex grammatical structures such as past perfect (she had already been), passives (she was raised), modal verbs (her fans could make), idiomatic and colloquial expressions (came up, stick to), and extended sentences including multiple clauses. The language functions used in the input text include giving personal information; introducing others; describing past experiences, describing people; expressing likes and dislikes; reporting facts and actions; narrating and describing past, present, and future events; emphasizing or exemplifying a point, feeling, issue; complimenting, and expressing opinions, agreement, and disagreement. The overall CEFR level of the input text of Text B was B2.

CEFR analysis findings

The CEFR analysis of the first set of questions of Text B found that it is capable of testing B1+ level in terms of student's Overall oral comprehension and Understanding audio media and recordings, and B2 level in terms of student's Overall oral comprehension, Vocabulary range and Identifying cues and inferring. More specifically, the CEFR levels of the five true statements that the student needs to select correspond to a different levels ranging from B1, B1+ and B2. However, the CEFR analysis found that overall, the first set of questions of Text B is capable of testing B1+/B2 level. For example, three out of the five true statements (B, E, and I) reflect the B1+ descriptor of Overall oral comprehension as the student needs to be able to understand factual information and identify both general message and specific details.¹⁵³ More specifically, this is evident in the first two statements as the topics covered include biographical detail, travel and work. The student must identify general messages about these themes and listen for specific details in order to detect distractors or false information.

¹⁵² Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

¹⁵³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.48 and 60.

Additionally, the other two true statements (C and J) reflect elements of the B2 descriptor of the Overall oral comprehension as the student should be able to follow extended conversations which includes complex lines of argument, given that the topic is familiar, and that the direction of the argument is signposted with explicit markers.¹⁵⁴ In terms of Identifying cues and inferring, this set of questions reflects elements of B2 level as the student needs to be able to watch out for specific points and contextual information provided in the audio recording in order to be able to select the true statements.¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, in relation to Vocabulary range, this set of questions reflects B2 level as the student needs to have a good range of vocabulary around general topics in order to be able to select the true statements; in this case this topics include biographical detail, travel and work but also a few colloquialisms which are used in the audio recording.¹⁵⁶ More specifically, this task is not B1 because in terms of understanding audio the B1 descriptors outlines student's ability to understand key points provided delivery is slow and clear. In this first set of questions of Text B, students are expected to understand more than the key points through justifications and consequences. In this Text, the audio is not delivered slowly.¹⁵⁷ Additionally, the Vocabulary range at B1 is described as a good knowledge of familiar topics/ everyday situations. However, Text B presents a biography of a world traveller which is not an everyday topic or situation.¹⁵⁸

The second set of questions of Text B included five multiple choice questions. The CEFR analysis of the second set of questions of Text B indicated that the overall CEFR level was B2. More specifically, the analysis found that the first multiple choice questions align with the B2 level descriptor of the Overall oral comprehension scale as the student needs to be able to follow an extended conversation in familiar topics in order to select the correct answers. In this case, the conversation is an extended discourse and within this answer the student must listen until the end of the one's speakers turn, in order to find the answer.¹⁵⁹ Additionally, the analysis found that the second multiple choice question is capable of testing to the B2 level of students' Vocabulary range as the students need to have a good range of vocabulary to ascertain the correct answers and also to be able to recognise synonyms and phrases with similar meaning, such as for example 'challenge perceptions' and 'break stereotypes'.¹⁶⁰ In terms of the third multiple choice question, the analysis found that this aligns with the B2 level descriptor of the CEFR strategy Identifying cues and inferring as the students have to infer much more heavily in this question in order to identify that people visiting 'countries they avoided because they wrongly thought that those countries would be unwelcoming' is the same as travelling 'more adventurously'.¹⁶¹ There is also a distractor placed in the question. More specifically, one option which outlines that 'visited less friendly countries' could be easily selected by mistake, as it has similarities with the mention of 'unwelcoming' countries. The fourth multiple choice question reflects elements of B1+ level descriptor in Overall oral comprehension as it requires students to understand that the main message of this part of the input text is about the traveller's reasons for travelling, whilst searching for specific details as

¹⁵⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid. p.60.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 131.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 52.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid. p.131.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid. p.48.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid. p.131.

¹⁶¹ Ibid. p.60.

to why and trying to eliminate the other two options.¹⁶² The fifth multiple choice question is capable of testing B2+ level in relation to students' ability to understand audio recording, as students are asked to identify the tone of the programme. The presenters do not explicitly state this during the audio recording, but the tone of the radio programme can be inferred through exclamations and emphatic questions such as 'isn't she impressive?' 'she sure is' and also spoken tone.¹⁶³

The CEFR analysis of the second set of questions of Text B indicated that the overall level is not B1 because the B1 level descriptor of understanding audio recordings mentions the student's need to understand key points provided delivery is slow and clear.¹⁶⁴ However, in this set of questions students are expected to understand more than the key points via justifications and consequences outlined in the audio recording which in this case is also not delivered particularly slowly. The B1 level descriptor of Vocabulary range is described as a good knowledge of familiar topics and everyday situations. However, a biography of a world traveller is not an everyday situation. Additionally, the CEFR analysis showed that the overall level of Text B is not C1 because at C1 level the students should be able to understand a range of recorded and broadcast material, whereas this particular audio recording is just one broadcast. Additionally, the C1 level descriptor of Vocabulary range mentions that students should understand technical vocabulary in their area of specialism.¹⁶⁵ However, this audio recording lacks technical vocabulary.

Text C

Text C of the English B HL N20 listening comprehension examination was selected because it assesses a wide range of students' knowledge and skills including their ability to understand complex arguments, formal discourse, understand synonyms, demonstrate inferring skills and understanding the tone, overall message and meaning of the text. In text C of HL, the student listens to a lecture and presentation given at a conference about the impact of technology on the human brain. In the first section, students must complete five multiple choice questions. In this second section, students must complete five open-ended written response questions. From the IB documentation, the theme explored in this text is human ingenuity and the topics covered involve communication, media, technology, scientific innovation, social relationships, and education.¹⁶⁶ The CEFR domains covered in this text are the public and educational domains.¹⁶⁷ The total number of marks allocated to this task are 10 marks, five marks allocated to the first set of questions which includes five multiple choice questions, and five marks allocated to the second set of questions which includes five open-ended written response questions. To respond to the two set of questions, the student should be able to listen for detail and gist and to infer implied meanings.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of text C is a lecture given at a conference focusing on the impact of technology on the human brain. The analysis of the input text indicated that the word count of the audio

¹⁶² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

¹⁶³ Ibid. p. 52.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid. p.131.

¹⁶⁶ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

¹⁶⁷ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

transcript of text C was 599 words. The talk was delivered by one male speaker who had standard Australian accent. More specifically, the speaker had clear pronunciation and accent. The audio recording included some authentic features such as applause before the presentation and mouse-click sounds indicating the change of the presentation slides. During the lecture, the speaker used some basic grammatical structures such as possessive pronouns ('their') (A1 and A2), regular plurals ('questions', 'answers') (A1 and A2), prepositional phrases of time ('before') (A1 and A2), common adjectives ('simpler', 'average') (A1 and A2), adverbs ('collaboratively', 'increasingly', 'fully') (A2 and B1), imperatives ('have a quick look') (A1 and A2), common nouns ('seconds', 'experiment') (A1 and A2) and compound and complex nouns ('memory-reliant') (A2 to B2). Additionally, the speaker used some more complex grammatical structures such as passives ('questions were posed') (B1 and B2), modals ('had to', 'we cannot have') (B1 and B2), phrasal verbs ('rely on', 'come up', 'tend to', 'resulted in', 'reading from') (B1 to C1), and extended sentences including multiple clauses. The language functions used in this input text include but are not limited to understanding and using numbers, narrating and describing past events, comparing things, reporting facts and actions, critiquing and reviewing, and synthesising. Additionally, some other language functions used in the input text of text C include emphasizing or exemplifying a point; speculating and hypothesising; expressing opinions, certainty, doubt, and probability. The overall CEFR level of the input text of text C was B2.

CEFR analysis findings

The first set of questions of text C includes five multiple choice questions. The CEFR analysis found that this set of questions can test up to B2 and B2+ level in relation to students' ability to identify cues and inferring, understand as a member of a live audience, understand audio recording, and overall oral comprehension. Regarding Identifying cues and inferring, the questions can test up to B2 level as the student is expected to try to understand the main points and ideas mentioned in the audio recording but also understand contextual cues. More specifically, this is evident as the student needs to listen out for main points such as 'in the first phase', 'in the second phase', but also listen out for other clues in the more difficult later statements of the audio recording, which include more synonyms and distractors.¹⁶⁸ In terms of Overall oral comprehension, this set of questions can test up to B2+ level as the student is required to understand a wide range of topics including familiar and unfamiliar ones such as topics around personal, social, vocational and academic life. More specifically, in this section of text C, the topic covered is a scientific experiment and its research findings as part of a lecture. This could be an unfamiliar topic for many students and would most likely be encountered in an academic context.¹⁶⁹ Additionally, in terms of students' understanding as a member of a live audience, this set of questions can test up to B2+ level as the students need to demonstrate their ability to understand the different opinions and views related to a specialised field. In this case the students need to be able to understand the different arguments, the research findings and the stages and process of the experiment mentioned in the audio recording.¹⁷⁰ In terms of students' understanding of audio recording, this set of questions can test up to B2+ level as the students need to understand information on a topic

¹⁶⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 48.

¹⁷⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.50.

related to an academic field of study and identify arguments and opinions related to the topics discussed.¹⁷¹

The CEFR analysis found that this set of questions does not reflect elements of B1 level descriptors because the descriptor for the CEFR strategy Identifying cues and inferring at B1 requires making 'basic inferences or predictions about text content from headings, titles or headlines'.¹⁷² In this set of questions, students need a greater level of skill to locate cues and infer meaning from subtler material than headings. Additionally, the descriptor for the CEFR activity of Overall oral comprehension at B1, mentions understanding of 'the main points made in clear standard language or a familiar variety on familiar matters regularly encountered at work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives'.¹⁷³ This question is a lecture, of an academic and scientific nature, going beyond material regularly encountered. Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that this set of questions does not reflect C1 level descriptors because the descriptor for the CEFR strategy of Identifying cues and inferring at C1 requires skill 'at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'.¹⁷⁴ In this question, students are not required to infer anything as subtle as attitude or mood. In addition, the descriptor for the CEFR activity of Overall oral comprehension at C1 expects students to 'follow extended discourse even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly'.¹⁷⁵ In this question, the material needed to answer the question is quite clearly signposted on most occasions.

The second set of questions of text C includes five open-ended written response questions. The CEFR analysis found that this set of questions can test up to B2+ and C1 level in terms of students' oral comprehension, ability to understand audio recording, vocabulary range and their ability to identify cues and inferring. Regarding Overall oral comprehension, this set of questions was found to test up to B2+ level as students need to understand the mention of reading on a screen (denotes the 'how' aspect of the question) and 'as a result', which are personal, everyday topics or phrases. The mention of missing 'deeper meanings' brought a more academic and abstract tone. Additionally, this set of questions can test C1 level of students' Overall oral comprehension as the students need to be able to follow an extended conversation when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are implied. In this case, the signposting of relevant information and information needed to answer the question was not as clear, as it was evident in other questions. For example, in some cases the effect is mentioned before the cause, potentially making it harder to find the answer before getting to the end of the paragraph and realising it was relevant.¹⁷⁶ Regarding students' ability to understand audio recording, the CEFR analysis found that this set of questions can test up to B2+ level as this sort of lecture would be encountered in an academic setting and contains information regarding the viewpoints of various authors and professors which the students need to discern.¹⁷⁷ In terms of Vocabulary range, this set of questions can test up to C1 level, as the student need to have a good command of common idiomatic expressions and

¹⁷¹ Ibid. p. 52.

¹⁷² Ibid. p.60.

¹⁷³ Ibid. p.48.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid. p.60.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. p.48.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 48.

¹⁷⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.52.

colloquialisms. There are certain idiomatic phrases and colloquialisms, including phrasal verbs that are evident in the audio recording, such as ‘brain drain’ and ‘it turns out that’, which add complexity to this part of the audio. Students would need a broad lexical repertoire to understand the presentation delivered in this audio recording such as terms like ‘cognitive resources’, even if only to eliminate it as a possible answer.¹⁷⁸

Furthermore, in terms of Identifying cues and inferring, the CEFR analysis found that this set of questions can test up to C1 level, as the students need to be skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next. Although not necessarily having to understand all elements of this section, students need to infer that the answer to the question is in the middle of this particular paragraph. In some cases, the effect is mentioned before the cause, potentially making it harder to find the answer before getting to the end of the paragraph and realising it was relevant.¹⁷⁹ More specifically, this set of questions reflects elements of C1 level as the topic of this text covers areas of scientific research. Additionally, this is because in some cases the answers to the questions are located in sentences with multiple clauses including anaphoric references, requiring the students to have a broad lexical repertoire, even just to eliminate possible answers.

The CEFR analysis found that this set of questions does not reflect B1 level descriptors. This is because the descriptor for the CEFR strategy of Identifying cues and inferring at B1 requires students to make ‘basic inferences or predictions about text content from headings, titles or headlines’. In this question, students need a greater level of skill to locate cues and infer meaning from subtler material than headings.¹⁸⁰ Additionally, the descriptor for the CEFR activity of Overall oral comprehension at B1 outlines students’ understanding of ‘the main points made in clear standard language or a familiar variety on familiar matters regularly encountered at work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives’. This set of questions requires students to understand the meaning of a lecture, of an academic and scientific nature, going beyond material regularly encountered in everyday situations.¹⁸¹ In addition, the descriptor for the CEFR activity of understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings at B1 mentions that students ‘can understand the main points of news bulletins and simpler recorded material about familiar subjects delivered relatively slowly and clearly’. The content, length and speed of this recording is of a higher level.¹⁸² Furthermore, the CEFR analysis found that this set of questions of text C does not reflect elements of C2 as the CEFR descriptor for Overall oral comprehension at C2 expects students to ‘understand with ease virtually any kind of language, whether live or broadcast, delivered at fast natural speed’.¹⁸³ However, this set of questions does not allow students to achieve this level, based on the speed and content of the recording.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid. p.131.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid. p.60.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ Ibid. p.48.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Ibid. p. 48.

Writing

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the SL English B writing assessment (Paper 1) of the May 2021 (M21) examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Input text analysis

In task one, the language used in the input text varies subtly in complexity throughout the question. There are elements of language which align most closely with CEFR A1 level language features. For example, there is standard subject, verb, object order in simple statements ('you want to convince a big company'), regular plural nouns ('players', 'landmarks'), subject personal pronouns ('you'), common prepositions ('in'), common adjectives ('big') and common nouns ('game', 'company'). Verb tenses used in the input text range are present simple ('[it] introduces'), present perfect ('you have come up with') and future ('it will be'); the first aligning with A1 level and the last two with A2 level. Other language features present in the input text of task one that align most closely with A2 level include definite and indefinite articles ('an idea', 'a game', 'the culture'), imperatives ('write a text'), phrasal verbs ('come up with') (B1), and modals ('you want') (A2).

The purpose of the language in task one is to give instructions to the student. In this task, the language also describes the imagined past experience of the student as they dreamt up the idea of a game, describing the game itself and describing places, in terms of the landmarks and regions, that may appear in the game. The language also functions as an expression of wishes and persuasion, on behalf of the student, as they 'want' to convince a big company to develop the game and a description of their hopes and plans that the game 'will be a success'. Lastly, the language provides suggestions to the student of certain elements to cover in the task.

As in the first task, the input language of task two includes grammatical structures ranging from simple to more complex. For example, there is standard subject, verb, object order in simple statements ('you want to voice your opinions'), common adjectives ('local') as well as regular plural nouns ('days', 'students'), subject personal pronouns ('you'), possessive pronouns ('your'), common prepositions ('in') and a direct object pronoun ('it'); all of which are typical of A1 level language features. There are multiple verb tenses included in the input text, namely present simple ('you feel') and present continuous ('online learning is becoming'); the former being typical of A1 level, while the latter is more typical of A2 level. The input text also features definite and indefinite articles ('the local government', 'a text') and imperatives ('write a text'), which can be aligned with A2 level language. There are examples of more complex grammatical structures, including a modal and a conditional ('the government should do') and a conjunction expressing contrast ('however'), which are both typical of B1 level.

The language included in the question for the second task serves to give clear instructions to students, setting the scene by describing the supposed habits and routines of students using online learning and reporting facts and actions regarding current accessibility. The question provides requirements as to how to address the task, establishing the attitude that the student

should adopt by briefly critiquing and reviewing government involvement and inviting students to complain about the situation and make suggestions for improvement.

In task three, as in the previous two tasks, there is a variety in the level of language used throughout the question. Firstly, there are elements of language which align most closely with A1 level language features. The input text uses standard subject, verb, object order in simple statements ('you want to inform students'), regular plurals ('students', 'features'), subject personal pronouns ('you') and possessive pronouns ('your', 'its'). In addition, there are common prepositions ('in'), common adjectives ('special'), common nouns ('museum', 'text'), ordinal numbers ('first') and a superlative ('the most special'). There are only two verb tenses used in the input text; present simple ('the museum is') at A1 and past simple ('you went') at A2 level. Other A2 level language features include definite and indefinite articles ('the opening', 'a museum'), imperatives ('write a text') and modals ('you want').

As in the previous two examples, the primary language function of the input text is to provide students with instructions for task completion. In this task, past experiences and places are described as the student is given the context of a completed imaginary trip to a museum opening. The description of the museum includes a degree of critiquing, reviewing and comparison (with all other museums), stating that it is 'the first of its kind'. There is an expression of wish, as the student is instructed that they 'want to inform' others, as well as suggestions of what to include in their text.

Finally, all input texts feature a relative pronoun, in combination with a preposition ('in which'); this grammatical structure is typical of B2 level language. Overall, the input language in all three tasks is intelligible and clear while both suitably accessible and challenging for SL students.

Student sample analysis

Sample 1

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 1 selected the 'proposal' text type in order to complete task two. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions and linguistic form.

The student began by using language to describe the habits and routines of young people using online learning, whilst describing online learning itself. The student develops an argument in favour of online learning by describing the advantages and is able to express their opinions about online learning while providing some justification; they emphasise and exemplify their point by including a personal anecdote about online learning usage. The student continues by reviewing and critiquing current issues with online learning access, describing particular problems in rural areas. There is an expression of obligation and necessity, with a slight persuasive tone, as the student calls the government to action, giving advice and making suggestions that the price of the service be reduced and network accessibility improved.

The student uses mainly simple language throughout their response. Many examples align most closely with CEFR A1 level language features. For example, regular and common

irregular plurals ('tools', 'people'), subject personal pronouns ('I'), possessive pronouns ('my') and common prepositions ('in'). There is also use of common adjectives ('new'), common nouns ('problem'), demonstrative adjectives ('this') and the present simple tense ('I can'), all typical of CEFR A1. The student also uses elements of CEFR A2 language, by using the past simple tense ('we intended') and definite/ indefinite articles ('the', 'a'). Finally, there are also examples of CEFR B1 language in the use of modals ('the government must') and an adverb describing a more complex concept than time or frequency ('precisely').

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 4/12 for language, indicating that 'the command of the language is partially effective'. This aligned with Ecctis' judgement on Criterion A; there is evidence of vocabulary that is appropriate to the task ('technology', 'students', 'internet', 'network'), yet there are multiple errors in verb conjugations or vocabulary choice which impede communication and intelligibility, particularly in the first half of the text. According to our mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR B1 level.

Regarding Criterion B, the IB awarded a mark of 3/12 for the communication of message, meaning that 'the task is partially fulfilled'. Again, this is consistent with our judgement; although some ideas are relevant to the topic of online learning, many are descriptive of online learning as opposed to being persuasive or making suggestions for improvement, which is only addressed in the last few sentences. Therefore, although a limited number of suggestions are proposed, there is room for development of these ideas, such as how they may be achieved. This mark is equivalent to CEFR A2, based on our mark scheme analysis.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 2/6 for their conceptual understanding (Criterion C), suggesting that 'conceptual understanding is limited'. Awarding this mark, is in line with our judgement regarding limited appropriateness for task context and purpose. The student has indicated that their text is designed to be a proposal yet uses much of the text to describe online learning and waits until the last few sentences to make any proposals; subsequently register and tone are inappropriate. In addition, there is no adherence to paragraphing conventions, as the text is one continuous piece of writing. It is also unclear who the designated audience is supposed to be; it is not stated in the response, and the lack of conventional structure does little to clarify the suggested audience. According to our mark scheme analysis, the mark attributed to this criterion is equivalent to CEFR A2+.

CEFR analysis:

In addition to attributing a CEFR level to each criterion of the sample based on our mark scheme analysis, the sample was analysed separately and compared to CEFR scales and descriptors in its own right, in order to verify the judgement made above.

The following CEFR activities were identified as relevant to this task and output text analysis: Overall written production and Overall written interaction. The scale of Overall written production was acknowledged at B1 level; the sample is an example of a 'straightforward connected text', linking 'shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence' by the usage of sequential markers such as 'in summary', 'however' and 'therefore'. Within the Reports and essays descriptor, this sample aligns with elements of A2 level; where the student produces 'simple texts on familiar subjects of interest, linking sentences with connectors like 'and', 'because' or 'then'. For written interaction, the scale of Correspondence was selected at A2

level as the student is expected to 'produce short, simple notes, e-mails'; the simple requirements are similar to the sample as it certainly doesn't match the structure and conventions of a letter or a proposal.

Certain CEFR competences were also felt to be applicable to the task, namely Linguistic competence and Pragmatic competence. Within linguistic competence, the sample was felt to match with General linguistic range at B1 due to the student having 'sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with some hesitations and circumlocutions' and 'repetition and even difficulty with formulation at times'; this accounts for language errors and lack of flow in certain areas. For the Vocabulary range and Vocabulary control descriptors, B1 level was again selected; the sample featured a 'a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics', a 'good control of elementary vocabulary but major errors still occur when expressing more complex thoughts'. The descriptors for Grammatical accuracy at A2 are particularly relevant due to their reference to a student who uses 'some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes'. Despite the lack of paragraphing, the sample can be awarded a B1 level for Orthographic control as the 'spelling, punctuation and layout are accurate enough to be followed most of the time'. Within pragmatic competence the coherence and coherence descriptor can be used at A2+ level, as the sample includes 'the most frequently occurring connectors to link simple sentences in order to tell a story or describe something as a simple list of points'; there are certainly no complex connectors or complex structural conventions. The Thematic development descriptor can also be used at A2+ as the simplistic structure used by the student relates to the ability to 'tell a story or describe something in a very simple text'. Finally, the propositional precision descriptor at A2 seems appropriate to the sample, as the student 'can communicate what they want to say in a simple and direct exchange of limited information on familiar and routine matters, but in other situations they generally have to compromise the message'; this accounts for the lack of clarity when the student is trying to express more complex ideas.

Despite the range of descriptors and levels identified above, it has been concluded that this sample is of an overall CEFR level A2. Whilst there are several aspects of the language, spelling, punctuation, and vocabulary choice that are positioned at B1, the basic notion of the task is not fulfilled. The text type does not align with the conventions of a proposal, there are no discernible paragraphs, and the intended audience is unclear. This fact aligns the majority of the criteria B and C, at CEFR A2 level as shown above. We can conclude that this sample is not A1 overall, as although the message is not always clear, the topic and context of this task demand a higher level of expression than the 'basic information about personal details' required in A1. The vocabulary used is substantially varied, although not always used correctly. There are instances where messages are break down, but it is 'usually' clear what they are trying to say, as stated in 'A2'. Similarly, we can also deduce that this sample not B1 overall; the student does not 'make simple, logical paragraph breaks in a longer text', as in Coherence and cohesion at B1, nor do they show 'awareness of the conventional structure of the text type concerned when communicating their ideas' as in Thematic development at B1, and finally they do not always 'express the main point they want to make comprehensibly' as in propositional precision at B1.

Sample 2

Sample 2 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a high range performance in the SL writing assessment that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate a high knowledge and skills in writing production and interaction as well as high linguistic competence at SL.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 2 selected the 'letter to editor' text type in order to complete task two. The output text was analysed, in the same way as the input text, for grammatical structures, language functions and linguistic forms.

In this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. They describe the habits and routines of young people using online learning, describe online learning itself and describe their own past experiences via anecdotes of their own usage, appearing to express gratitude for the opportunity. Each paragraph critiques and reviews a particular issue related to online learning; the student develops their argument by expressing their opinions, justifying, and emphasising them by comparing an ideal scenario with examples of problems described by their peers. In this sample, the student is persuasive as several suggestions are made to the government about how to improve access and uptake of online learning while the student expresses their wishes and hopes for its improvement.

The language used by the student varies throughout, ranging from simple to complex structures. There are several elements which broadly align with language at A1 level. For example, the student uses the standard subject, verb, object order in simple statements ('the online learning websites can develop courses'), regular and common irregular plurals ('opinions', 'families'), subject personal pronouns ('I', 'they'), possessive pronouns ('their', 'my') and common prepositions ('on', 'at'). Also at A1 level are common nouns ('the TV', 'internet'), common adjectives ('public', 'online'), demonstrative adjectives ('this', 'these') and the present simple tense ('I hope', 'I forget'). The student also uses elements of A2 language such as adverbs of time and frequency ('immediately'), prepositional phrases of place and time ('at home') or definite and indefinite articles with countable and uncountable nouns ('the', 'a'). There are also several A2 structures used which involve the conjugation of verbs into different forms and tenses, the gerund ('by increasing', 'by waiting'), the past simple tense ('I watched', 'I found'), the present perfect tense ('[lots of students] haven't heard'), modals ('I could', 'the government should') and phrasal verbs ('benefit from'). The sample also includes the use of the passive voice ('the computer is used'), a structure typical of B1 level.

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 9/12 for language, indicating that the 'command of language is effective and mostly accurate'.¹⁸⁴ This judgement correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A. More specifically, the analysis found that there was evidence of vocabulary that is both appropriate to the task and varied throughout, with very little repetition. For example, throughout the sample the student used words such as 'internet', 'teacher', 'knowledge', 'time-consuming', 'courses' and 'students'. There was also a variety of basic and complex grammatical structures employed, as shown by the output text analysis above and the

¹⁸⁴ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

grammatical structures ranging comfortably from A1 to B1. At this level, the IB expects that ‘occasional errors in basic and complex grammatical structures do not impede communication’ and this is evident in this sample as it is intelligible throughout, with only minor errors which did not prevent understanding.¹⁸⁵ According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a B2 level.

The student was awarded a mark of 9/12 for Criterion B and the message conveyed, demonstrating that ‘the task is fulfilled’¹⁸⁶. Again, this is consistent with our judgement, as most ideas were relevant to the task and developed well with additional detail and examples provided. For example, the student mentions several sources that they have seemingly consulted, such as classmates whose families only have one computer and a friend who knows nothing of online learning. These examples were used by the student to strengthen their argument. The response was clearly presented and structured in a logical manner, with clear paragraph breaks to separate ideas but also conjunctions to link the paragraphs together. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a B2 level.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 4/6 for Criterion C on their conceptual understanding. This judgement suggests that ‘conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated’, a finding that is generally in line with Ecctis judgement regarding context, purpose, audience, and task conventions.¹⁸⁷ The student selected ‘letter to editor’ as the text type for their task and has adhered to certain conventions. For example, the letter is addressed to a recipient, although it is supposed to be addressed to an editor and instead begins ‘dear government officer’, meaning that the audience of the letter is incorrect and there is no reference to any newspaper or magazine, suggesting that the student has potentially misinterpreted the task. The letter is appropriate in terms of register, it is fairly formal throughout and has only a few informal utterances, such as contractions and signing off the letter with x’s. The letter fulfils the ultimate purpose of aiming to persuade, stating on multiple occasions what ‘the government should’ do and providing evidence as to why. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to B2 level.

CEFR analysis:

This sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR activities, strategies and competences in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student’s output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis.

The CEFR activities of written production and written interaction were deemed significant for the analysis of this student sample. Within written production, the scale of Overall written production was acknowledged at B2 level. This is because the student can ‘produce clear, detailed texts’, ‘synthesising and evaluating information and arguments from a number of sources’, alluding to the opinions and experiences of their peers. Within the Reports and essays CEFR activity, this sample also aligned with elements of B2 level, as the student ‘can produce an essay or report which develops an argument, giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view’; the student proposes a well-structured argument, with

¹⁸⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 34.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 35.

multiple points, and with evidence and reasons to support each opinion. For the CEFR activity of written interaction, the scale of Correspondence was selected at B2 level, as the analysis found that the student 'can use formality and conventions appropriate to the context when writing personal and professional letters'; as previously stated, the student does adhere to certain conventions regarding tone and formality.

Certain CEFR competences were also felt to be applicable to the task, namely the linguistic competence and pragmatic competence. Within the linguistic competence, the sample was found to match with the CEFR competence of General linguistic range at B2 level due to the student being 'able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints and develop arguments using some complex sentence forms to do so'; as previously analysed in the linguistic analysis of the output text, the student uses a range of simple and more complex language to express themselves. For the CEFR competences of Vocabulary range and Vocabulary control, B2 level was again selected. This is because the analysis found that in the sample the student demonstrated that they could 'vary formulation to avoid frequent repetition', with 'generally high' lexical accuracy and any errors occurring 'without hindering communication'. The descriptors for Grammatical accuracy at B2 level were particularly relevant to this student sample due to their reference to a student that 'shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control' with a 'good command of simple language structures and some complex grammatical forms'. Due to the very clear structure of the sample, it can be awarded a B2 level for Orthographic control as the student 'can produce clearly intelligible, continuous writing which follows standard layout and paragraphing conventions'. Within Pragmatic competence the CEFR competences of Coherence and cohesion can be used at B2+ level, as the student used 'a variety of linking expressions efficiently to mark clearly the relationships between ideas'. The most relevant descriptor for the CEFR competence of Thematic development was that at B2 level, as the student demonstrated that they can 'follow the conventional structure of the communicative task', adhering quite closely to the formal structure of a letter. Finally, the CEFR competence of Propositional precision descriptor at B2 level was considered appropriate to the sample, as the student demonstrated that they can 'communicate the essential points even in more demanding situations' whilst lacking 'expressive power and idiomaticity'; the student clearly put forward the essential points of their argument but lacked idiomatic and colloquial language features.

The CEFR descriptors and levels identified above point clearly to an overall CEFR level of B2. Whilst there are a few elements that lean towards B2+ and even C1, namely in Coherence and cohesion, Reports and essays and Correspondence, the student has made some errors in grammatical forms, such as verb conjugations and tenses. As a result, this prevents the student achieving the 'high degree of grammatical accuracy' required for B2+ and C1 level. In addition, the student did not demonstrate 'good command of common idiomatic expressions' expected at C1 level. Therefore, the CEFR analysis of this student sample concluded that the sample is not B1 overall, as the student has more than 'enough language to get by' and has not written using repetitive language, as stated at B1 level. Also, the student has used some complex language structures, such as modals, passive voice and the gerund, which go beyond the 'frequently used routines' and 'range of simple vocabulary' mentioned in B1 descriptors.

Sample 3

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 3 selected the 'brochure' text type in order to complete task two. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions and linguistic form.

In this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. They describe the habits and routines of an increasing number of people using online learning during the pandemic, reporting facts and actions undertaken during this time. The student expresses their opinions and develops an argument about the matter when describing the situation, justifying and defending their point of view by presenting the benefits of an increased access to online learning and in their conclusion to the written piece. Whilst presenting their argument, the student compares the different circumstances of students and the potential positive outcomes compared to their current struggles. The student exemplifies their points throughout the piece, providing examples of solutions, benefits, necessary steps, benefits and obstacles. In addition to presenting their argument, the student responds to counter arguments by listing the potential obstacles to his proposal, evaluating previous suggestions, before reminding that progress will 'certainly be seen in the years to come'. The language successfully serves to persuade the audience of the importance of funding online learning, expressing hopes and plans, by making suggestions as to how to achieve the goal and implying a sense of obligation and necessity on the part of the government by mentioning them in many of the 'steps involved', which even take on the form of instructions.

The language used by the student varies throughout, ranging from simple to more complex structures. There are several elements which broadly align with language at CEFR A1. For example, the student uses a series of common adjectives ('political', 'adequate', 'major'), demonstrative adjectives ('this', 'these'), simple comparatives ('more motivated', 'perform better') and 'there are' with uncountable nouns ('there are still obstacles', 'there are many ways'). Also, at A1 are some different verb conjugations, such as the imperative ('set up', 'discuss', 'distribute') and the present simple tense ('this is', 'this project needs'). The student also uses elements of CEFR A2 language; common prepositions of place ('in school'), modal verbs in the present tense ('would need'), the present continuous tense ('online learning is becoming', 'the local government is not doing enough') and the use of a future tense ('won't be time'). The sample also includes vocabulary typical of a broader range of intensifiers ('enough') and verbs using different conjugations of the conditional tense ('if there are many students in need, the allowed budget would not be enough'), both typical of CEFR B1 level. Finally, the student also includes elements of CEFR B2 level language such as the passive voice in multiple tenses ('would be distributed to', 'can be spent'), including the passive voice in the future tense ('a lot of time will be needed to exploit this', 'will certainly be seen').

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 12/12 for language, indicating that 'command of the language is mostly accurate and effective'. This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A; there are only occasional errors, which are minor and do not impede understanding or communication. The IB expects that 'vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic expressions'; the student uses a variety of common and complex vocabulary including phrases such as 'sanitary restrictions are far from being over' or 'exploit

this project to its full potential'. At this level it is also expected that a student can 'a variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures' that do not interfere with communication. As analysed in the output text analysis, grammatical structures employed range from A1 to B2 and include present simple, present continuous, conditionals, the passive voice in different tenses, modals, imperatives, and the future tense and used very accurately. According to our mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR C1 level.

The student was awarded a mark of 11/12 for Criterion B and the message conveyed, demonstrating that 'the task is fulfilled effectively' where 'ideas are relevant to the task'. Indeed, the student has conveyed ideas clearly, outlining and fully communicating the message about students' access to online learning, thus this judgement correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding this criterion. At this level, the IB also expects that 'ideas are fully developed, providing details and relevant examples'. Although the student could have elaborated more in some areas, details, examples, and hypothetical scenarios are provided in support of their argument. The student response is well structured as they present a situation, a proposed solution, steps involved toward addressing the issue, benefits and potential obstacles and a conclusion with summarising of concluding thoughts; consequently the IB's expectations are met regarding a response which is 'structured in a logical and coherent manner that supports the delivery of the message'. This mark is equivalent to CEFR B2 or B2+, based on our mark scheme analysis.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 4/6 for Criterion C or their conceptual understanding. This judgement suggests that 'conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated', a finding that is in line with our judgement. Additionally, at this level, 'the choice of text type is generally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience' and 'the response incorporates some conventions of the chosen text type'; the structure, tone and headings are clearly presented, meaning that this adheres largely to the conventions of a brochure. However, it is not entirely clear who the target audience is, and it would be more effective to address them throughout the response.

CEFR analysis:

This sample has been analysed and compared to the specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis.

Very similar CEFR activities and competences were identified as relevant in this sample, as with the previous two; for CEFR activities written production and written interaction were deemed significant. Within written production, the scale of Overall written production was acknowledged at B2 level; the student can 'produce clear, detailed texts', 'synthesising and evaluating information and arguments from a number of sources'; the student achieves this by clearly outlining and summarising arguments from multiple points of view, including a range of their peers and the government. Within the Reports and essays descriptor, this sample also aligns with elements of B2, as the student 'can produce an essay or report which develops an argument, giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view'. Specifically, the student proposes a well-structured argument, detailing multiple points; these include the current situation, possible solutions, steps to achieve the solutions, obstacles and concluding thoughts. Additionally, in each of the points put forward, the student provides reasons for their opinions. For Written interaction, the scale of Correspondence was selected at B1+ level, as

it was felt that the student could 'compose letters expressing different opinions and giving detailed accounts of personal feelings and experiences' including the ability to 'make a complaint and request action'; as previously stated, the student expresses their opinion regarding online learning, whilst including the opinions of others, whilst mentioning the problems with the current system and making suggestions for rectification. Within Written interaction, the scale of Overall written interaction can also be deemed appropriate. At B1+ level, the student is expected to 'convey information and ideas on abstract as well as concrete topics' and 'explain problems with reasonable precision', which aligns with the content and level of detail in the student's response.

Certain CEFR competences were also felt to be applicable to the task, namely linguistic competence, and pragmatic competence. Within linguistic competence, the sample was felt to match with General linguistic range at B2+ due to the student being able to 'express themselves clearly without much sign of having to restrict what they want to say'; the student uses a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary, including common and more complex vocabulary, some examples of figurative language, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions. For the Vocabulary range descriptor, B2+ level was again selected; in the sample, the student demonstrated that they could 'understand and use the main technical terminology of their field', reflected in the use of more complex vocabulary throughout the response. The descriptors for Grammatical accuracy at C1 are particularly relevant due to their reference to a student that 'consistently maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy; errors are rare and difficult to spot'; in the sample, the mistakes are indeed only minor, rare and do not affect the articulation of meaning. As for the scale of Vocabulary control, the sample has been attributed a CEFR C1 level, as the student 'uses less common vocabulary idiomatically and appropriately. Occasional minor slips, but no significant vocabulary errors.' Due to the very clear structure of the sample, it can be awarded a C1 level for Orthographic control as the student uses layout, paragraphing and punctuation are consistently, whilst 'spelling is accurate, apart from occasional slips of the pen'. Within Pragmatic competence, the Coherence and cohesion descriptor can be used at B2+ level, as the student can 'use a variety of linking expressions efficiently to mark clearly the relationships between ideas'. The most relevant descriptor for Thematic development is that at B2+ level, as the student can demonstrate 'appropriate highlighting of significant points, and relevant supporting detail', showing this through the bullet pointing of the most important ideas, with supporting examples. Finally, the propositional precision descriptor at B2 seems appropriate to the sample, as the student can 'communicate the essential points even in more demanding situations', clearly putting forward the essential points of their argument.

The CEFR descriptors and levels identified above point clearly to an overall CEFR level of B2+. Whilst there are a few elements that lean towards C1, namely in Grammatical accuracy, Vocabulary control and Orthographic control, the student makes some minor grammatical errors. In addition, whilst the response does address some conventional elements of a brochure, mostly in its brevity and presentation, the target audience of the response is not clearly articulated; this means that the student fails to reach the C1 descriptor for Overall written production, which mentions 'varying the tone, style, and register according to addressee, text type and theme'. Some of the arguments lack elaboration and in-depth analysis, meaning that the student does not fulfil the requirements of the C1 descriptor for Thematic development; 'can expand and support the main points at some length with subsidiary points, reasons and relevant examples'. We can conclude that the sample is not as

low as B2 overall, as the student uses a wide range of simple but also complex grammatical structures which goes beyond a tendency ‘to use complex structures rigidly with some inaccuracy’, demonstrated at B2. Also, the student has used some complex language structures, such as modals and the passive voice in multiple tenses, signifying that they have more than ‘a relatively high degree of grammatical control’, expected at B2. The structure and the overall presentation of the response is clear and effective, with the purpose subsequently passed to the reader with clarity; for this reason, the response exceeds the B2 descriptor ‘clearly intelligible, continuous writing which follows standard layout and paragraphing conventions’.

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the HL English B writing assessment (Paper 1) of the M21 examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Input text analysis

In task one, the language used in the input text varies subtly in complexity throughout the question. There are elements of language which align most closely with A1 level language features. For example, the input text includes regular plural nouns (‘languages’, ‘leaders’, ‘causes’), subject personal pronouns (‘you’), common prepositions (‘in’) and common adjectives (‘international’). Verb tenses used in the input text are present simple (‘you notice’) and present continuous (‘is not doing’), both of which are typical of A1 level. There are other language features present, that align most closely with A2 level, including countable and uncountable nouns (‘many’), prepositional phrases of place (‘in the world’), modals (‘you want’, ‘leaders should’), gerunds (‘disappearing’) and imperatives (‘write a text’, ‘suggest’). There is also evidence of a broader range of intensifiers (‘enough’), which is typical of B1 level. The principal purpose of the language in task one is to give instructions to the student. In this task, the language is used to describe ‘things’, such as the current state of world languages and the supposed feelings and emotions of the student (‘[you] feel that the international community is not doing enough’). The language also functions as an expression of opinions and wishes, by predetermining the stance and action that the student needs to adopt in their writing. Lastly, the language provides suggestions to the student of certain elements to cover in the task, including the idea of obligation and necessity regarding world leaders.

As in the first task, the input language for task two includes grammatical structures ranging from simple to more complex. For example, there are regular plural nouns (‘tourists’, ‘groups’, ‘opinions’), subject personal pronouns (‘you’), possessive adjectives (‘your city’), common prepositions (‘in’) with common intensifiers and adjectives (‘very popular destination’); all of which are typical of A1 level language features. There are multiple verb tenses included in the input text, namely present simple (‘you want’) and present perfect tense (‘has become’); the former being typical of A1 level, while the latter is more typical of A2 level. The input text also features prepositional phrases of place (‘around the world’), imperatives with elliptical subjects (‘highlight opinions’) and modals (‘you want’), which can be aligned with A2 level language. Other language elements that add complexity to the input text, include an idiomatic phrase (‘draw attention’) and a compound sentence (‘write a text in which you describe ...’).

The language included in the question for the second task serves to give clear instructions to students, reporting imagined facts and actions, such as the growth of mass tourism and its impact. Also, the language in the input text of this task sets the scene by describing the habits and routines of mass tourism and the alleged impact on a city in which the student must imagine they live. The question provides requirements as to how to address the task, establishing the opinions that the student should adopt, inviting students to draw comparisons between different groups of the population and describe people, synthesise their opinions and make suggestions for improvement.

In task three, as in the previous two tasks, there is a variety in the level of language used throughout the question. Firstly, there are elements of language which align most closely with A1 level language features. The input text uses subject personal pronouns ('you'), possessive adjectives ('your experience'), common adjectives ('challenging') and the past simple tense ('you addressed'). In addition, there are many language features aligning with A2 level including the present continuous tense ('who are considering'), the present perfect ('you have just returned'), the gerund ('in achieving'), imperatives ('explain'), phrasal verbs ('reflect on') and adverbial preposition phrases ('just returned from a volunteering programme'). Finally, there are also more complex structures reflective of B2 level, such as a restrictive relative clause ('students who are considering the same programme') and the passive voice in the present perfect ('have been invited'). Other language elements that add complexity to the input text, include a compound-complex sentence ('you have just returned from a volunteering programme overseas and have been invited to share your experience with students who are considering the same programme').

As in the previous two examples, the primary language function of the input text is to provide students with instructions for task completion. In this task, past experiences and places are described as the student is given the context of an imaginary volunteering experience abroad and an invitation to talk to school students. There is an expression of opinion and reaction, as the student is advised to detail the most challenging elements of their experience and their new outlook on life; these suggestions on topics also include writing about how the challenges were addressed.

Student sample analysis

Sample 4

Sample 4 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a medium range performance in the HL writing assessment, where the student demonstrates a high range performance in the use of linguistic forms, simple and complex grammatical structures and vocabulary, but faces challenges in developing their arguments in order to address the requirements of the task.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 4 selected the 'speech' text type in order to complete task two. The output text was analysed, in the same way as the input text, for language functions, grammatical structures and linguistic forms.

The student began by using language to introduce themselves and greet their audience. They described places by discussing the situation in their city and country. The student developed their speech by expressing their opinions and the opinions of others by describing the advantages and the disadvantages of mass tourism, with some justification; they emphasised some of their points by exemplifying the issues they discuss. The student also drew comparisons in this discussion, by comparing the two miscellaneous groups of people consulted and their differing opinions. The output analysis identified that there was an expression of wish and hope, as the student made some brief suggestions as to how the situation could be improved. Finally, the student expressed thanks and gratitude to their imagined audience.

The student used a range of language throughout their response, ranging from A1 to B2 level. There are examples of A1 level language features, including possessive adjectives ('their'), common adjectives ('popular', 'new'), the present simple tense ('I think') and the present continuous ('the environment is being'). The student also used elements of A2 level language, by using the modal auxiliary verbs ('I can see it', 'it should be'), prepositional phrases of place and time ('here', 'nowadays'), adverbs of frequency ('daily'), comparative adjectives ('bigger ... than'), phrasal verbs ('to have an impact on', 'to care about'), gerunds ('being disrespected', 'for listening'), an imperative ('feel free'), the past simple tense ('I wanted') and the future ('I will say'). In addition, the sample included examples of B1 level language in the use of a broader range of intensifiers and qualifiers ('very happy', 'way more job offers', 'really'), adverbial phrases expressing reason, cause or effect ('this is a point, because I can see it myself', 'so', 'that's why'), the conditional tense in first person plural ('we could give') and the passive voice in the present tense ('the environment is being polluted'). Finally, there was an example of B2 level language in a restrictive relative clause ('the people who disagree with the big amount of tourists').

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 7/12 for Criterion A: language, indicating that the student's 'command of the language is effective and mostly accurate'.¹⁸⁸ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A. This is because there were fairly frequent but minor errors, demonstrating first language interference in the sample. For example, although this student sample included incorrect plural nouns, word order, close to but incorrect word choice, the text remains intelligible, and the communication is unimpeded. In this specific assessment band, the IB expects that 'vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic expressions'.¹⁸⁹ The analysis found that in this sample the student used a variety of common and less common vocabulary items including words such as 'environment', 'sensibilisation', 'consideration' and 'inhabitants'. There is also evidence of colloquialisms such as 'way more' and 'way bigger', which demonstrates a knowledge of the language which is appropriate to the spoken context. At this level it is also expected that a student can effectively use 'a variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures' that do not interfere with communication. As analysed in the output text analysis, grammatical structures employed in this sample range from A1 to B2 and include present simple, present continuous, conditionals, the passive voice, modals, imperatives and the future tense which are used accurately.

¹⁸⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.37.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

According to the Ecctis' mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR B2 level.

Regarding Criterion B, the IB awarded a mark of 6/12 for the communication of message, meaning that 'the task is generally fulfilled' where 'some ideas are relevant to the task'.¹⁹⁰ Indeed, the student fulfilled many of the task requirements such as describing the situation, informing the public about an investigation and presented the positive and negative aspects of mass tourism. However, it is not clear who the different groups of people are that have been consulted for their opinions and the suggestions for future action are rather brief and vague, thus this judgement correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding this criterion. At this level, the IB also expects that 'ideas are outlined, but not fully developed'.¹⁹¹ Although the student addressed many of the main points required in this task, there is a lack of development, explanation, and supplementary examples to support their argument. The student response was generally well structured and connected, adhering to paragraphing conventions; consequently, the IB's expectations are met regarding a response which is 'generally clearly presented ... generally structured in a logical manner, leading to a mostly successful delivery of the message'.¹⁹² This mark is equivalent to B1 level based on the Ecctis' mark scheme analysis.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 3/6 for Criterion C: conceptual understanding, suggesting that 'conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated', a finding that is in line with Ecctis' judgement regarding this criterion.¹⁹³ Additionally, at this level, 'the choice of text type is generally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience' and 'the response incorporates some conventions of the chosen text type'; the use of phatic language ('good morning, everyone'), contractions ('let's'), discourse markers and a concluding address meaning that this adheres largely to the conventions of a speech.¹⁹⁴ However, it is not entirely clear who the target audience is, which could have been added in the introductory address. According to Ecctis' mark scheme analysis, the mark attributed to this criterion is equivalent to B2 level.

CEFR analysis:

As with previous samples, this sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR activities, strategies and competences in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis.

For CEFR activities, written production was deemed significant to examine as part of the CEFR analysis of this student sample. Within written production, the scale of Overall written production was acknowledged at B1 level. This is because the student demonstrated that they can 'produce straightforward connected texts on a range of familiar subjects within their field of interest' and can link 'a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence', as evidenced by the clear sequence of the speech.

¹⁹⁰ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 38.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.* p.38.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*

¹⁹³ *Ibid.* p. 39.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

Certain CEFR competences were also felt to be applicable to the task, namely the linguistic competence, the pragmatic competence and the sociolinguistic competence. Within linguistic competence, the sample was felt to align with Grammatical accuracy at B1+ level due to the student demonstrated that they are being able to communicate ‘with reasonable accuracy in familiar contexts; generally good control, though with noticeable mother-tongue influence’. More specifically, as previously analysed, errors occurred due to incorrect word choices, but it was usually clear what the student was trying to express. In relation to the CEFR competence of Vocabulary control, the B2 level was selected. This is because in the sample the student demonstrated that they could use ‘generally high’ lexical accuracy, but with some ‘confusion and incorrect word/sign choice’ that did not hinder communication. Within Pragmatic competence, the Coherence and cohesion descriptor can be used at B2, as the sample is ‘generally well-organised and coherent’ with ‘a range of linking expressions and cohesive devices’; the student also structured their text ‘in clear, logical paragraphs’. The most relevant descriptor for Thematic development is that at B1 level, as the student demonstrated that they ‘show awareness of the conventional structure of the text type’, due to the introduction, main body and concluding statement of their speech. Finally, within sociolinguistic competence the sample was aligned with sociolinguistic appropriateness at B1 level; the student is able to ‘respond to a wide range of language functions, using their most common exponents in a neutral register’.

Despite the range of descriptors and levels identified above, the analysis concluded that this sample was of an overall CEFR B1+ level. Whilst the students’ response reflects a number of the Coherence and cohesion descriptors at B2, referencing organisation and structure, there is a discernible lack of development in other areas, with mother tongue influence affecting language accuracy. The sample cannot adhere to the Overall written production scale at B2 level, as it also lacks the necessary ‘evaluating information and arguments from a number of sources’ that is required at this level. Therefore, the CEFR analysis concluded that this sample was not merely B1 level overall, as although there is a lack of specialist language, the topic and context of this task demand a higher level of expression than the ‘repertoire of frequently used routines and patterns associated with more predictable situations’ mentioned in Grammatical accuracy at B1 level. Indeed, the output text attempts more complex forms such as compound sentences, complex sentences, and several types of subordinate clause.

Sample 5

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 5 selected the ‘official report’ text type in order to complete task three. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions and linguistic form.

The student was required to detail a recent volunteering experience and has thus used the language to describe past experiences and inform an audience. They describe things and people by discussing the culture and people of Tanzania. The student develops their response by expressing their opinions about their experience, detailing advantages and challenges of their time abroad; this also involves defining similarities and differences between the home and host countries. There is an expression of obligation, as the student explains the duties of the hotel volunteers. In addition, the student successfully emphasises and exemplifies their

points by including examples of what they had learnt during their experience and the objectives of the company.

The student uses a range of language throughout their response, ranging from A1 to B2. There are examples of CEFR A1 level language features, including common adjectives ('foreign', 'young'), demonstrative adjectives ('this') and possessive adjectives ('their culture'). The student also uses elements of CEFR A2 language, by using the present perfect tense ('it has led to', 'I have seen'), the superlative with a definite article ('one of the best'), the future tense ('the NTVT will help you'), the past simple tense ('their objectives lay', 'I had to'), adverbial phrases of time and frequency ('at night', 'properly', 'simultaneously') and the gerund ('being able'). In addition, the sample includes examples of CEFR B1 language in the use of a modal verb in a negative form ('you will not make'), direct reported speech ('a family member once said 'you will not make a difference by') and conjunctions expressing cause and effect ('due to the lack' 'thus'). Finally, there is an example of CEFR B2 language in a relative clause ('volunteers who have experience in the hospitality industry').

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 9/12 for language, indicating that 'command of the language is effective and mostly accurate'. This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A; errors are mainly minor such as small spelling errors or incorrect prepositional choice. Nevertheless, the text is clearly intelligible and communication is clear. The IB expects that 'vocabulary is appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic expressions'; there is evidence of varied and specialist vocabulary that is highly appropriate to the task and well selected, such as 'poverty', 'hospitality industry', 'open-mindedness' and the correct usage of idiomatic expressions such as 'come in handy' and 'Mother Nature'. At this level, it is also expected that a student can effectively use 'a variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures' that do not interfere with communication. As already identified in the output text analysis, grammatical structures employed range from A1 to B2 and include the present perfect, the superlative, the past simple and future tenses, modals, reported speech and relative clauses. According to our mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR C1 level.

The student was awarded a mark of 9/12 for Criterion B and the message conveyed, demonstrating that 'the task is fulfilled' and that 'most ideas are relevant to the task'. Indeed, the student has fulfilled all of the task requirements, to some degree, by describing the programme's objectives and the most challenging aspects of achieving them. The student also details how the experience has changed their outlook on life. However, it is not entirely clear how the student addressed and resolved these challenges; there are some brief ideas mentioned, but these lack clarity and sometimes lack relevance. Therefore, this judgement correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding this criterion. At this level, the IB also expects that 'ideas are developed well, with some detail and examples'; the student has developed each section of their report, providing explanation of their findings and justification of their opinions, combined with supplementary examples in support of their argument. The student response is well structured and connected, divided into different sections with appropriate headings, in an effort to address each element of the task brief. Consequently, the IB's expectations are

met regarding a response which is 'structured in a logical manner, supporting the delivery of the message'. This mark is equivalent to CEFR B2, based on our mark scheme analysis.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 4/6 for Criterion C or their conceptual understanding. This judgement suggests that 'conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated'; a finding that is in line with our judgement. Additionally, at this level, 'the choice of text type is generally appropriate to the context, purpose and audience' and 'the response incorporates some conventions of the chosen text type'; the use of an introduction to the scenario, sub-headings, specialist language and analysis of findings throughout mean that this adheres largely to the conventions of an official report. However, within each section of the text, the student neglects to use paragraphing conventions or include any discernible breaks between distinct ideas; the title of the piece is also rather informal for use in an official report. According to our mark scheme analysis, the mark attributed to this criterion is equivalent to CEFR B2.

CEFR analysis:

As with previous samples, this sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis.

Very similar CEFR activities and competences were identified as relevant in this sample, as in the others. For CEFR activities, written production was deemed significant. Within written production, the scale of Overall written production was acknowledged at B1; the student can 'produce straightforward connected texts on a range of familiar subjects' and can 'link a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence'. These requirements are evidenced by the organisation of the sample text into sub-headings and designated sections, designed to address each of the key areas in the task brief.

Certain CEFR competences were also felt to be applicable to the task, namely linguistic competence and pragmatic competence. Within linguistic competence, the sample was felt to match with Grammatical accuracy at B2 due to the student having 'a good command of simple language structures and some complex grammatical forms'; as previously analysed, a broad range of grammatical structures is employed, with only minor errors occurring in spelling and some incorrect prepositional choices, but communication is unimpeded. For the Vocabulary range descriptor, B2 descriptors were identified; in the sample, the student demonstrated that they could use 'a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field', including 'appropriate collocations of many words/signs in most contexts'. Within Pragmatic competence, the Coherence and cohesion descriptor can be used at B1, as the sample links 'a series of shorter, discrete simple elements into a connected, linear sequence of points'; there is however, a noticeable lack of paragraphing conventions.

Despite the range of descriptors and levels identified above, it has been concluded that this sample is of an overall CEFR level B2. The student's response is not deemed to reach B2+ or C1 level in any descriptors; in the case of accuracy this is because these descriptors allude to a text which rarely contains errors, and this does not describe the sample. We can also conclude that this sample is not merely B1 level overall because it exceeds the simple grammatical forms and familiar vocabulary contexts referred to in the criteria. Instead, the

student has employed accurate collocations and complex grammatical structures, such as relative clauses. Furthermore, the sample adheres to linguistic competence descriptors at B2, because the sample meets to criteria of using technical and idiomatic language.

Sample 6

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 6 selected the 'news report' text type in order to complete task two. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions and linguistic form.

In this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. As would be expected from a news article, the student reports facts, and actions throughout the response, including the time of the report and the percentage increase in tourism. They also describe the habits and routines of an increasing number of tourists, including where they tend to visit from. The student describes places and past experiences by detailing the changes that have occurred in 'Star City' and making comparisons between the city before and after the influx of tourists. As required in the task, the student highlights opinions from different groups of people, by consulting hypothetical residents and exemplifying any subsequent points with facts or using numbers in a range of statistics. Suggestions are made by the 'city head', as to how to ease the negative effects of tourism.

The language used by the student varies throughout, ranging from simple to more complex structures. There are several elements which broadly align with language at CEFR A1. For example, the student uses the past simple tense ('another hotel worker informed'), the present continuous ('the city is becoming'), simple comparatives ('more lively') and demonstrative adjectives ('this morning's). The student also uses elements of CEFR A2 language; an adverbial phrase of time ('at 8:00am this morning'), modal verbs ('could have different impact'), superlatives ('the highest level of pollution', 'the biggest gain'), the gerund ('reporting that') and the future tense ('it will continue'). The sample also includes the past perfect tense ('the central government had invested'), the passive voice in the past simple tense ('a report was published'), direct reported speech ('the head of tourism department stated that 'the increase in the number of tourism...') and extended phrasal verbs ('they have raised some concerns over'), all typical of CEFR B1 level. Finally, the student also includes elements of CEFR B2 level language such as the past perfect continuous tense ('tourists have been visiting Star City').

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 11/12 for language, indicating that 'command of the language is mostly accurate and very effective'. This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A; errors are extremely rare and minimal meaning that communication is clear, and the text is intelligible throughout. The IB expects that 'vocabulary is appropriate to the task and nuanced and varied ... including the purposeful use of idiomatic expressions'; there is evidence of varied and subject specific lexis that is highly appropriate to the task, such as 'externality', 'employment rate', 'GDP', 'revenue', 'sustainable sector', and 'subsidy'. In addition, there is also evidence of some accurately used colloquial language ('this boom',

'green production'). At this level, it is also expected that a student can use 'a variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures' selectively and in a way that does not interfere with communication. As already identified in the output text analysis, grammatical structures employed range from A1 to B2 and include present continuous, past perfect continuous, the future tense, modals, superlatives and compound sentence forms. According to our mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR C1 level.

The student was awarded a mark of 10/12 for Criterion B and the message conveyed, demonstrating that 'the task is fulfilled effectively' and 'ideas are relevant to the task'. Indeed, the student has completely fulfilled each of the task requirements, by introducing the scenario of an increased number of tourists and the impact of mass tourism, informing the audience of the hypothetical investigation, and presenting the opinions of different groups within the population before drawing attention to the necessary future actions; therefore, this judgement correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding this criterion. At this level, the IB also expects that 'ideas are fully developed, providing details and relevant examples'; the student has developed each part of their news report with anecdotes, reported speech and statistics. The student response is well structured and connected in a logical and coherent manner; the text is well organised into clear paragraphs, with discourse markers to connect them. This mark is equivalent to CEFR B2, based on our mark scheme analysis.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 6/6 for Criterion C or their conceptual understanding. This judgement suggests that 'conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated'; a finding that is in line with our judgement. Additionally, at this level, 'the choice of text type is appropriate to the context, purpose and audience' and 'the response fully incorporates the conventions of the chosen text type'. There are several elements of the response that adhere largely to the conventions of a news report including the initial layout, a concise headline, a date, paragraphing, specialist language, a formal register and reported speech. According to our mark scheme analysis, the mark attributed to this criterion is equivalent to CEFR B2+.

CEFR analysis:

As with previous samples, this sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis.

Very similar CEFR activities and competences were identified as relevant in this sample, as in the others. For CEFR activities, written production was deemed significant. Within written production, the scale of Overall written production was acknowledged at B1; the student can 'produce straightforward connected texts on a range of familiar subjects within their field of interest' and can link 'a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence', as evidenced by the clear sequence of the news report, where short paragraphs are connected and well sequenced.

Certain CEFR competences were also felt to be applicable to the task, namely Linguistic competence and Pragmatic competence. Within Linguistic competence, the sample was felt to match with Grammatical accuracy at B2+ due to the student demonstrating 'good grammatical control' with only rare 'non-systematic errors and minor flaws in sentence structure'; as previously analysed, errors are very rare and minor, such as a missing article or

incorrect plural noun. For the Vocabulary control descriptor, B2 was selected; in the sample the student demonstrated that they could use ‘generally high’ lexical accuracy, but with some ‘confusion and incorrect word/sign choice’ that does not hinder communication. With regards to Vocabulary range, the sample was felt to align with the C1 descriptor, as the student has a proven use of ‘technical vocabulary and idiomatic expressions’, as analysed in the output text analysis. Within Pragmatic competence, the Coherence and cohesion descriptor can be used at B2+, as the sample uses ‘a variety of linking expressions efficiently to clearly mark the relationships between ideas’, such as discourse markers. The most relevant descriptor for Thematic development is that at B2, as the student ‘can follow the conventional structure of the communicative task concerned when communicating their ideas’, due to the layout, the structure and the register employed.

Despite the range of descriptors and levels identified above, it has been concluded that this sample is of an overall CEFR level B2+. Whilst the student’s response adheres to a CEFR C1 criterion, this is only in the use of vocabulary, with the rest of the selected descriptors ranging from B2-B2+. In addition, the output text contains a number of infrequent and minor errors which are permitted at the CEFR B2+ level, yet C1 grammar descriptors refer to consistently accurate grammar. We can conclude that this sample is not merely B2 level overall, as the Grammatical accuracy descriptor at B2 alludes to using ‘complex structures rigidly with some inaccuracy’; a rigidness that we do not see. In addition, the Coherence and cohesion descriptor at B2 mentions a ‘generally well-organised’ text and a ‘limited number of cohesive devices’ and a degree of ‘jumpiness’ in the response; the student has produced a very well-structured text that is cohesive and logical throughout, due to a broad range of cohesive devices.

Speaking and Interactive skills

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the SL English B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 7

Task analysis

The student sample 7 was focused on a photograph which depicted a woman, presumably a model, having make-up applied to her by another woman. The photograph was not labelled with a title, theme or caption. The presentation of the visual stimuli and the follow up discussion on the photograph as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range of IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics including but not limited to the following ones: identities, lifestyles, health and wellbeing, subcultures, physical wellbeing, equality, social issues, sharing the planet, social issues, community, communication and media, experiences, customs/ traditions, life stories and education. More specifically, the task covered the occupation and public CEFR domains.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills that are being assessed in this student's sample include describing a photo, inferring information, relating conversation to the target culture, explaining cultural phenomena, and sharing opinions and interpretations of the visual stimulus. During the whole internal oral assessment, the teacher asked 18 questions to the student, including questions related to both the photograph but also other IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics from the syllabus. The analysis of the input text indicated that the questions were well thought out, in order to produce a continuous and relevant conversation. However, the teacher often paused mid-question to change vocabulary or reformulate the question, which sometimes made it much more difficult for the student to understand the questions and follow the conversation. The teacher was sometimes asking two or three questions at once, which made it more complex for the student to understand, follow up and respond to the questions. The questions posed by the teacher included a combination of basic and more complex grammatical structures including several basic grammatical structures such as subject personal pronouns (you, they), possessive pronouns (their, our), common prepositions (in), common and demonstrative adjectives, adverbs (culturally, better), present simple and present perfect, but also some complex grammatical structures such as modals (should, could), conditionals (would help), extended sentences with multiple clauses, phrasal verbs (live on, integrate in) and idiomatic and colloquial language.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment the student used a wide range of common grammatical structures and also made some attempts to use more complex grammatical structures, though they made occasional errors when using more complex grammatical structures. More specifically, the student used some basic grammatic structures including regular and common irregular plurals (girls, bodies), subject, personal and possessive pronouns, common prepositions (in), common adjectives (small, low, perfect), adverbs (specifically, actually), intensifiers (very), quantifiers (enough, many, more), present simple, present simple (the girl is preparing, is increasing), and some contractions (don't, aren't). Additionally, the student used some complex grammatical structures including present perfect (we have studied), passive voice (they are not accepted), modal verbs (we should, we can see) and extended sentences including multiple clauses. In terms of vocabulary, the student used some more common nouns such as 'pictures', but also some more complex nouns such as 'make-up', and some technical and specialist vocabulary including words such as 'anorexia' and 'airbrushed'. Regarding pronunciation, the student seems to have some mother tongue influences but their speech is intelligible in terms of what they are trying to say and express. Overall, it is evident from the student's sample that the student used both basic and some more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary, with occasional errors in complex grammatical structures and vocabulary and some mother-tongue influences in pronunciation and intonation which did not impede communication.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings that discussed on the earlier section above. The total score of the student sample was 18 out of 30. More specifically, the teacher allocated 7 marks for Criterion A which reflects B2 level, 3

marks for Criterion B1 which reflects B1 level, 4 marks for Criterion B2 reflecting B1 level, and 4 marks for Criterion C reflecting B1 level. Ecctis agreed with the way the student sample was marked by the teacher. The analysis of the student's sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample is B1+. The following section provides a detailed overview of the CEFR analysis and evidence behind the decision and the reasons why B1+ was considered the most appropriate overall CEFR level for this sample.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis indicated that a range of CEFR levels have been identified for different descriptors, ranging from B1, B1+ and B2. More specifically, Ecctis found that the student's sample was higher than B1 level because the demand of the task goes beyond the student expressing the 'simple, straightforward information of immediate relevance' expected at the B1. Additionally, this is because the students' responses to the questions go beyond a straightforward narrative or description which is expected in terms of Thematic development at B1 level. Furthermore, in terms of language, the CEFR analysis indicated that the student's language goes beyond the 'sufficient vocabulary' on familiar topics such as hobbies, work and travel which are expected at B1.

Additionally, Ecctis found that in some the student's sample was lower than B2 level in some CEFR descriptors. For example, regarding the Conversation CEFR activity, the B2 level descriptor outlines that the student can sustain relationships with other users in extended discussions on general and familiar topics. However, in this student sample the student is sometimes unable to sustain the conversation in extended discourse and the environment is not noisy. Additionally, in terms of Overall oral interaction, the B2 level descriptor specifies that the student can interact with fluency and spontaneity and provide explanations and justifications to their arguments. However, in this sample reviewed, due to instances of hesitation and reformulation, the student does not perform with 'fluency and spontaneity' and they also don't develop all answers with 'explanations'. With regard to Overall oral production, the B2 CEFR level descriptor supports that the student can provide detailed descriptions and presentations by expanding their points with subsidiary ideas and examples. However, in this sample reviewed, the student develops some answers but without many subsidiary points or additional relevant examples of their own. Additionally, in relation to General linguistic range, the B2 CEFR level descriptor outlines that the student has sufficient range of language to give detailed descriptions and present their arguments without conspicuous searching for words and using some complex sentence forms with multiple clauses. However, the analysis of this sample found that the student uses conspicuous searching for words at several points during the speaking assessment and does not use many complex sentence forms. In addition, the CEFR B2 level descriptor of the Thematic development competence outlines the students' ability to produce and support a clear argument, expanding and supporting their key personal opinions and ideas. In this sample, although the student is able to expand and support some points of view, but without length and without extra examples or points.

Therefore, the analysis found that the student's sample reflects B1+ level. This is evidenced in the B1+ level descriptor of the Overall oral interaction activity which states that the student communicates with confidence in familiar and less common topics, by expressing their perceptions and points of view. This is evidenced in this sample as the student is mostly confident throughout the conversation with the teacher, expressing opinions on topics such as

plastic surgery, body image and culture as well as all the other topics discussed. Additionally, in terms of Overall oral production, the B1+ CEFR level descriptors focuses on students' ability to sustain a description and a presentation of a topic through a straightforward sequence of key points. In this sample reviewed it is evident that the student sustains a description of one topic at a time, with some good structure and linear sequence. Furthermore, the B1+ level descriptor of the General linguistic range competence describes a student profile with an appropriate range of language to describe unexpected events and provides justifications and views on key issues and ideas discussed around some abstract or cultural topics. This is evident in this sample as the student explains the main points with little issue, and they are able to discuss cultural topics, such as education in native American communities. Regarding Thematic development the student's sample reflects the B1+ CEFR level descriptor which outlines that student can develop an argument which can be followed most of the time. In this example, the student's speech and arguments, interpretations and message can be followed, and they are clear during the majority of the time of the oral assessment. Therefore, for all the reasons outlined above, the analysis indicated that this student sample reflects B1+ level.

Sample 8

Sample 8 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a high range performance in the SL speaking assessment that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate a high linguistic competence by using simple and complex grammatical structures and vocabulary effectively and they successfully engage and interact with the teacher, and maintain that interaction during the conversation.

Task analysis

The student sample 8 was focused on a photograph which was taken in a busy and built-up area and features several double decker buses and large crowds holding placards with slogans. The visual stimulus material was titled 'sharing the planet'. The presentation of the visual stimuli and the follow up discussion on the photograph as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range of IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics including but not limited to the following ones: sharing the planet, the environment, global issues, social issues, human rights, scientific innovation, education, climate, communication and media, community, migration, social relationships, identities, experiences, life stories, subcultures, personal attributes, beliefs and values, lifestyles, the working world, and customs and traditions.¹⁹⁵ Therefore, the task covered the educational and public CEFR domains.¹⁹⁶

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this student sample include describing a photo, inferring information, relating conversation to target cultures, explaining cultural phenomena, sharing opinions and interpreting a stimulus. During the whole internal oral assessment, the teacher asked questions to the student, including questions related to both the photograph but also other general topics from the IB prescribed themes included in the syllabus. The analysis of the input text of this student sample indicated that the examiner did not need to have a lot of

¹⁹⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

¹⁹⁶ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

input in this examination, as the student provided a lot of information in each answer, speaking readily, fluently and independently. The analysis of the input text showed that when questions were asked, they were concise, clear, and relevant. The questions posed by the teacher included a combination of basic and more complex grammatical structures, as well as several basic grammatical structures such as subject personal pronouns ('you'), possessive pronouns ('your', 'their'), present simple ('you feel', 'that is'), present continuous ('they are dealing'), past simple ('you talked', 'we looked') which are typical of A1 and A2 levels. Additionally, the input text included some more complex grammatical structures such as adverbs of degree, extent and probability ('obviously'), the gerund ('through studying') the present perfect ('have you been struck by'), and futures ('we are going to move on') which are common at A2 level, and conditionals ('would you like'), phrasal verbs ('to touch on'), question tags, and idiomatic and colloquial language ('have you been struck by') which are common at B1 and B2 levels.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment the student used a wide range of common grammatical structures and more complex grammatical structures, with minor and rare errors when using complex grammatical structures. More specifically, the student used some basic grammatical structures including possessive pronouns ('my'), adverbs of manner ('quickly'), regular and common irregular plurals ('signs', 'people'), present simple ('the image depicts'), present continuous ('they are holding') and past simple ('I read') which are evident at A1 and A2 levels. Additionally, the student effectively used some more complex grammatical structures including adverbs of degree, extent and probability ('apparently'), the gerund ('while protesting'), present perfect ('England has been'), modals ('we can see'), passive voice ('this protest is promoted by', 'my identity is shaped'), conditionals ('we could', 'we should not...if you think...then you should'), and futures ('there will be', 'it is going to happen') which are typical at B1 and B2 levels. Furthermore, the student effectively used some complex nouns such as 'xenophobia', extended sentences using multiple clauses, and idiomatic and colloquial language such as the phrase 'we are a far cry from', 'hot potato', 'actions speak louder than words', and 'killing two birds with one stone'. In terms of pronunciation, the student's accent and intonation was found to be generally clear but, in some cases, there were some interferences from mother tongue accent that made some words harder to comprehend, but this had a little impact on intelligibility. Overall, it is evident from the student's sample that the student used both basic and some more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary effectively, with minor and rare errors which did not impede communication. Additionally, the student's pronunciation and intonation were sometimes affected by mother-tongue influences, but generally these did not affect intelligibility.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings. An overview of the mark scheme analysis can be found in Appendix 1. The total score of the student sample was 29 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 11 marks for Criterion A: language which reflects B2+ and C1 level, 6 marks for Criterion B1: message-visual stimulus which reflects B2+ level, 6 marks for Criterion B2: message-conversation reflecting B2 level, and 6 marks for Criterion C: interactive skills-communication reflecting B2 level. Ecctis agreed with how the student sample was marked by the teacher.

More specifically, Ecctis agreed with the examiner's marking on this student sample because the student's use of grammatical structures and vocabulary was very effective and accurate, and because during the presentation of the visual stimulus, the student was continuously and consistently drawing on both information from the stimulus but also making references to personal experiences and views by actively engaging with the content of the photograph. In addition, Ecctis agreed with the examiner's marking because the student made continuous efforts to maintain and sustain the conversation and the interaction with the interlocutor, by confidently and independently responding to the questions about a wide range of topics posed by the interlocutor. The analysis of the student's sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample was B2 to B2+ levels. The following section provides a detailed overview of the CEFR analysis and evidence behind the decision and the reasons why B2 and B2+ levels were considered the most appropriate overall CEFR levels for this sample.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis indicated that a range of CEFR levels have been identified for different descriptors, ranging from B2, B2+ and C1, with the student demonstrating a very high level of language proficiency. More specifically, this is because the student used a lot of language features, a wide range of grammar including a variety of tenses, passives and modals, and complex vocabulary including idiomatic expressions. The analysis of the student's sample found that the student demonstrates a wide range of lexical repertoire including elaborate descriptors and narratives, providing personal examples and interpretations. Additionally, regarding Thematic development, the student expanded and supported their main points with additional implicit and explicit details during the conversation. More specifically, the analysis of the student sample found that the student demonstrated some elements of C1 level in terms of Grammatical accuracy as the student used a wide range of common and complex grammatical structures with rare errors that are difficult to spot. Additionally, in terms of Vocabulary control, the analysis found that the student's sample reflected elements of C1 level as the student uses less common vocabulary including idiomatic expressions effectively, with only occasional errors. However, in relation to Vocabulary range, the student's sample does not fully align with the C1 level as although the student used idiomatic expressions effectively, they used non-technical language throughout the discussion and the conversation was focused more on broad and general topics.

Regarding fluency and interaction with the teacher, the student demonstrated a high degree of sustaining relationship with the teacher by actively engaging in the conversation and fluently and confidently expressing personal opinions. As a result, there is evidence of C1 elements in student's speech, especially around grammar and vocabulary, fluency and interaction with the interlocutor. However, the depth of each topic discussed by the student was not high and the broad nature of the topics did not allow for the specialist nature of the C1 level overall. Additionally, although there are examples of C1 skills in this sample, the limitations of the SL task and mark scheme make a B2+ at SL more appropriate. More specifically, the analysis of the student's sample indicated the student potentially limited in CEFR level by the limitations of the task and mark scheme. More specifically, the analysis found that this student demonstrates C1 level in several CEFR scales but achieving B2 at SL. Therefore, the analysis found that if this student was in HL, they would probably achieve C1 level.

Ecctis found that the student's sample was exceeding B2 level in some CEFR scales and it was aligned with B2+ level in some other CEFR scales. On the one hand, the analysis of the student's sample found that the language used by the student does not lack 'expressive power and idiomaticity' which is evident in the B2 level of the propositional precision CEFR competence, as in this sample the student effectively used some idiomatic expressions as mentioned above. Additionally, in this sample the student demonstrates their ability to go beyond the signalling the difference between fact and opinion which is evident in the B2 level of the Thematic development CEFR competence. Furthermore, the B2 level of the General linguistic range CEFR competence outlines that the student uses 'some complex sentence forms'. However, it is evident from the student sample that the student used a wide range of complex grammatical structures and sentence forms which go beyond B2 level. On the other hand, the B2 level of the CEFR activity of understanding the interlocutor seems to be aligned with the student's sample as the student can understand in detail what the teacher said in standard language and on familiar topics. Additionally, in terms of Overall phonological control, the student's sample seems to reflect elements of B2 level as the student used appropriate pronunciation and intonation with occasional mother tongue influences which do not impede intelligibility and communication. Furthermore, the analysis of the student's sample indicated that regarding the CEFR activity of conversation, the sample aligns better with the B2 level which states that the student can maintain relationships with the interlocutor, but also the B2+ level which states that the student can establish relationships with the interlocutor through asking questions, expressing agreement or disagreement and providing comments throughout the conversation. Additionally, in terms of Overall oral production and Fluency, the CEFR analysis found that the student clearly demonstrated B2+ level in both of those CEFR activities. As a result, for all the reasons mentioned above, the analysis found that this student sample reflects B2 level with some elements of B2+. More specifically the analysis found that if this student was in the HL, they would be able to reach C1 level but as they are SL students, they are limited due to the restrictions of the SL mark scheme.

Sample 9

Task analysis

The student sample 9 was focused on a photograph depicts a crowd of people, holding the St. George flag. There is a caption underneath the photograph, reading 'The Black Country, West Bromwich, England 'St. George's Day. Stone Cross Parade'. Additionally, the visual stimulus is labelled on the top of the page 'theme: identities'. More specifically, the presentation of the visual stimuli and the follow up discussion on the photograph as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range of IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics including but not limited to the following ones: identities, subcultures, lifestyles, customs and traditions, festivals and celebrations, community, social relationships, health and wellbeing, physical wellbeing and education. More specifically, the task covered the personal and public CEFR domains.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this student's sample include describing a photo, inferring information, relating conversation to target cultures, explaining cultural phenomena, and sharing opinions and interpretations of a stimulus. During the whole internal oral assessment, the teacher asked questions to the student, including questions related to both the photograph but also other IB prescribed themes from the syllabus. The analysis of the input text of this

student's sample indicated that some of the questions posed by the teacher were clear but the phrasing and language used in certain questions was confusing and ambiguous. More specifically, some questions posed by the teacher were vague or badly worded and it was not always clear what the examiner was referring to. For example, the teacher asked some questions which were ambiguous and confusing, including the following questions: 'what does it give them, in a way?; what does it show, in a way?; what kind of parties do you go to or when you have a sense of belonging that people dress up the same way or just go somewhere?; (anxieties...) what could that be in terms of school?; what could one do in order to avoid those negative factors of results of mental health?'. Therefore, some of the questions asked by the teacher were not appropriate for the level of the student as some of the questions posed were not well constructed, and in some cases difficult for the student to understand. The questions posed by the teacher included a combination of basic and more complex grammatical structures, including several basic grammatical structures such as personal pronouns (you, they), possessive pronouns (their, your), regular and common irregular plurals (games, people, parties), prepositional phrases of place (around), adverbs (usually), present continuous (you are wearing) and past simple (you touched upon). Additionally, the teacher used some more complex grammatical structures such as present perfect (have you been), conditionals (could you, would you), modals (they can), phrasal verbs (to dress up, to bring out) and the gerund (by wearing).

Output text analysis

The analysis of the student's sample indicated that this was a very weak student who struggled to respond to some of the questions posted by the teacher. Throughout the speaking assessment, the student used very basic and simple language. More specifically, the student used some basic grammatic structures including regular and common irregular plurals (people), subject pronouns (I, they), common prepositions (in, on), prepositional phrases of place (behind), determiners (many, some, most), common adjectives (young, different), adverbs (especially, well) and present simple (the flag is, they represent, I think). The analysis of the output text indicated that the student made few attempts to use complex grammatical structures including modals (I can see, they want), passive voice (the picture I have chosen, being seen as), and phrasal verbs (to lead to). Overall, it is evident from the student's sample that the student used both basic and made some attempts to use more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary, however, the student made consistent errors in using both basic but also more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary, which often impeded communication and understanding of what they wanted to express.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings that discussed on the earlier section above. The total score of the student sample was 9 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 3 marks for Criterion A which reflects A2 level, 3 marks for Criterion B1 which reflects B1 level, 2 marks for Criterion B2 reflecting A2 level, and 1 mark for Criterion C reflecting A1 level. Ecctis agreed with the how the student sample was marked by the teacher. More specifically, Ecctis agreed with the examiner's marking on this student's sample because the student struggled to respond to some questions and used very basic language throughout the conversation and made very little attempts to

actively engage and interact with the teacher. The analysis of the student's sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample is A2. The following section provides a detailed overview of the CEFR analysis and evidence behind the decision and the reasons why A2 was considered the most appropriate overall CEFR level for this sample.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis indicated that a range of CEFR levels have been identified for different descriptors, ranging from A2, A2+ and B1. Although this student sample includes some elements of A2+ and B1 skills, the analysis of this student sample concluded that the overall CEFR level is A2, because the student struggles to respond to some questions and uses very basic language throughout the conversation with the teacher.

More specifically, the CEFR analysis of the student sample found that the sample was not aligned with A1 level descriptors. This is because the A1 level descriptor for Overall oral production requires mainly isolated phrases, yet there are instances where this student links short sequences of thoughts, opinions, and justification. Additionally, the A1 level descriptor for Overall phonological control mentions 'a very limited repertoire of learnt words'. Although limited, the student does manage to construct some sentences spontaneously. Regarding General linguistic range, the A1 descriptor mentions 'simple expression about personal details and needs of a concrete type'. In this sample, the student talks about topics that go beyond this. Furthermore, the CEFR analysis found that this sample was not aligned with B1 level. This is because the student cannot always express the main point they want to make comprehensibly as outlined at the B1 level descriptor of the CEFR propositional precision scale. Additionally, in this sample the student cannot related a straightforward narrative with 'reasonable accuracy' as indicated in the B1 level descriptor of the Grammatical accuracy CEFR competence. More specifically, the student makes frequent errors in simple present tense verb conjugations. In addition, the descriptor for Overall oral interaction at B1 requires 'a wide range of simple language', which the student does not really manage to exploit. In terms of vocabulary, the student does not have the vocabulary breadth required for General linguistic range at B1 for example 'sufficient vocabulary' for 'family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events'.

As a result, Ecctis concluded that this sample is at A2 level. More specifically, the student sample aligns with the A2 level descriptor of the understanding an interlocutor CEFR activity as the student can understand the questions posed by the teacher only when they are phrased slowly and involve simple vocabulary. Regarding conversation, this sample reflected elements of the A2 level descriptor as the student can handle short and small conversations and rarely are able to understand enough to sustain the interaction and the discussion with the teacher. In terms of Overall oral interaction, the sample aligns better with the A2 level descriptor as the student can communicate in conversations involving simple, familiar, and routine topics. With regard to Overall oral production, the sample also reflects elements of the A2 level descriptor as the student provides only simple descriptions and presentations of people and things through simple phrases and sentences. In addition, the student demonstrates a narrow lexical repertoire and vocabulary reflecting elements of A2 level descriptor of the Vocabulary control competence. In terms of grammar, the student uses basic and simple grammatical structures, with small attempts to use more complex grammar but systematically and consistently makes mistakes in both basic and complex grammatical structures, reflecting elements of A2 level

descriptor of the Grammatical accuracy competence. Finally, regarding Overall phonological control, the student demonstrates elements of the A2 level descriptor as the pronunciation and intonation is clear enough to be understood, the teacher sometimes needs to ask for repetition. As a result, for all the reasons mentioned above, the analysis found that this student sample reflects A2 level.

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the HL English B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 10

Sample 10 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a low range performance in the HL speaking assessment that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate extended hesitation, resulting in limited quantity of output.

Task analysis

The student sample 10 was focused on a literary extract from 'The Bluest Eye' by Toni Morrison. There were no written instructions included in the sample material, however, the IB Language B document indicates that students are given 20 minutes to prepare a presentation based on the literary extract. The presentation of the literary extract and the follow up discussion on the extract as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range of IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics such as experiences (life stories), human ingenuity (artistic expressions), sharing the planet (the environment).¹⁹⁷ More specifically, the task covered the public CEFR domain.¹⁹⁸ The total number of marks available for this task were 30 marks.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this sample include the student's control of grammar and vocabulary, including the use of common and more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary, the student's use of prosodic features such as pronunciation and intonation, the student's propositional accuracy and task relevancy, the development of ideas, as well as the student's ability to start and maintain a conversation and interaction with the teacher. Regarding grammatical structures and vocabulary, the input text of the literary extract included some complex grammar and vocabulary including low frequency lexis such as 'astride', 'sanctified', 'shorn', adverbialisation of adjectives such as 'wicked people love wickedly', symplote such as 'her simplicity decorated us, her guilt sanctified us, her pain made us', epistrophe such as 'enough to touch her, envelop her, give something of himself to her', personification such as 'when the land kills of its own volition', adverbial clause of time such as 'when we stood astride her ugliness', adverbial phrases of condition such as 'there is no

¹⁹⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

¹⁹⁸ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

gift for the beloved', and intensifiers such as 'I even think' which are all typical of C1 level. As a result, the analysis of the input text indicated that the literary extract included a wide range of complex grammatical structures and vocabulary. The CEFR analysis of the input text indicated that this literary extract reflects elements of C1 and C2 levels.

Output text analysis

The analysis of the output text of the student sample indicated that this was a very weak student who struggled to respond to some of the questions asked by the teacher. More specifically, during the speaking assessment the student needed great support from the interlocutor which was evident as they asked for repetition and rephrasing of questions. In terms of grammatical structures, the student used basic and common grammar including demonstratives ('this year') reflecting elements of A1 level, present perfect in a negative form ('the flower has not grown') which is typical at B1 level, common and simple discourse markers ('okay, the problem is') which are typical at A1 level, and common and simple intensifiers ('it's very difficult') which are common at A1 level. Additionally, the student consistently made grammatical errors during the speaking assessment such as for example systematically confusing the first and third person and other personal pronouns. Therefore, in this sample, it is evident that the student used basic and common grammatical structures but systematically made errors which impeded intelligibility, understanding and communication.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings. The total score of the student sample was 7 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 2 marks for Criterion A: language which reflects A2 level, 1 mark for Criterion B1: message-literary extract which reflects A2 level, 2 marks for Criterion B2: message-conversation reflecting A2 level, and 2 marks for Criterion C: interactive skills-communication reflecting A2 level. Ecctis agreed with how the student sample was marked by the teacher. More specifically, Ecctis agreed with the examiner's marking on this student's sample because the student struggled to respond to some questions, used basic language throughout the conversation, made very little attempts to actively engage and interact with the teacher, consistently made errors in grammar and vocabulary which impeded communication, and in some cases the student's pronunciation hampered teacher's understanding of what the student wanted to say. The analysis of the student's sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample is A2. The following section provides a detailed overview of the CEFR analysis and evidence behind the decision and the reasons why A2 was considered the most appropriate overall CEFR level for this student sample.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis indicated that this student sample reflects A2 level descriptors in all the CEFR activities and competences used for the analysis. More specifically, the analysis of this student sample concluded that the overall CEFR level is A2, because the student struggled to respond to some questions, required repetition and rephrasing of questions, used very basic grammar and vocabulary throughout the conversation with the teacher, their pronunciation and intonation sometimes impeded intelligibility, and generally the student needed great support from the interlocutor. The A2 level descriptor for oral interaction have been aligned to

this output text as the criteria at this level specify that substantial support from the interlocutor is required, which is evident in this sample. In terms of Overall oral interaction, at B1 level, a degree of confidence is indicated and at B2 level, a degree of fluency and spontaneity are indicated, which are not evident in this student sample. In terms of Overall phonological control, B1 and B2 level descriptors state that intonation, stress, and pronunciation should be intelligible, with first language interference not impeding comprehensibility. However, in this student sample there were some pronunciation difficulties and mother tongue interference which impeded intelligibility. As a result, the analysis found that the A2 level descriptor for Overall phonological control better reflects this student's skills as it outlines that the student's pronunciation is generally clear, but the strong mother tongue influences, stress and intonation sometimes affect intelligibility.

Additionally, in terms of the CEFR activity of conversation, the A2 level descriptor better reflects this student's abilities as it is evident from the sample that this student can handle very short interactions and conversations and is rarely able to understand enough to maintain the discussion with the teacher. Furthermore, regarding Grammatical accuracy, this student used only basic grammatical structures, but systematically made mistakes when using basic grammatical structures which indicates elements of A2 level descriptor of Grammatical accuracy. Overall, the CEFR analysis found a discrepancy between the student's oral proficiency level (A2 CEFR level) and the input text (C1 - C2 CEFR levels) which suggests that the assessment material may be misaligned with the student's language level at the time of the examination and that this student did not seem to fit the HL student profile.

Sample 11

Task analysis

The student sample 11 was focused on a literary extract which was a narrative text from 'The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time' by Mark Haddon. There were no written instructions included in the sample material, however, the IB Language B document indicates that students are given 20 minutes to prepare a presentation based on the literary extract. The presentation of the literary extract and the follow up discussion on the extract as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range of IB themes and optional recommended topics such as: experiences (life stories), human ingenuity (artistic expressions), and sharing the planet (the environment). More specifically, the task covered the public CEFR domain. The total number of marks available for this task were 30 marks.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this sample include the student's vocabulary, grammar, prosodic features including intonation and pronunciation, structure and development of ideas such as synthesising, analysing and evaluating ideas and points of view, as well as conversational, interaction and participation skills. Regarding grammatical structures and vocabulary, the input text of the literary extract included a combination of both basic and complex including direct reported speech such as 'I said 'I am going to find out who killed Wellington''; first person narrative voice such as 'I said', 'And Father said'; modal verbs such as 'I could tell'; noun clause such as 'I could tell that he was angry'; adverbial clause of reason: 'because he was shouting'; past continuous such as 'father was sitting'; present continuous such as 'I am going'; past simple such as 'I asked'; phrasal verbs such as 'find out';

colloquialisms such as ‘a bloody dog’, and imperatives such as ‘leave it’. The CEFR analysis of the input text indicated that this is literary extract reflects elements of B1 and B2 level.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment the student used a wide range of common and basic grammatical structures, however he made only a few attempts to use more complex grammatical structures. The student’s speech was grammatically accurate during the majority of the speaking assessment and also used vocabulary accurately. However, the student only used basic grammatical structures and vocabulary accurately with only small attempts to use a wide range of vocabulary and more complex grammatical structures. In terms of grammatical structures, the student used basic and a few more complex grammatical structures including demonstratives (this extract), phrasal verbs (takes place), adverbial phrase of time (shortly after), modal verbs (we can see), and indirect reported speech (he also said that dogs are important too). Additionally, the student used some lower frequency and technical lexis (it’s not easy to live with a person that has Asperger’s Syndrome), adverbial clause of concession (I don’t believe he’s the worst parent to know, but I think he should have told Christopher about the truth), restrictive relative clause (the person who killed dogs), and adverbial clause of comparison (should be punished the same as if he killed a person).

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings that discussed on the earlier section above. The total score of the student sample was 20 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 8 marks for Criterion A which reflects B2 level, 4 marks for Criterion B1 which reflects B1 level, 4 marks for Criterion B2 reflecting B1 level, and 4 marks for Criterion C reflecting B1 level. Ecctis agreed with the how the student sample was marked by the teacher. More specifically, Ecctis agreed with the examiner’s marking on this student’s sample because the student used basic grammatical structures and vocabulary accurately and effectively, the student’s pronunciation was clear with some mother tongue influence at times, and the student attempted engagement and interaction with the teacher throughout the speaking assessment and the conversation. The analysis of the student’s sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample is B1+. The following section provides a detailed overview of the CEFR analysis and evidence behind the decision and the reasons why B1+ was considered the most appropriate overall CEFR level for this sample.

CEFR analysis

The levels of the CEFR descriptors aligned with the sample correspond to those indicated by the IB mark scheme are the ones of B1, B1+ and B2. The selected CEFR descriptors suggest that overall, the sample mostly reflects B1+ level criteria, although some B1 and B2 descriptors also accord with the competences demonstrated in the sample. More specifically, the B1+ oral interaction descriptors have been chosen compared to B1 and B2 level descriptors, as the B2 level descriptor states that language users should be proficient to the extent that interlocutors do not have to modify their language use. However, the student’s sample indicates that the interview context is structured with questions formulated using lengthy, contextualising lead-ins, such as ‘When he finds his father in the middle of the night watching television and drinking

whisky with tears coming out of his eyes, as you say Christopher misunderstands and thinks that his father is sad about Wellington, but why do you think his father is actually crying?'. In addition, at the B1 level, oral interaction descriptors state that language users are expected to ask for repetition and clarification. The student in this sample did not require further explanations or detail to be able to answer the questions. The B1 level criteria also refer to familiar topics of conversation, whereas the B1+ descriptor mentions the ability to express thoughts on abstract and cultural subjects such as books or films. As it is evident in this sample, the student demonstrates the ability to express thoughts and opinions on abstract and cultural topics, reflecting elements of B1+ level in relation to oral interaction.

In terms of Grammatical accuracy, this sample aligns best to the B1+ level descriptor which outlines that the student can communicate with accuracy in familiar situations, having good control of grammar and effectively expressing themselves with some mother tongue interference which do not impede intelligibility. In relation to Vocabulary control, the student demonstrated elements of B2 level descriptor which outlines that the student has high lexical accuracy with some confusion in specific words which do not hinder communication. Additionally, in terms of the CEFR activity of conversation, this student sample reflects elements of the B1+ level descriptor which states that the student can have long discussions only when the interlocutor makes efforts to support communication and understanding. Regarding Overall phonological control, this sample aligns with the B1 level descriptor which states that the pronunciation are generally intelligible, with some small errors, mother tongue influences, stress and intonation which do not hinder communication and understanding.

In relation to analysis and criticism of creative texts, this student demonstrates elements of B1 level descriptor as the student can outline the most important events in a clear and structured narrative using familiar language and is able to justify and explain the importance of events but also to identify links between them. The student's response does not conform with criteria specified in the B2 level descriptor in the activity of analysis and criticism, as at this level tasks involve comparing two literary texts, identifying formal features, and drawing on secondary sources which are not evident in this sample. Additionally, the A2 level of analysis and criticism of creative texts, the CEFR descriptor refer to the students' ability to form 'short, simple narratives' that only contain high frequency lexis. However, this does not accurately reflect the student's output text which includes a range of verb tenses, colloquial language, and phrasal verbs. As a result, it is evident that this speaking sample reflected a range of B1, B1+ and B2 level descriptors in different CEFR activities and competences. However, Ecctis concluded that overall, this student sample reflects B1+ level.

Sample 12

Task analysis

In this student sample, the literary extract is called 'Refugee Boy', by Benjamin Zephaniah. The student is asked to read the literary extract and then present what they read. Following the presentation of the literary extract, the student is asked a first set of questions related to the literary extract. After the completion of the presentation and the conversation related to the extract, the teacher asks a second set of questions related to a wide range of topics. The presentation of the literary extract and the follow up discussion on the extract as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range of IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics such as identities (lifestyles, health

and wellbeing, beliefs and values, subcultures, language and identity), experiences (life stories, rites of passage, customs and traditions, migration), and social organisation (social relationships, community, social engagement). More specifically, the task covered the public and personal CEFR domains. The total number of marks available for this task were 30 marks.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills that are being assessed in this student's sample include, presentation skills, developing an argument, supporting a specific point of view, making comparisons between things, describing the advantages and disadvantages of some things and expressing views and opinions. During the whole internal oral assessment, the teacher asked 13 questions to the student, including questions related to not only the literary extract but also other IB prescribed themes from the syllabus. The questions posed by the teacher included a combination of basic and more complex grammatical structures including phrases starting with 'let's' and infinitive (let's move on to the next section), modal verbs (could you tell me more about?), present simple (do you think she plays a similar role?), past simple (you mentioned a lot of things, you made some really good observations), and futures (we are going to). In terms of vocabulary, the teacher used several complex nouns including but not limited to 'excess, jealousy, affect, aspects, current, extract, identities, lifestyle, media, mental, observations, statement' as well as several complex adjectives such as 'fake, overwhelming and supportive'. The analysis of the input text indicated that the questions were structured and phrased in a clear language articulated in clear accent and pronunciation, and the teacher repeated one question when the student asked for further clarifications.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment the student used a wide range of common grammatical structures and more complex grammatical structures, with minor and rare errors when using more complex grammatical structures. In terms of vocabulary the student used a set of common and complex nouns and adjectives such as 'she is so comprehensive', 'he is very grateful', 'fluent', 'defensive', 'unfair', 'mental, physical health', and idiomatic expressions such as 'if I was in her shoes', 'balanced diet', 'it is hard to shallow' 'the other side of the coin', and 'shapes every action you take in your life and everything you do'. Regarding grammatical structures, the student used a wide range of basic and complex grammatical structures including connectors such as 'however, maybe, but, because', conditionals and more specifically the second conditional 'If it wasn't for her, he would be lost, and he wouldn't be as happy. I would not know what to do if I was in her shoes', future tenses (I am going to change my mind), adverbs (equally important), passive voice (written by), and present perfect (he hasn't lived, he has had). The student used grammar clearly most of the times with only minor mistakes usually when using possessive pronouns. The minor grammatical errors did not impede understanding and communication of what the student wanted to say.

During the presentation of the literary extract, the student described the characters of the literary extract, identified themes and topics across the extract (including topics such as cultural differences, and refugees), and made references to the text and the characters, including their behaviour, the relationship between the characters, and elements of the characters' personality. Additionally, during the presentation of the literary extract, the student expressed their opinion, summarised their arguments, provided concluding thoughts, associated their personal opinions but also made links between the extract and their own

personal experiences. In the second part of the speaking assessment, which was the conversation about general topics, the student responded clearly to the questions, by providing structured responses and examples of their personal life, experiences and interests, and explaining and justifying their argument. In this sample, the levels of interaction between the student and the teacher were high and the participation and interaction between the student and the teacher were sustained until the end of the conversation. Overall, the analysis of the output text indicate that the student had strong vocabulary and grammar, by using idiomatic expressions and complex grammatical structures, with minor errors which are rare and do not impede communication. Although the student used language very fluently, details and in-depth responses to teacher's questions were sometimes missing.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings that discussed on the earlier section above. The total score of the student sample was 29 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 11 marks for Criterion A which reflects B2+/C1 level, 6 marks for Criterion B1 which reflects B2 level, 6 marks for Criterion B2 reflecting B2 level, and 6 marks for Criterion C reflecting B2 level. Ecctis agreed with the how the student sample was marked by the teacher. More specifically, Ecctis agreed with the examiner's marking on this student's sample because the student was very fluent, they used vocabulary and grammar very effectively, they maintained the interaction with the interlocutor throughout the speaking assessment, and they provided a really good presentation, commentary, and summary of the literary extract. The analysis of the student's sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample is B2+. The following section provides a detailed overview of the CEFR analysis and evidence behind the decision and the reasons why B2+ was considered the most appropriate overall CEFR level for this sample.

CEFR analysis

The levels of the CEFR descriptors aligned with the sample and correspond to those indicated by the IB mark scheme are the B2, B2+ and C1 level descriptors. The selected CEFR descriptors suggest that overall, the sample mostly reflects B2+ level criteria, although some B2 and C1 descriptors also accord with the competences demonstrated in the sample. The overall CEFR level of this speaking sample was not lower than B2. This is because the student effectively used a wide range of basic and more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary (including several idiomatic expressions, figurative language, and metaphors), with minor mistakes which did not impede communication, demonstrating a high linguistic range. During the presentation of the literary extract and the conversation, the student's message was articulated clearly, with the student expressing feelings and opinions and connecting them to the literary extract. Additionally, throughout the conversation the student demonstrated many attempts to actively engage in interactions with the interlocutor. The overall CEFR level was not higher than C1 because the student makes minor occasional mistakes in grammatical structures and in some cases the student could have elaborated more in terms of the argumentation and justification in the conversation part of the speaking assessment by providing more in-depth insights on the arguments that they presented.

In terms of Overall oral production, the student sample reflected elements of the B2+ level descriptor as the student can clearly and systematically develop descriptions and presentations by highlighting the main points of the literary extract and the conversation. Regarding fluency, the student demonstrated elements of B2+ level as they were able to communicate with fluency, confidently and spontaneously. With regard to Thematic development, the student sample present elements of the B2+ level descriptor, as the student demonstrated their ability develop an argument systematically by outlining the key points in order to support their argument. In addition, in this sample, the student provides a clear presentation and interpretation of the literary extract by expressing their own views and connecting them to the extract, and describing emotions that the literary extract evokes, demonstrating elements of B2 level in the CEFR activity of expressing a personal response to creative texts. Regarding analysis and criticism of literary extracts, the sample reflects elements of the B2 level as the student can evaluate, describe and provide a justified opinion around the literary extract, by demonstrating their understanding of the themes, topics and arguments presented in the extract. The C1 level descriptor of Vocabulary control aligns with this sample as the student uses idiomatic expression, metaphors, figurative language and some more complex nouns and adjectives, with only minor and rare errors. Furthermore, in relation to grammatical accuracy, the student systematically and consistently demonstrates high level and control of basic and complex grammatical structures, with occasional errors that are difficult to spot. Overall, this sample reflects elements of B2, B2+ and C1 level descriptors in different CEFR activities and competences. However, the analysis found that this student sample reflects best B2+ levels.

Appendix 3: French Language B Review and Comparative Analysis

Reading

Standard Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL French B reading comprehension examination of N20 to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text A

Text A of French B SL Paper 2 of the N20 reading comprehension examination is a 289-word extract from an article focusing on cyclone '*Berguitta*' and its approach to Reunion Island, in the Indian Ocean. The article is adapted from an authentic online source.¹⁹⁹ The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes and optional recommended topics listed in the Language B syllabus including sharing the planet, the environment, urban and rural environment, climate, physical geography, and global issues.²⁰⁰ The CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and educational domains.²⁰¹ More specifically, text A includes nine assessment items included in three sets of questions. The first set of questions requires students to select four correct statements from a list of eight, the second set of questions includes a sentence completion task using phrases from the text, and the third set of questions includes four multiple choice questions.

To correctly respond to the first set of questions, the student should read the first paragraph of the text, skimming, and scanning for key details mentioned in the statements, before deciding which are true and false. Additionally, in order to find the answers to the second set of questions, and obtain the marks, the student should focus on the second paragraph of the text. Students are required to locate phrases that are synonymous with those used in the sentence starters, in order to find appropriate material that can be lifted from the text and used to complete each sentence in questions 2 to 5. Similarly, in the third set of questions, the students are required to read the third paragraph of the text in order to identify the correct answers to the multiple-choice questions. All questions in text A indicate the specific paragraphs in which the corresponding answers can be found, making it simpler for students to navigate the text and locate the most relevant areas.

¹⁹⁹ Le Parisien, 2018. Le «cyclone intense» Berguitta menace La Réunion. [online] Available at: <<http://www.leparisien.fr/societe/le-cyclone-berguitta-menace-la-reunion-15-01-2018-7502118.php>> [Accessed 09 March 2020]. source adapted.

²⁰⁰ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

²⁰¹ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text A includes a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as possessive pronouns (*'leurs'*) (A1), present simple (*'recommandent, prennent'*) (A1), past simple/ present perfect (*'est devenue'*) (A1/A2), future (*'pourront'*) (A2), conditional (*'devrait'*) (B1), passive voice using the conditional (*'les côtes ... devraient être touchées'*) (B1), modal verbs in the conditional tense (*'devraient être'*) (B1) and relative clauses (*qui est*) (B2). Additionally, the input text of text A employs a variety of language functions including describing habits and routines, describing peoples, places, and past experiences, reporting facts and actions, developing an argument, justification, and emphasising or exemplifying a point.

The CEFR analysis of text A indicates that different sets of questions target different CEFR levels. More specifically, the review and analysis found that the first set of text A questions aligns with a range of A2+ and B1 level descriptors, due to the varying complexity of the eight statements within this question. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this set of questions is A2+ level. This judgement is predominantly due to the direction with which students are provided when in search of the answers; although the text could be considered long, students are specifically instructed only to review one short paragraph. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the first set of questions.

Table 27: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A (1st set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	1	True/ False	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: A2+: 'Can use an idea of the overall meaning of short texts and utterances on everyday topics of a concrete type to derive the probable meaning of unknown words/signs from the context'.</p> <p>B1: 'Can deduce the probable meaning of unknown words/signs in a text by identifying their constituent parts (e.g. identifying roots, lexical elements, suffixes and prefixes)'.²⁰² (Statements B and D).</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: A2+: 'Can understand short, simple texts on familiar matters of a concrete type which consist of high frequency everyday</p>	A2+	<p>The CEFR analysis found that the first set of questions is not lower than A2+, as a deeper understanding of text content is required than merely identifying the text type, as in the Identifying cues and inferring descriptor. In addition, the text requires students to identify language that refers to more complex ideas than the short factual descriptions mentioned in Reading for information and argument at A2.</p> <p>This set of questions is also not higher than B1, as this task does not reflect elements of the B1 CEFR descriptors for Overall reading comprehension or Reading for information</p>

²⁰² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>or job-related language'.²⁰³</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: A2+: 'Can understand the main points of short texts dealing with everyday topics (e.g. lifestyle, hobbies, sports, weather)'.²⁰⁴</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B1: 'Can find and understand relevant information in everyday material, such as letters, brochures and short official documents'.²⁰⁵</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'.²⁰⁶</p>		<p>and argument. For instance, the former mentions a satisfactory level of comprehension of the text, when instead students can look for main points or synonyms to word match. The latter refers to identifying significant points in an article, when students are, in fact, directed to the correct paragraph. Nevertheless, there are elements of B1 present. In particular, the Identifying cues and inferring scale can be aligned with B1. Students need to analyse the constituent elements of vocabulary items in order to predict their meaning; in text A this includes identifying that '<i>troisième</i>' (found in the text) is an ordinal number related to the cardinal number '<i>trois</i>' or that '<i>vitesse</i>' (found in statement D) stems from the noun '<i>vite</i>'.²⁰⁷</p>

Conversely, the CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions in text A corresponds to a mixture of A2+ and B1 level descriptors, yet with an overall CEFR alignment of B1. Students are required to find and understand relevant information in everyday material, an article. This is characteristic of Reading for orientation at B1 level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the second set of questions.

Table 28: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A (2nd set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	2-5	Sentence completion	Identifying cues and inferring: B1: 'Can follow a line of argumentation or the	B1	The CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions is not lower than B1 level overall. The CEFR scale

²⁰³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

²⁰⁴ Ibid. pp. 56-57.

²⁰⁵ Ibid. pp.55-56.

²⁰⁶ Ibid. p. 131.

²⁰⁷ Ibid. p.60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>sequence of events in a story, by focusing on common logical connectors (e.g. however, because) and temporal connectors (e.g. after that, beforehand).²⁰⁸</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B1: 'Can find and understand relevant information in everyday material, such as letters, brochures and short official documents'.²⁰⁹</p> <p>Vocabulary range: A2+: 'Has sufficient vocabulary to conduct routine everyday transactions involving familiar situations and topics'. (Questions 3 and 5).</p> <p>B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'. (Questions 2 and 4).²¹⁰</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: A2+: 'Can understand short, simple texts on familiar matters of a concrete type which consist of high frequency everyday or job-related language'.²¹¹</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: B1: 'Can recognise significant points in straightforward news articles on familiar subjects'.²¹²</p>		<p>of Identifying cues and inferring aligns with B1. For instance, question 2 uses an infinitive expression followed by the temporal adverb 'longtemps', while question 5 uses 'puisque' in the question and the synonymous logical connector 'car' in the input text. Vocabulary range aligns with B1, in places. For instance, in question 2 the student must recognise that 'il est déconseillé de se rendre...', an antonymous phrase without a clear subject, links with 'les autorités recommandent aux habitants ... de ne pas partir'. Although there are elements of A2+ level, this only applies to a minority of sub-questions.</p> <p>This section of questions is not higher than B1 as the student continues to be directed to a specific paragraph; this does not reflect the long and complex texts required in the Reading for orientation scale at B2. In addition, the vocabulary specifically referred to in the input text and questions is not specialist in nature, as required by the Vocabulary range descriptor at B2.</p>

²⁰⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

²⁰⁹ Ibid. pp.55-56.

²¹⁰ Ibid. p. 131.

²¹¹ Ibid. p. 54.

²¹² Ibid. pp. 56-57.

Similarly, the CEFR analysis of the third set of questions for text A revealed a range of A2+ and B1 level descriptors, with an overall CEFR alignment of B1 level. In this set of questions, students are expected to recognise antonyms, low-frequency lexis, and the similarities between different language features with synonymous meanings. This reflects the expectations of the B1 level descriptor for Vocabulary range. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the third set of questions.

Table 29: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A (3rd set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
3	6-9	Sentence completion	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: A2+: 'Can exploit their recognition of known words/signs to deduce the meaning of unfamiliar words/signs in short expressions used in routine everyday contexts'. (Questions 6, 7 and 8).</p> <p>B1: 'Can deduce the probable meaning of unknown words/signs in a text by identifying their constituent parts (e.g. identifying roots, lexical elements, suffixes and prefixes)'. (Question 9).²¹³</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: A2+: 'Can understand short, simple texts on familiar matters of a concrete type which consist of high frequency everyday or job-related language'. (Questions 6 and 8).</p> <p>B1: 'Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to their field of interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension'. (Questions 7 and 9).²¹⁴</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: A2+: 'Can identify specific information in simpler material they encounter such as letters,</p>	B1	<p>The CEFR analysis found that this set of questions was not lower than B1 because certain questions were found to align with the Identifying cues and inferring scale at B1 level. For instance, question 9 requires closer linguistic analysis of constituent elements in order to determine the similarities between 'près de' (in the text) and 's'approchera' (in the question), where 'proche' is a synonym for the first expression. Question 7 is an example of Overall reading comprehension at B1; the student needs a deeper understanding of the text than in previous questions, in order to ascertain that 'les habitants risquent d'être privés' encapsulates the same sentiment as 'en cas d'éventuelle rupture'.</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than B1 level, as the student is not required to scan through a long and complex text on a wide range of professional topics, as required for the Reading for orientation scale at B2. Similarly, regarding Vocabulary range, much of the vocabulary that students need in order to</p>

²¹³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

²¹⁴ Ibid. p. 54.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text A of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>brochures and short news articles describing events'.²¹⁵</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B1: 'Can find and understand relevant information in everyday material, such as letters, brochures and short official documents'.²¹⁶</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'.²¹⁷</p>		<p>answer the questions is related to familiar topics and everyday situations, but not the specialist element referred to in certain B2 descriptors. In addition, there are opportunities to conduct simple word matching, such as in question 6 where students can associate '<i>les habitants font la queue dans les magasins car...</i>' with an almost identical phrase in the text.</p>

Higher Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL French B reading comprehension examination of N20 to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text C

Text C is a 475-word narrative text adapted from an authentic public domain source, a historical war journal.²¹⁸ The journal is set at an undisclosed point during the First World War and the excerpt describes the narrator's experience as they depart for battle. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes and optional recommended topics listed in the IB syllabus, such as experiences, life stories, social organisation, social relationships, social engagement, sharing the planet, and peace and conflict.²¹⁹ Therefore, the CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and personal domains.²²⁰

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text C includes a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as present simple ('*débordent*', '*je connais*') (A1), past simple/ present perfect ('*on nous a regroupés*') (A1/ A2), adverbs ('*autant*', '*tant de*') (A2), adverbial phrases ('*à nouveau*') (A2),

²¹⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 56-57.

²¹⁶ Ibid. pp.55-56.

²¹⁷ Ibid. p. 131.

²¹⁸ Lejeail, C., n.d. *Journal de guerre* [online] Available at: < <https://short-edition.com/fr/oeuvre/nouvelles/journal-de-guerre> > [Accessed 19 March 2020].

²¹⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

²²⁰ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

the gerund (*'grouillant', 'saluant'*) (A2), future tense (*'m'ira', 'je serai'*) (A2), reflexive verbs (*'on se ressemble'*) (A2), future perfect (*'il se sera fait'*) (B2), relative clauses (*'que'*) (B2), and the present subjunctive (*'qu'on se dise'*) (C1). Furthermore, there are instances of colloquial language and idiomatic expressions, such as *'le boche'* and *'il m'ira comme un gant'*. Additionally, the input text of text C includes a variety of language functions including giving personal information, describing past experiences, people, places, emotions and feelings, obligation, and necessity, expressing wishes and emphasising or exemplifying a point.

The CEFR analysis of text C indicated that different sets of questions target different CEFR levels. Certain assessment items in the first set of questions generally correspond to B2 and C1 CEFR level descriptors. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for the first set of questions is B2+. This judgement is predominantly due to the fact that the questions associated with the text reach CEFR C1 descriptors on at least three scales, yet students are essentially lifting verbatim answers from only one reading text, meaning that they are not demonstrating the necessary skills to reach C1 levels for the Reading for orientation or Grammatical accuracy scales. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the first set of questions.

Table 30: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (1st set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	23-26	Short answer to closed question	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'.²²¹</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: B2: 'Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary, but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms'. (Questions 24 and 25).</p> <p>C1: 'Can understand a wide variety of texts including literary writings,</p>	B2+	This set of questions is not lower than B2+ because the student needs an understanding of more than the 'frequently used routines and patterns' in lower Grammatical accuracy descriptors. ²²⁶ In terms of Overall reading comprehension, this task requires a more detailed understanding, in parts, than the 'satisfactory' level in B1 descriptors. ²²⁷ The text used in this task is lengthier and more complex than adverts, everyday material, short documents, or brochures mentioned in B1 descriptors for the Reading for orientation scale. The student is expected to possess a broad range of vocabulary, which is more complex and

²²¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

²²⁶ Ibid. p.132.

²²⁷ Ibid. p. 54.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>newspaper or magazine articles, and specialised academic or professional publications, provided there are opportunities for rereading and they have access to reference tools'. (Questions 23 and 26).²²²</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B2: 'Can scan quickly through long and complex texts, locating relevant details'.²²³</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'. (Question 23).</p> <p>C1: 'Can understand and use appropriately the range of technical vocabulary and idiomatic expressions common to their area of specialisation'.²²⁴ (Questions 24, 25 and 26).</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B2: 'Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make mistakes which lead to misunderstanding'.²²⁵</p>		<p>varied than the 'familiar topics and everyday situations' mentioned in lower descriptors for Vocabulary Range.²²⁸ For example, questions 24, 25 and 26 were actually deemed to reflect the Vocabulary range descriptor at C1; less commonly encountered synonyms are used. For example, '<i>proches</i>', '<i>grouillant</i>', and '<i>la foule</i>' are used as opposed to simpler alternatives.</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than B2+, as the balance of B2 and C1 descriptors led to the majority of sub-questions being classed as B2+. In terms of Grammatical accuracy, the grammatical structures that the student actually needs to select and copy from the text are quite simple (e.g. first person verbs, plural nouns), thus independent grammatical accuracy is not applied. There is also a lack of idiomatic or specialist language in most sub-questions which limits the level of achievement on the Vocabulary range scale.</p>

Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions of text C corresponds to a range of B2 and C1 descriptors. All questions in this section were found to align with Overall reading comprehension and Reading for information and argument at C1 CEFR level. This is because this section of questions required students to comprehend the finer details and implied attitudes within complex literary texts.²²⁹ Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this set of questions is C1, due to the complex nature of the text, the breadth of vocabulary required to successfully deduce meaning and the requirement of

²²² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

²²³ Ibid. pp.55-56.

²²⁴ Ibid. p. 131.

²²⁵ Ibid. p. 132.

²²⁸ Ibid. p. 131.

²²⁹ Ibid. p.54.

deciphering inferred attitudes, including those that use idiomatic language. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the second set of questions.

Table 31: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (2nd set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	27-29	Matching	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: B2: 'Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues'. (Question 27).</p> <p>C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'. (Questions 28 and 29).²³⁰</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: C1: 'Can understand a wide variety of texts including literary writings, newspaper or magazine articles, and specialised academic or professional publications, provided there are opportunities for rereading and they have access to reference tools'.²³¹</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: C1: 'Can understand in detail a wide range of lengthy, complex texts likely to be encountered in social, professional or academic life, identifying finer points of detail including attitudes and implied as well as stated opinions'.²³²</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of</p>	C1	<p>This set of questions is not lower than C1 because the majority of sub-questions are levelled at overall C1 level; only two descriptors in question 27 are aligned with B2 level. The Identifying cues and inferring scale was found to align with CEFR C1 level in questions 28 and 29. For instance, question 28 requires the student to locate a synonym of 'avides'; reference to '<i>les dents avides de déchirer la chair ennemie</i>' includes figurative and idiomatic language and a need to use context to interpret how the narrator feels toward the enemy. In terms of the Overall reading comprehension scale, the C1 level descriptor specifically mentions the ability to understand literary writings, whereas B2 level does not. In addition, Reading for information and argument at C1 acknowledges this type of lengthy, complex text and the identification of finer details and attitudes, that are not detailed in B2+ level descriptors.</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than C1 level as it does not adhere to certain conventions expected in C2 descriptors. For instance, the</p>

²³⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

²³¹ Ibid. p. 54.

²³² Ibid. pp. 56-57.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'. (Question 27). C1: 'Has a good command of common idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; can play with words/signs fairly well'. ²³³ (Questions 28 and 29).		understanding of textual implications in the Reading for information and argument scale, the connotative levels of meaning in the Vocabulary range scale and the presence of highly colloquial language in the Overall reading comprehension scale.

Regarding the third set of questions of text C, the CEFR analysis found that this corresponds to descriptors from B2 and C1 levels. Specifically, this set of questions was found to align to the scales of Identifying cues and inferring, Overall reading comprehension and Vocabulary range at both B2 and C1 level descriptors, leading to an overall judgement for this section of questions at B2+ level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the third set of questions.

Table 32: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (3rd set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
3	30-33	Short answer to closed question	Identifying cues and inferring: B2: 'Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues'. (Questions 30 and 33). C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'. (Questions 31 and 32). ²³⁴ Overall reading comprehension: B2: 'Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed	B2+	This set of questions is not lower than B2+ level because the student needs an understanding of more than the 'frequently used routines and patterns' in lower Grammatical accuracy descriptors. ²³⁹ For example, the student needs to discern the object of a range of relative, direct and indirect object pronouns ('que', 'le', 'lui', 'en'). In terms of Overall reading comprehension, this task requires a more detailed understanding, in parts, than the 'satisfactory' level in B1 descriptors. ²⁴⁰ The text used in this task is lengthier and more

²³³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

²³⁴ Ibid. p.60.

²³⁹ Ibid. p.132.

²⁴⁰ Ibid. p. 54.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms'. (Question 30).</p> <p>C1: 'Can understand a wide variety of texts including literary writings, newspaper or magazine articles, and specialised academic or professional publications, provided there are opportunities for rereading, and they have access to reference tools'.²³⁵ (Questions 31, 32 and 33).</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B2: 'Can scan quickly through long and complex texts, locating relevant details'.²³⁶</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'.²³⁷ (Questions 30, 31 and 33).</p> <p>C1: 'Has a good command of common idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; can play with words/signs fairly well'.²³⁸ (Question 32).</p>		<p>complex than adverts, everyday material, short documents, or brochures mentioned in B1 descriptors for the Reading for orientation scale. The student is expected to possess a broad range of vocabulary, which is more complex and varied than the 'familiar topics and everyday situations' mentioned in lower descriptors for Vocabulary Range.²⁴¹</p> <p>This set of questions was not judged to be higher than B2+ because the balance of B2 and C1 descriptors led to the majority of sub-questions being classed as B2+.</p> <p>In terms of Grammatical accuracy, the grammatical structures that the student needs to select and copy from the text are quite simple (e.g. singular and plural nouns), thus independent use of grammatical accuracy is not applied. The vocabulary items that need to be copied can be classed as relating to general topics, as in B2 level, ('<i>Père</i>', '<i>paysage</i>', '<i>sourires</i>'). Equally, there is also a lack of idiomatic or specialist language in most sub-questions which limits the level on the Vocabulary range scale.</p>

The CEFR analysis of the fourth set of questions of text C found that these correspond predominantly to C1 level descriptors, apart from Reading for orientation which was identified at B2 level. The student is required to demonstrate understanding of a lengthy and complex

²³⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

²³⁶ Ibid. pp.55-56.

²³⁷ Ibid. p. 131.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

literary text, identify subtle meanings, such as implied opinions, and recognise a wide range of vocabulary, including synonyms and idiomatic language; these judgements have led to an overall CEFR judgement of C1 level for this section. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the fourth set of questions.

Table 33: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C (4th set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (4 th set of questions)					
Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
4	34-35	Sentence completion	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'.²⁴²</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: C1: 'Can understand a wide variety of texts including literary writings, newspaper or magazine articles, and specialised academic or professional publications, provided there are opportunities for rereading and they have access to reference tools. Can understand in detail lengthy, complex texts, whether or not these relate to their own area of speciality, provided they can reread difficult sections'.²⁴³</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: C1: 'Can understand in detail a wide range of lengthy, complex texts likely to be encountered in social, professional or academic life, identifying finer points of detail including attitudes and implied as well as stated opinions'.²⁴⁴</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B2: 'Can scan quickly through</p>	C1	<p>This set of questions is not lower than C1 level; there are only two questions in this section, both have been judged to be C1 level overall. The C1 level descriptors for Reading for information and argument, and Identifying cues and inferring, require mood, opinion and attitudes to be inferred; both questions in this section require the inferring of the global tone and mood of the text. In terms of the Overall reading comprehension scale, the C1 level descriptor specifically mentions the ability to understand literary writings, whereas B2 level does not. The variety and complexity of vocabulary and grammatical items also reflect C1 level descriptors; in question 34, differentiating between option B and C, 'a de la peine' and 'a peur', requires a deep understanding of all the vocabulary used to refer to the father's mood and actions.</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than C1 level because it does not adhere to certain conventions expected in C2 level descriptors. For instance, the</p>

²⁴² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

²⁴³ Ibid. p. 54.

²⁴⁴ Ibid. pp. 56-57.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (4th set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			long and complex texts, locating relevant details'. ²⁴⁵ Vocabulary range: C1: 'Can select from several vocabulary options in almost all situations by exploiting synonyms of even words/signs less commonly encountered. Has a good command of common idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; can play with words/signs fairly well'. ²⁴⁶		understanding of textual implications in the Reading for information and argument scale, the connotative levels of meaning in the Vocabulary range scale and the presence of highly colloquial language in the Overall reading comprehension scale.

Listening

Standard Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL French B listening comprehension examination of N20 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text B

In text B of the N20 French B listening comprehension examination (paper 2) the student is asked to listen to a conversation between two people about past times. Text B includes two sets of questions. In the first set of questions students are presented with 10 statements and must decide which five are true. Each question in the second set of questions includes a statement, the student must decide who in the conversation said each statement ('Clémentine', 'Thibault' or both). From the IB documentation, the topics discussed during the conversation focus on identities, lifestyles, health and wellbeing, experiences, leisure activities, human ingenuity, entertainment, and artistic expressions.²⁴⁷ The CEFR domain covered in this text includes the personal domain.²⁴⁸ To respond to both sets of questions and obtain the marks, the students should be able to listen for main points, specific details, and gist whilst inferring implied meanings.

²⁴⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.55-56.

²⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 131.

²⁴⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

²⁴⁸ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text B is a medium-length conversation and dialogue between two speakers about their past times. The analysis of the input text indicated that the total word count of the audio transcript was 390 words. The speakers of the audio recording have standard French accents, clear pronunciation, and intonation. The audio recording included some authentic features such as background noises and footsteps. During the conversation, a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary is used such as present simple (*'j'écoute', 'ils sont'*) (A1), past simple/ present perfect (*'tu n'as jamais goûté'*) (A1/ A2), adverbs (*'franchement', 'plutôt'*) (A2), adverbial expressions (*'de plus en plus'*) (A2), the superlative (*'le meilleur'*) (A2), modal verbs (*'tu veux'*) (A2), the conditional (*'je serais'*) (B1), emphatic pronouns (*'toi'*) (B2), and relative clauses (*'ce qui'*) (B2). Additionally, the input text of text B includes a variety of language functions including clarifying, describing past experiences, things, feelings, and emotions, expressing opinions, and agreement. Furthermore, there are also instances of reporting facts and actions, critiquing and reviewing, responding to counter arguments, and expressing abstract ideas.

The CEFR analysis of text B indicates that different sets of questions target different CEFR levels. More specifically, the review and analysis found that the first set of text B questions aligns with a range of A2+ and B1 level descriptors, due to the varying demand and complexity of the 10 statements within this question. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this set of questions is B1. This judgement is predominantly due to the amount of question elements which test up to B1 levels, allowing progressive difficulty throughout this section of the task and the opportunity for students to demonstrate a B1 level of proficiency in multiple skill areas. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the first set of questions.

Table 34: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B (1st set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	6	True/ False	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: A2+: 'Can exploit their recognition of known words/signs to deduce the meaning of unfamiliar words/signs in short expressions used in routine everyday contexts'. (Statements D, F, J)</p> <p>B1: 'Can deduce the probable meaning of unknown words/signs in a text by identifying their constituent parts (e.g. identifying roots, lexical elements, suffixes and prefixes)'.²⁴⁹ (Statements C, G)</p>	B1	This set of questions is not lower than B1 level because there are certain sub-questions which require students to undertake linguistic analysis, such as identifying suffixes and prefixes, to identify and associate unknown terms. For instance, statement G, presents students with the following vocabulary items: <i>'se relaxer', 'se détendre', 'anti-stress', 'méditation'</i> . Overall oral comprehension at B1 aligns with the task requirements,

²⁴⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>Overall oral comprehension:</p> <p>A2+: 'Can understand enough to be able to meet needs of a concrete type, provided people articulate clearly and slowly.' (Statements C and D)</p> <p>B1: 'Can understand the main points made in clear standard language or a familiar variety on familiar matters regularly encountered at work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives.'²⁵⁰ (Statements F, G and J)</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: A2+: 'Can understand in an interview what people say they do in their free time, what they particularly like doing and what they do not like doing, provided they speak slowly and clearly'.²⁵¹</p> <p>Vocabulary range: A2+: 'Has sufficient vocabulary to conduct routine everyday transactions involving familiar situations and topics'. (Statements C and D)</p> <p>B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'.²⁵² (Statements F, G and J)</p>		<p>specifically in statements F, G and J; students must listen for main points such as mention of 'coloriage' and 'enfants'. The range of vocabulary in the same three statements reflects the familiar topics mentioned in B1 descriptors (e.g. past times, lifestyles, opinions) rather than the everyday transactions described in lower descriptors.</p> <p>This section of questions is not higher than B1 level because it does not satisfy the requirements of several B1+ level descriptors. For example, the Identifying cues and inferring scale at B1+ would require a student to derive meaning from a portion of a text by considering the text as a whole. However, in this task, students only focus on specific areas of the transcript for each statement, through word matching, rather than needing to focus on the entire text.</p>

The CEFR analysis of the second set of questions of text B found that these correspond predominantly to B1 and B1+ level descriptors. The student is required to demonstrate an understanding of the majority of recorded material, general messages, and specific details, as well as using context to deduce the meaning of any unknown vocabulary; these judgements

²⁵⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

²⁵¹ Ibid. p. 52.

²⁵² Ibid. p. 131.

have led to an overall CEFR judgement of B1+ for this section. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the second set of questions.

Table 35: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B (2nd set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	7-11	Multiple-choice question	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: A2+: 'Can exploit their recognition of known words/signs to deduce the meaning of unfamiliar words/signs in short expressions used in routine everyday contexts'. (Question 9)</p> <p>B1: 'Can follow a line of argumentation or the sequence of events in a story, by focusing on common logical connectors (e.g. however, because) and temporal connectors (e.g. after that, beforehand)'. (Question 8)</p> <p>B1+: 'Can identify the meaning of unfamiliar words/signs from the context on topics related to their field and interests'. ²⁵³ (Questions 7, 10 and 11)</p> <p>Overall oral comprehension: B1+: 'Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided people articulate clearly in a generally familiar variety'. ²⁵⁴</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: B1: 'Can understand the main points and important details in stories and other narratives (e.g. a description of a holiday),</p>	B1+	<p>This set of questions is not lower than B1+ level. Although certain questions feature descriptors at the A2+ level and B1 levels, many elements test up to B1+ levels, showing progressive difficulty throughout the task and the opportunity for students to demonstrate a B1+ level; there are even elements of B2 vocabulary. For this reason, the majority of individual sub-questions in this section are graded as overall B1+ level. (Questions 7, 10, 11)</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than B1+ because the sub-questions do not satisfy the requirements of many B2 level descriptors. For instance, the conversation does not feature linguistically and propositionally complex discourse of a technical nature, as mentioned in the Overall oral comprehension B2 level descriptor. At B2 level, the Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings scale requires students to demonstrate understanding of material typical of documentaries, whereas this is an informal conversation about hobbies.</p>

²⁵³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

²⁵⁴ Ibid. p.48.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>provided the delivery is slow and clear'. (Questions 8 and 9)</p> <p>B1+: 'Can understand the information content of the majority of recorded or broadcast material on topics of personal interest delivered in clear standard language'.²⁵⁵ (Questions 7, 10 and 11)</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'. (Questions 7, 8 and 9)</p> <p>B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'.²⁵⁶ (Questions 10 and 11)</p>		

Higher Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL French B listening comprehension examination of N20 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text B

In text B of the N20 French B listening comprehension examination (paper 2) the student is asked to listen to a radio interview between a presenter and a young environmental activist, concerning her motivations and environmentally conscious actions. Text B includes two sets of questions. The first set of questions includes a gap-fill activity, whereby students must fill gaps in an excerpt from the home page of the interviewee's blog with open responses, to summarise key pieces of information. Each question in the second set of questions includes a statement, the student must decide who in the conversation said each statement ('Simon', 'Léa' or both). From the IB documentation the topics discussed during the interview focus on human ingenuity, scientific innovation, communication, and media, sharing the planet, the environment, social organisation, and community.²⁵⁷ The CEFR domains covered in this text

²⁵⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 52.

²⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 131.

²⁵⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

include the public and educational domains.²⁵⁸ To respond to both sets of questions and obtain the marks, the students must be able to understand general messages in the text and discern specific details to complete the sentences in the gap-fill questions with the correct wording. They must also be able to use contextual clues and recognise anaphoric references and idiomatic expressions in order to answer the second set of questions.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text B is a radio interview between two speakers about the environment and environmental activism. The analysis of the input text indicated that the total word count of the audio transcript was 535 words. The speakers of the audio recording have standard French accents, clear pronunciation, and intonation. The audio recording included some authentic features such as introductory music to the radio show. During the interview, the speakers use a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as demonstrative pronouns (*'celui-ci'*) (A2), adverbs (*'autrefois'*, *'même'*, *'personnellement'*) (A2), adverbial expressions (*'de nouveau'*, *'à quel point'*) (A2), comparisons (*'mieux que'*) (A2), modal verbs (*'il faut'*) (A2), direct object pronouns (*'la lavait'*) (A2), the passive voice (*'le prochain client était encouragé'*) (B1) and relative clauses (*'qui'*, *'que'*, *'où'*, *'ce qui'*) (B2). In addition, the text includes a range of different verb tenses including: the simple present (*'j'habite'*, *'tu as'*) (A1), past simple/ present perfect (*'une bouteille est tombée'*, *'m'a permis'*, *'j'ai créé'*) (A1/ A2), imperfect (*'je sortais'*, *'c'était'*) (A2) and the conditional (*'nous pourrions'*) (B1). Furthermore, there are examples of idiomatic language which students are required to comprehend in order to successfully answer questions (*'ça fait chaud au cœur'*). The input text of text B includes a variety of language functions, including correcting information, giving instructions, clarifying, and describing past experiences. There are also instances of expressing agreement and disagreement, comparing things, obligation, and necessity, persuading, and developing an argument.

The CEFR analysis of text B indicates that different sets of questions target different CEFR levels. More specifically, the review and analysis found that the first set of text B questions aligns with a range of B1, B1+ and B2 level descriptors, due to progressive difficulty as the student works from question 6 through to question 10. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this set of questions is B1+ level. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the first set of questions.

Table 36: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B (1st set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1 st set of questions)					
Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	6-10	Gap-fill/ cloze with open response	Identifying cues and referring: A2+: 'Can exploit their recognition of known words/signs to deduce the meaning of unfamiliar words/signs in short expressions used	B1+	This set of questions is not lower than B1+. In question 10, as in the Overall oral comprehension descriptors at B1+ level, the student would benefit

²⁵⁸ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>in routine everyday contexts'. (Question 8)</p> <p>B1: 'Can deduce the probable meaning of unknown words/signs in a text by identifying their constituent parts (e.g. identifying roots, lexical elements, suffixes and prefixes)'. (Questions 6, 9 and 10)</p> <p>B1+: 'Can extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words/signs from the context and deduce sentence meaning, provided the topic discussed is familiar'. ²⁵⁹ (Question 7)</p> <p>Overall oral comprehension: B1: 'Can understand the main points made in clear standard language or a familiar variety on familiar matters regularly encountered at work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives'. (Questions 6 and 8)</p> <p>B1+: 'Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided people articulate clearly in a generally familiar variety'. ²⁶⁰ (Questions 7, 9 and 10)</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: B1: 'Can understand the main points and important details in stories and other narratives (e.g. a description of a holiday), provided the delivery is</p>		<p>from recognising the general message from the recording, that recycling is not sufficient, before identifying more specific actions mentioned by the speaker. In question 7, as in the Identifying cues and inferring descriptors at B1+ level, a larger section of text must be considered in order to understand a specific detail; anaphoric references must be recognised in order to deduce that the event in question is related to the previous sentence. There are also elements of B2, in certain sub-questions, which push the overall judgement beyond B1. In question 7, B2 level Vocabulary range is evidenced as students need a broader range to recognise that '<i>me rendre compte</i>' is synonymous with '<i>prendre conscience</i>', and that '<i>problème du recyclage</i>' is the answer and not '<i>qui nous concerne tous</i>'. Question 10, also requires B2 level in Grammatical accuracy, which elevates the overall judgement; students need to recognise that a previous structure '<i>que</i> + infinitive', signals that the second '<i>que</i>' should also be followed by an infinitive, in the comparative statement.</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than B1+ because at B2 level, the Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings scale requires students to</p>

²⁵⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

²⁶⁰ Ibid. p.48.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1st set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>slow and clear'. (Questions 8, 9 and 10)</p> <p>B1+: 'Can understand the information content of the majority of recorded or broadcast material on topics of personal interest delivered in clear standard language'.²⁶¹ (Questions 6 and 7)</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B1: 'Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used 'routines' and patterns associated with more predictable situations'. (Questions 6, 7, 8 and 9) B2: 'Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make mistakes which lead to misunderstanding'.²⁶² (Question 10)</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'. (Questions 6, 8 and 9) B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'.²⁶³ (Questions 7 and 10)</p>		<p>demonstrate understanding of material typical of documentaries, whereas this is an interview about the environment which focuses on personal anecdotes and opinions. Additionally, at B2 level, the scale of Identifying cues and inferring requires the use of contextual clues to deduce meaning. However, there is no need for this process in this gap-fill task; the sentence structure in the gap-fill text and the transcript are so similar that the answers are well signposted for copying. In order to achieve B2 level on the Overall oral comprehension scale, students must be able to follow propositionally and linguistically complex discourse; in this task, the student is required to identify information about personal anecdotes, factual information and an opinion, which do not involve complex lines of argument. There is also a lack of linguistic complexity in the gap-fill sentences as they use common nouns ('<i>bouteille</i>', '<i>un kilo</i>', '<i>recyclage</i>'), simple adverbial expressions of frequency ('<i>par jour</i>') and an infinitive ('<i>réutiliser</i>').</p>

The CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions of text B corresponds to a wide range of level descriptors. These descriptors range from B1 – C1 level, leading to individual sub-questions being judged at B1+ (question 11), B2 (questions 12 and 13), C1 (question 14) and B2+ (question 15); the distribution of ascending complexity in most scales, shows a clear progression of skills from question 11 through to question 15. The overall judgement for this section of questions is B2; it is felt that a B2 student would be well positioned to access content

²⁶¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 52.

²⁶² Ibid. p. 132.

²⁶³ Ibid. p. 131.

from B1 to C1 level and obtain the majority of marks at the middle level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the second set of questions.

Table 37: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B (2nd set of questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	11-15	Multiple-choice question	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: B1+: 'Can extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words/signs from the context and deduce sentence meaning, provided the topic discussed is familiar'. (Question 11)</p> <p>B2: 'Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues'. (Questions 12 and 13)</p> <p>C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'.²⁶⁴ (Questions 14 and 15)</p> <p>Overall oral comprehension: B1+: 'Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided people articulate clearly in a generally familiar variety'. (Questions 11 and 12)</p> <p>B2: 'Can understand the main ideas of propositionally and linguistically complex discourse on both concrete and abstract topics delivered in standard language or a familiar variety, including technical discussions in</p>	B2	<p>This set of questions is not lower than B2 level because at this level the Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings scale mentions mood and attitude, which can be seen in question 12. This scale even reaches B2+ level descriptors in question 14 and 15; 'Entendre à quel point la communauté t'a soutenue dans ce projet, ça fait chaud au cœur !' Vocabulary range at B2 level is also evidenced, as the student requires a good range of vocabulary for general topics. There are a number of synonyms used between the questions and the transcript; 'changer' and 'évoluer', 'on doit' and 'il faut', 'faire évoluer' (a causative construction) and 'changer', 'd'abord' and '(il faut) commencer'; the causative also being linguistically complex. There are even elements of this scale at C1 level; the answer to question 14 hinges on an understanding of the following idiomatic expression: 'ça fait chaud au cœur!' In addition, the scale of Overall oral comprehension is present at B2 level in the form of propositionally and linguistically complex discourse. For instance, in question 13 the following relative clause</p>

²⁶⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>their field of specialisation'. (Question 13)</p> <p>C1: 'Can follow extended discourse even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly'.²⁶⁵ (Questions 14 and 15)</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: B1: 'Can understand the main points of news bulletins and simpler recorded material about familiar subjects delivered relatively slowly and clearly'. (Question 11)</p> <p>B2: 'Can understand most documentaries and most other recorded or broadcast material delivered in the standard form of the language and can identify mood, attitude, etc'. (Questions 12 and 13)</p> <p>B2+: 'Can understand recordings in the standard form of the language likely to be encountered in social, professional or academic life and identify viewpoints and attitudes as well as the information content'.²⁶⁶ (Questions 14 and 15)</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'. (Question 11)</p> <p>B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'.</p>		<p>is used, '<i>ce qui m'a beaucoup surpris!</i>' This also means that the student needs to recognise an anaphoric reference in order to find the answer.</p> <p>Although there are certain descriptors at the B2+ and C1 levels, this set of questions is not higher than B2 because there are also examples where the question demand and language are simplistic. The 'technical vocabulary and idiomatic expressions' of the C1 Vocabulary range descriptor are not present throughout this section.²⁶⁸ This can be seen in questions 11 and 12, where the pivotal content includes phrases such as '<i>tu as raison, c'est pas compliqué,</i>' and '<i>je suis bien d'accord avec toi,</i>' which are beginner level phrases and are strongly emphasised in the text. Certain answers are also more obviously signposted, meaning that the C1 descriptor for Identifying cues and inferring ('using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer mood'), is not always required.²⁶⁹</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings at C1 level requires students to understand even non-standard usage of language in broadcast material, including implicit attitudes; this set of questions includes explicit opinions only.</p>

²⁶⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

²⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 52.

²⁶⁸ Ibid. p.131.

²⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (2nd set of questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			(Questions 12, 13 and 15) C1: 'Can understand and use appropriately the range of technical vocabulary and idiomatic expressions common to their area of specialisation'. ²⁶⁷ (Question 14)		

Writing

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the SL French B writing assessment (Paper 1) of the M21 examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 2

Sample 2 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a high range performance in the SL writing assessment that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate a high level of knowledge and skills in writing production and interaction, as well as high linguistic competence at SL.

Input text analysis

The input language for task two varies in complexity throughout. For example, there are a number of structures, typical of CEFR A1 level language features: subject personal pronouns ('vous', 'il'), possessive adjectives ('vos', 'votre'), common prepositions ('dans'), common adjectives ('verts') and the present simple tense ('vous participez'). The input text also features definite and indefinite articles ('les', 'un'), imperatives ('expliquez') and the gerund ('invitant'). There are also examples of more complex grammatical structures, including a modal verb in the conditional tense ('il devrait') and a relative clause ('où'); the former being typical of CEFR B1, while the latter is typical of CEFR B2.

The language included in the question for the second task serves to give clear instructions to students, setting the scene by reporting their supposed participation in a competition and describing the place to be considered in the project. The question provides suggestions as to how to address the task, stipulating that the project be innovative, inviting students to describe their proposed project, and explain the reasons why it should be selected as the winning entry.

²⁶⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

The language serves to convey the level of persuasion that the student needs to employ by expressing a level of necessity for the project to be chosen.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 2 selected the proposal text type in order to complete task two. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions, grammatical structures, vocabulary, and linguistic forms.

In this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. They described the city in which they live, the environmental habits and routines of those living in the area, and their past experiences of travelling abroad, which inspired the commencement of the project. The student expressed their wishes, hopes and plans for the future of their city, such as stopping construction and encouraging families to use the local green spaces. Throughout the output text, the student developed their argument by expressing their opinions, addressing the main objectives of the task, and providing justification, such as exemplifying the proposed benefits of the project. In this sample, the student was persuasive as they expressed obligation and necessity by listing the actions that should be undertaken to reduce the impact on the environment and preserve green spaces.

The language used by the student varies throughout, ranging from simple to some complex structures. There are several elements which broadly align with language at CEFR A1 level. For example, the student used the standard subject, verb, object order in simple statements (*'j'écris cette proposition'*), regular and common irregular plural nouns (*'gens', 'animaux'*), subject personal pronouns (*'je', 'on', 'vous'*), possessive adjectives (*'notre', 'mes'*) and common prepositions (*'dans', 'pour', 'à'*). Also, the student used some other grammatical structures common at CEFR A1 level such as adjectives (*'verts'*), intensifiers (*'très'*), demonstrative adjectives (*'cette', 'ces'*) and the present simple tense (*'j'écris'*). The student also used elements of CEFR A2 language, such as definite and indefinite articles (*'le', 'des'*), adverbs (*'d'abord'*), determiners (*'beaucoup'*), superlatives (*'le meilleur'*), modal verbs in the present simple (*'nous devons', 'ils peuvent'*), the past simple/ present perfect tense (*'vous avez lu', 'j'ai lu'*) and the future tense (*'je vais aller', 'je vais donner'*). The sample also included the use of more complex language structures, including conjunctions expressing contrast (*'cependant'*), a modal verb in the conditional tense (*'il devrait'*) and relative clauses (using *'qui'*); the latter being an example of CEFR B2 language, and all others at B1 level. Finally, the student also used the present subjunctive (*'c'est dommage qu'on fasse'*) including the *'ne explétif'* structure to emphasise the negative connotation (*'avant qu'il ne soit'*); both of these structures exemplify CEFR C1 level language.

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 6/12 for language, indicating that the 'command of language is partially effective'.²⁷⁰ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A. There is evidence of vocabulary which is generally appropriate to the task and varied throughout, with some repetition; *'le changement climatique', 'des usines', 'les arbres'* and *'l'environnement'* are some appropriate terms used. There is also a variety of basic and some complex grammatical structures employed, as shown by the input text analysis above and the grammatical structures ranging comfortably from A1 to C1 level. Despite the successful

²⁷⁰ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

inclusion of some more complex grammatical structures, the student made some unsuccessful attempts in using both basic and complex grammatical structures. For instance, the student used incorrect present tense verb conjugations (*des usines qui produissent*), anglicisms (*major*), incorrect indefinite articles (*un solution*) and an unsuccessful attempt to use the passive voice in the perfect tense (*a été bruler*). At this level, the IB expects that 'errors at times interfere with communication'; there are indeed instances of message breakdown due to linguistic errors.²⁷¹ For instance, the student used the incorrect construction of an idiomatic expression *je vais aller doit au but* and *c'est très dommage*. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR B2 level.

The student was awarded a mark of 7/12 for Criterion B and the message conveyed, demonstrating that 'the task is fulfilled'.²⁷² Again, this is consistent with Ecctis' judgement, as most ideas were relevant to the task and developed well with additional detail and examples provided. For example, the student mentioned a number of causes for the environmental situation in their area, before providing details for whom the outcomes of the project will be beneficial and why. The student also explained the origins of the project, described their trip to Brazil and provided examples of why their project should have been chosen. The response was clearly presented and structured in a logical manner, with clear paragraph breaks to separate ideas and headings used to signpost the content of each paragraph, each one relevant to those required in the task description. This mark is equivalent to CEFR B1+ level, based on the mark scheme analysis.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 6/6 for Criterion C or their conceptual understanding. This judgement suggests that 'conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated', a finding that is in line with Ecctis' judgement regarding context, purpose, audience, and task conventions.²⁷³ The student selected the proposal as the text type for their task and adhered to its conventions. For example, the proposal had a clear project title, details of the proposer, and addressed the organisers of the competition, as stated in the task instructions. The main body of the text began by introducing the project background before explaining the ideas and project objectives, simultaneously addressing all key points required in the task instructions; this demonstrated that the student interpreted the task correctly. The proposal is appropriate in terms of register, being fairly formal throughout and with only a few idiomatic or colloquial expressions, which may be considered more informal in nature. The proposal fulfils the ultimate purpose of aiming to persuade the organisers, stating on several occasions what the project entails, justifying the necessity of the proposed actions, and how it is the best proposal.

CEFR analysis:

The sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. The CEFR analysis found that the output text of sample 2 corresponds to a wide range of level descriptors. These descriptors range from B1 – B2+ level, a range that generally aligns with those corresponding to the mark

²⁷¹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

²⁷² Ibid. p. 34.

²⁷³ Ibid. p. 35.

scheme analysis. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this sample is CEFR B2 level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of Sample 2.

Table 38: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL writing (Sample 2)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL Writing Paper 1 (Sample 2)					
Sample Number	Task Selected	Text Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	Question 2	Proposal	<p>Overall written production: B1: 'Can produce straightforward connected texts on a range of familiar subjects within their field of interest, by linking a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence'.²⁷⁴</p> <p>Reports and essays: B1+: 'Can produce a text on a topical subject of personal interest, using simple language to list advantages and disadvantages, and give and justify their opinion'.²⁷⁵</p> <p>Overall written interaction: B1+: 'Can convey information and ideas on abstract as well as concrete topics, check information, and ask about or explain problems with reasonable precision'.²⁷⁶</p> <p>Correspondence: B2+: 'Can compose formal correspondence such as letters of enquiry, request, application and complaint using appropriate register, structure and conventions'.²⁷⁷</p> <p>General linguistic range: B2: 'Has a sufficient range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints and</p>	B2	<p>This sample is not lower than B2 level, because it frequently exceeds the expectations of lower descriptors. For instance, the Correspondence scale at B1 level mentions basic, factual texts and the use of 'limited supporting details'; this sample goes beyond mere factual information in order to form an argument.²⁸⁶ In addition, General linguistic range at B1 level allows for 'lexical limitations' and 'difficulty with formulation'; the accuracy of language in this sample is higher than this.²⁸⁷ The CEFR descriptor for Vocabulary range at B1 level expects the student to write about everyday topics, however, an environmental project involves a wider range of vocabulary. Indeed, there are even examples of C1 level vocabulary, as the student correctly uses the present subjunctive ('<i>c'est dommage qu'on fasse</i>') and idiomatic expressions ('<i>j'en ai marre</i>'). The student uses a range of other structures, which are more complex than the frequently used routines mentioned in the B1 level Grammatical accuracy descriptor. For example, superlatives, modal verbs, conditionals, and relative clauses.</p>

²⁷⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 66.

²⁷⁵ Ibid. p. 68.

²⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 82.

²⁷⁷ Ibid. pp. 82-83.

²⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 83.

²⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 130.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL Writing Paper 1 (Sample 2)

Sample Number	Task Selected	Text Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>develop arguments without much conspicuous searching for words/signs, using some complex sentence forms to do so'.²⁷⁸</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics. Can vary formulation to avoid frequent repetition, but lexical gaps can still cause hesitation and circumlocution.'²⁷⁹</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B2: 'Has a good command of simple language structures and some complex grammatical forms, although they tend to use complex structures rigidly with some inaccuracy'.²⁸⁰</p> <p>Vocabulary control: B2: 'Lexical accuracy is generally high, though some confusion and incorrect word/sign choice does occur without hindering communication'.²⁸¹</p> <p>Orthographic control: B1: 'Can produce continuous writing which is generally intelligible throughout'.²⁸²</p> <p>Thematic development: B1+: 'Can develop an argument well enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time'.²⁸³</p>		<p>This sample is not higher than B2 level because the student lacks the linguistic precision, flexibility, and accuracy of the Correspondence and General linguistic range descriptors at C1 level. In addition, Vocabulary range at C1 demands a range of synonyms, idiomatic expressions, and colloquialisms; although there are some examples, the sample is quite repetitive, and there is a limited range of idiomatic expressions. To qualify for Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range at C1 level, errors must be rare and difficult to spot with 'no significant vocabulary errors'.²⁸⁸ On the other hand, this sample features anglicisms and spelling errors in common vocabulary ('<i>le problem</i>', '<i>major</i>', '<i>construier</i>') and errors in simple grammatical rules ('<i>de le changement</i>', '<i>je vais décrivez</i>').</p>

²⁷⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.130-131.

²⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 131.

²⁸⁰ Ibid. p. 132.

²⁸¹ Ibid. pp.132-133.

²⁸² Ibid. p. 136.

²⁸³ Ibid. p. 140.

²⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 132.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL Writing Paper 1 (Sample 2)

Sample Number	Task Selected	Text Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>Coherence and cohesion: B2+: 'Can use a variety of linking expressions efficiently to mark clearly the relationships between ideas'.²⁸⁴</p> <p>Propositional precision: B1+: 'Can explain the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision'.²⁸⁵</p>		

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the HL French B writing assessment (Paper 1) of the M21 examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 4

Sample 4 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a low range performance in the HL writing assessment that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate extended hesitation, resulting in limited quantity of output.

Input text analysis:

In task three, there is a variety in the level of language used throughout the question. Firstly, there are elements of language which align most closely with CEFR A1 level language features. The input text uses possessive adjectives ('*son*', '*votre*'), subject personal pronouns ('*il*'), common adjectives ('*ancien*', '*même*') and common prepositions ('*dans*', '*sur*'). In addition, there are language features aligning with CEFR A2 level including indefinite articles ('*un*', '*des*'), the imperative ('*rédigez*'), prepositional expressions ('*à l'expression de*') and the past simple/ present perfect tense ('*a passé*', '*il vous a parlé*'). Finally, there are also more complex structures reflective of CEFR B1 level, such as the conditional tense in third person plural form ('*souhaiteraient*') and relative clauses (introduced by '*qui*'), which are reflective of CEFR B2 level.

The primary language function of the input text of task three is to provide students with instructions for task completion. In this task, past experiences are described as the student is given the context of having heard a former student detailing their previous travels. The input

²⁸⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 141.

²⁸⁵ Ibid. pp. 141-142.

text introduces a third party, as it describes the former student. There is also the notion of giving advice and expressing the wishes, opinions, hopes, and plans of other students who may wish to experience the same.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 4 selected the proposal text type in order to complete task three. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions and linguistic forms.

The student used language to fulfil a wide range of functions throughout the text, beginning by introducing themselves and their intentions, before introducing the fictional former student whose experiences are the focus of the text. The student developed their proposal by describing the former student, complimenting their determination, describing their emotions during their experience, and comparing that student to other entrepreneurs. In some considerable detail, the student described the past experiences of the former student in the working world and whilst travelling abroad. The student then described things and places, as they detailed the former student's trip to America and exemplified their success by mentioning the businesses they established. Advice and suggestions were given on the behalf of the former student, who addressed the audience persuasively by relating their experience to the current situation in school.

The student used a range of language throughout their response, ranging from A1 to B2 CEFR levels. Firstly, there are examples of CEFR A1 level language features including possessive adjectives ('votre', 'son', 'leur'), common prepositions ('dans', 'ici', 'pour'), common adjectives ('scolaire', 'riche', 'connu'), simple questions ('qui est Joel?') and the present simple tense ('je me présente'). The student also uses elements of CEFR A2 language, by using definite and indefinite articles ('la', 'une'), adverbs ('autrement', 'presque'), past simple/ present perfect tense ('a fini'), the imperfect tense ('j'étais'), the superlative ('le plus important') and the imperative ('écrivez', 'pensez', 'ajoutez'). In addition, the sample included examples of CEFR B1 level language in the use of the conditional tense ('il serait', 'aurait'), reported speech and conjunctions expressing cause and effect ('grâce à', 'même si'). Finally, there are examples of CEFR B2 level language in relative clauses ('ce qui concerne', 'que') and emphatic pronouns ('lui', 'vous').

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark of 3/12 for language, indicating that 'command of the language is limited'.²⁸⁹ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A; vocabulary usage is sometimes appropriate to the task and a range of basic and complex language structures are employed, yet not in a consistently accurate manner. As analysed in the output text analysis, grammatical structures employed range from A1 to B2 level and include correctly used examples of the present simple, the past simple/ present perfect, imperfect, and conditional tenses, imperatives, superlatives, and relative clauses. The IB expects that at this level there are errors in both basic and complex language features which impede the communication of messages; both of which can be found in this sample. For example, there are errors in verb conjugations of the present and present perfect tenses, incorrect adjectival agreement, incorrect use of articles with the superlative, incorrect gender of articles with

²⁸⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.37.

nouns, anglicisms and frequent misspellings; this demonstrates first language interference in the sample. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR B1 level.

Regarding Criterion B, the IB awarded a mark of 4/12 for the communication of the message, meaning that ‘the task is generally fulfilled’, where ‘some ideas are relevant to the task’.²⁹⁰ Indeed, the student fulfilled many of the task requirements such as detailing past experiences, the motivations of the former student and providing advice to other students. However, the task requires an exploration of the student’s experiences travelling and working abroad, yet the student focused very little on the former and messages were not always communicated; thus, this judgement correlates with Ecctis’ findings regarding this criterion. At this level, the IB also expects that ‘ideas are outlined, but not fully developed’.²⁹¹ Although the student has addressed many of the main points required, there is a lack of detail in certain points, messages are repetitive and generalised, lacking in specific detail, such as the final advice given. The student’s response was generally well structured and connected, adhering to paragraphing conventions, as the student created clearly defined sections, with subheadings that relate to each of the required components of the task. Consequently, the IB’s expectations are met regarding a response which is ‘generally clearly presented ... generally structured in a logical manner, leading to a mostly successful delivery of the message’.²⁹² This mark is equivalent to CEFR A2+ level, based on the mark scheme analysis.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 1/6 for their conceptual understanding (Criterion C), suggesting that ‘conceptual understanding is limited’, a finding that is in line with Ecctis’ judgement.²⁹³ Additionally, at this level, ‘the choice of text type is generally inappropriate to the context, purpose or audience’ and ‘the response incorporates limited recognisable conventions of the chosen text type’.²⁹⁴ Indeed, the student indicates that they selected the proposal text type, yet the text resembles that of a letter; this is particularly evident in the initial formal address (*‘cher’*), a formal sign off (*‘cordialement’*) and an informal self-introduction, which is reminiscent of a speech. According to the mark scheme analysis, the mark attributed to this criterion is equivalent to CEFR A2 level.

CEFR analysis:

The sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student’s output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. The CEFR analysis found that the output text of sample 4 corresponds to a wide range of level descriptors. These descriptors range from A2 to B1 levels; a range that generally aligns with those corresponding to the mark scheme analysis. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this sample is CEFR A2+ level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of Sample 4.

Table 39: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL writing (Sample 4)

²⁹⁰ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 38.

²⁹¹ Ibid.

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ Ibid. p. 39.

²⁹⁴ Ibid.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL writing Paper 1 (Sample 4)

Sample Number	Task Selected	Text Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
4	Question 3	Proposal	<p>Overall written production: B1: 'Can produce straightforward connected texts on a range of familiar subjects within their field of interest, by linking a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence'.²⁹⁵</p> <p>Reports and essays: A2: 'Can produce simple texts on a subjects of interest, linking sentences with connectors like 'and', 'because' or 'then''.²⁹⁶</p> <p>Overall written interaction: B1: 'Can compose personal letters and notes asking for or conveying simple information of immediate relevance, getting across the point they feel to be important'.²⁹⁷</p> <p>Correspondence: A2: 'Can convey personal information of a routine nature, for example in a short e-mail or letter introducing themselves'.²⁹⁸</p> <p>General linguistic range: A2+: 'Has a repertoire of basic language which enables them to deal with everyday situations with predictable content, though they will generally have to compromise the message and search for words/signs'.²⁹⁹</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has sufficient</p>	A2+	<p>This sample is not lower than A2+ because the student uses sufficient language to express information about work and travel, as required in the 'everyday situations' mentioned in the General linguistic range descriptor at A2+.³⁰⁷ The student is also capable of giving simple examples and telling a simple story, which is reflective of Thematic development at A2+. There are also instances of descriptors at B1, which boost the overall level beyond a simple A2 level. For example, in terms of Overall written production, the student is able to use more complex language than that required at A2 (e.g. 'and', 'but', 'because') and can link elements into a longer sequence, as at B1. The ability to structure a text into clear logical paragraphs is also evident, as in the Coherence and cohesion descriptor at B1.</p> <p>This sample is not higher than A2+ because Thematic development at B1 demands an 'awareness of the conventional structure of the text type'; in this sample, a letter style was incorrectly used instead of the proposal format.³⁰⁸ In addition, the term 'reasonably fluently' is used in this descriptor, but there are instances where messages are not conveyed in the</p>

²⁹⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 66.

²⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 68.

²⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 82.

²⁹⁸ Ibid. pp. 82-83.

²⁹⁹ Ibid. pp.130-131.

³⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 130.

³⁰⁸ Ibid. p. 140.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL writing Paper 1 (Sample 4)

Sample Number	Task Selected	Text Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>vocabulary to express themselves with some circumlocutions on most topics pertinent to their everyday life such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events'.³⁰⁰</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: A2: 'Uses some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes; nevertheless, it is usually clear what they are trying to say'.³⁰¹</p> <p>Vocabulary control: A2: 'Can control a narrow repertoire dealing with concrete, everyday needs'.³⁰²</p> <p>Orthographic control: B1: 'Spelling, punctuation and layout are accurate enough to be followed most of the time'.³⁰³</p> <p>Thematic development: A2+: 'Can give an example of something in a very simple text using 'like' or 'for example'. Can tell a story or describe something in a simple list of points.'³⁰⁴</p> <p>Coherence and coherence: B1: 'Can make simple, logical paragraph breaks in a longer text'.³⁰⁵</p>		<p>sample.³⁰⁹ Propositional precision at B1 requires the expression of main points 'comprehensibly', yet not all messages in this sample are comprehensible.³¹⁰ Vocabulary control at B1 mentions 'good control of elementary vocabulary' but the student has made many mistakes in simple language.³¹¹ Grammatical accuracy at B1 expects accurate use of a 'repertoire of frequently used 'routines' and patterns', yet mistakes in present tense verb conjugations (A1 CEFR language) are frequently made.³¹² Correspondence at B1 expects 'describing experiences, feelings and events in some detail' but detail and development are lacking in this sample.³¹³ Finally, Reports and essays at B1 require 'brief reports in a standard conventionalised format', yet the conventions of the chosen text type are not adhered to in this sample.³¹⁴</p>

³⁰⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

³⁰¹ Ibid. p. 132.

³⁰² Ibid. pp.132-133.

³⁰³ Ibid. p. 136.

³⁰⁴ Ibid. p. 140.

³⁰⁵ Ibid. p. 141.

³⁰⁹ Ibid. p. 140.

³¹⁰ Ibid. p. 142.

³¹¹ Ibid. p. 133.

³¹² Ibid. p. 132.

³¹³ Ibid. p. 83.

³¹⁴ Ibid. p. 68.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL writing Paper 1 (Sample 4)

Sample Number	Task Selected	Text Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			Propositional precision: A2: 'Can communicate what they want to say in a simple and direct exchange of limited information on familiar and routine matters, but in other situations they generally have to compromise the message'. ³⁰⁶		

Speaking and Interactive skills

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the SL French B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 8

Sample 8 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a medium range performance in the SL speaking assessment.

Task analysis

The visual stimulus material with which the student was presented in sample 8 was in the text type of a photograph, displaying an individual with a shopping trolley, approaching a shopping centre; there is a large sign advertising a *Carrefour* supermarket and another advertising that there are 70 shops in the complex. The visual stimulus material is titled '*identités*'. The student presentation of the visual stimuli, the associated follow up discussion and the ensuing teacher-student conversation about general topics, included a wide range of IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics including, but not limited to, the following: identities, lifestyles, health and wellbeing, beliefs and values, language and identity, experiences, leisure activities, customs and traditions, social organisation, community, education, social engagement, sharing the planet, peace, and conflict.³¹⁵ More specifically, the task covers the personal and public CEFR domains.³¹⁶

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this student sample include describing a photo, inferring information, relating information to target cultures, explaining cultural phenomena, sharing

³⁰⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 141-142.

³¹⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

³¹⁶ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

opinions, and interpretations of a stimulus. During the second and third stages of the internal oral assessment, the teacher asked questions to the student, including those related to both the photograph but other IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics from the syllabus. The analysis of the input text in this sample indicated that the examiner's questions were concise and well-formed, linguistically accurate, clearly pronounced and well planned in order to be appropriately pitched to the ability of the student; this allowed the student to fulfil the basic requirements of the examination such as using opinions and descriptions, whilst covering multiple overarching themes. The questions posed by the teacher included a combination of basic and more complex grammatical structures, including several structures aligning with CEFR A1 level language. For instance, some simple grammatical structures included simple question tags (*'n'est-ce pas?'*), adverbs (*'récemment'*, *'maintenant'*, *'jamais'*), possessive adjectives (*'leurs'*), common prepositions (*'dans'*), common adjectives (*'dernières'*), intensifiers (*'assez'*), demonstrative adjectives (*'cette'*) and the present simple tense (*'ils font'*). Furthermore, there are examples of language which align with CEFR A2 level language, such as definite articles (*'les'*), past simple/ present perfect tense (*'a changé'*, *'as utilisé'*), the imperfect (*'n'avaient pas'*), future tense (*'nous allons changer'*), modal verbs (*'on peut dire'*) and reflexive pronouns (*'eux-mêmes'*). Examples of more complex linguistic structures include the conditional tense (*'je voudrais'*), Wh- questions referring to the past (*'quelle était'*), both typical of CEFR B1 level language, and relative clauses (introduced by *'qui'*), which are reflective of CEFR B2 level.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment, the student used a wide range of common grammatical structures, combined with a limited number of those which are more complex; the student committed errors in both instances. The student used some basic grammatical structures including demonstrative adjectives (*'cette'*), possessive adjectives (*'leurs'*), common adjectives (*'premier'*, *'rouge'*), intensifiers (*'très'*), the present simple tense (*'n'aime pas'*, *'nous croyons'*) and a simple comparison (*'plus jeune'*); all of which align with CEFR A1 level language. There were also examples of language which reflected CEFR A2 level language, such as definite and indefinite articles (*'un'*, *'le'*, *'les'*), adverbs (*'spécifiquement'*), countable and uncountable nouns (*'beaucoup de'*), the past simple/ present perfect tense (*'a voyagé'*) and reflexive pronouns (*'toi-même'*). Finally, the student utilised examples of more complex grammatical structures, including connectives expressing cause and effect (*'parce que'*), the conditional tense in the third person plural form (*'voudraient'*), both typical of CEFR B1 level, and relative clauses (introduced by *'qui'*) which reflect CEFR B2 level language. In terms of pronunciation, the student's accent and intonation was generally clear but, in some cases, there was interference from a mother tongue accent that made some words harder to comprehend, but this had little impact on intelligibility.

Marking analysis

The IB awarded a mark of 6/12 for language, indicating that 'command of the language is partially effective'.³¹⁷ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A: language; vocabulary usage is generally appropriate to the task, with the student able to express themselves fairly successfully on a range of topics throughout the conversation. The student employed a range of basic and complex language structures, yet not in a consistently accurate manner. As analysed in the output text analysis, grammatical structures employed

³¹⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 46-47.

range from A1 to B2 CEFR levels and include correctly used examples of the present simple, the past simple/ present perfect and conditional tenses, emphatic pronouns, and relative clauses. The IB expects basic structures to be ‘mostly accurate’, with errors found in more complex language features and mispronunciations which impede the communication of messages at times; all of which can be found in this sample.³¹⁸ For example, there are errors in verb conjugations, word order, anglicisms and the mispronunciation of some simple terminology; this demonstrates first language interference in the sample. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR B1+ level.

Regarding Criterion B1: message-visual stimulus, the IB awarded a mark of 5/6 for the presentation relating to the visual stimulus, meaning that ‘the presentation is consistently relevant to the stimulus’ and ‘draws on explicit and implicit details’.³¹⁹ Indeed, the student was able to provide descriptions of the image, although sometimes commenting on insignificant details. Additionally, the student identified cultural phenomena, namely the opening of shops on a Sunday, and was further able to position this within the wider context of the target culture. Furthermore, the student was able to fulfil the expectations of the IB, including personal interpretation, by comparing and contrasting this practice with that of their own country. The judgement by the IB correlates with Ecctis’ findings regarding this criterion. This mark is equivalent to CEFR B2 level, based on the mark scheme analysis.

For Criterion B2: message-conversation, the student was awarded 4/6 for the conversation section, meaning that ‘responses are mostly relevant to the questions’; this aligns with the findings of the sample analysis.³²⁰ The majority of the student’s responses were appropriate, although they were repetitive at times. At this level, the IB expects that some responses are developed, yet ‘broad in scope and depth’.³²¹ Indeed, the student was able to provide explanations which were predominantly opinion based, limiting the depth of the analysis. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR B1 level.

Finally, for Criterion C: interactive skills, the IB awarded the student 5/6 for their interactive skills and communication; this signifies that ‘comprehension and interaction are consistently sustained’.³²² This judgement aligns with Ecctis’ findings, as the student demonstrated consistent comprehension, with no evidence of misunderstanding throughout the duration of the conversation and no need for examiner repetition. Furthermore, the student fulfilled other expectations of the IB descriptor at this level, by maintaining use of the target language in their responses, although not always accurate, and sustaining independent contributions with only minimal pauses for formulation. Ecctis found that this level of achievement is equivalent to CEFR B2 level.

CEFR analysis

The sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student’s output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. The CEFR analysis found that

³¹⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 46-47.

³¹⁹ Ibid. p. 48.

³²⁰ Ibid.

³²¹ Ibid.

³²² Ibid. p. 49.

the output text of Sample 8 corresponds to a wide range of level descriptors. These descriptors range from B1 to B2 CEFR levels; a range that generally aligns with those corresponding to the mark scheme analysis. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this sample is CEFR B1+ level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of Sample 8.

Table 40: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL internal assessment (Sample 8)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL internal assessment (Sample 8)

Sample Number	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
8	<p>Conversation: B1+: 'Can have relatively long conversations on subjects of common interest, provided the interlocutor makes an effort to support understanding'.³²³</p> <p>Overall oral interaction: B1+: 'Can communicate with some confidence on familiar routine and non-routine matters related to their interests and professional field. Can exchange, check and confirm information, deal with less routine situations and explain why something is a problem. Can express thoughts on more abstract, cultural topics such as films, books, music, etc'.³²⁴</p> <p>Understanding an interlocutor: B2: 'Can understand in detail what is said to them in the standard language or a familiar variety even in a [audially/visually] noisy environment'.³²⁵</p> <p>Overall oral production: B2: 'Can reasonably fluently sustain a straightforward description of one of a variety of subjects within their field of interest, presenting it as a linear sequence of points'.³²⁶</p> <p>Sustained monologue: describing experience: B1+: 'Can clearly express feelings about something experienced and give</p>	B1+	<p>This sample is not lower than B1+ because the Fluency descriptor at B1 expects very evident pausing, whereas the conversational flow is well-sustained throughout this sample.³³⁵ In addition, Grammatical accuracy at B1 mentions 'a repertoire of frequently used routines', yet the student exceeds this with their use of relative clauses and the conditional tense.³³⁶ The Thematic development descriptor at B1 refers to a 'straightforward narrative or description', whereas the conversation includes opinions and interpretations.³³⁷ For Conversation at B1, a student can undertake everyday conversation whilst asking for repetition; the topic of conversation in this sample is beyond the everyday and the student does not need to ask for repetition. Overall oral production at B1 expects students to cover one of a variety of subjects, whereas the student in this sample addresses multiple topics throughout the conversation.</p> <p>This sample is not higher than B1+ because Fluency descriptors belonging to higher CEFR levels demand longer stretches of language with a fluency and spontaneity that are lacking from this sample. In addition, Grammatical accuracy at B2 requires a 'high degree' of grammatical control, whereas the</p>

³²³Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 73-74.

³²⁴ Ibid. p. 72.

³²⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 73.

³²⁶ Ibid. p. 62.

³²⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 142.

³³⁶ Ibid. p. 132.

³³⁷ Ibid. p. 140.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL internal assessment (Sample 8)

Sample Number	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>reasons to explain those feelings'.³²⁷</p> <p>General linguistic range: B1: 'Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events, but lexical limitations cause repetition and even difficulty with formulation at times'.³²⁸</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with some circumlocutions on most topics pertinent to their everyday life such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events'.³²⁹</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B1+: 'Communicates with reasonable accuracy in familiar contexts; generally good control, though with noticeable mother-tongue influence. Errors occur, but it is clear what they are trying to express'.³³⁰</p> <p>Vocabulary control: B1: 'Shows good control of elementary vocabulary but major errors still occur when expressing more complex thoughts or handling unfamiliar topics and situations'.³³¹</p> <p>Overall phonological control: B2: 'Can generally use appropriate intonation, place stress correctly and articulate individual sounds clearly; accent tends to be influenced by the other language(s) they speak, but has little or no effect on intelligibility'.³³²</p> <p>Thematic development: B1+: 'Can develop an argument well</p>		<p>sample includes errors in some more basic structures such as verb conjugation.³³⁸ The sample does not demonstrate the depth of development expected in the B2 descriptor for Thematic development or Overall oral production, which mention significant use of subsidiary points and relevant examples. Overall oral interaction at B2 is similar to the aforementioned descriptors, with similar notions of fluency and development of argument, which are also not evident in this sample.</p>

³²⁷ Ibid. pp. 62-62.

³²⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 130-131.

³²⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

³³⁰ Ibid. p. 132.

³³¹ Ibid. pp. 132-133.

³³² Ibid. pp. 134-135.

³³⁸ Ibid. p. 132.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French SL internal assessment (Sample 8)

Sample Number	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time'.³³³</p> <p>Fluency: B2: 'Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with users of the target language quite possible without imposing strain on either party'.³³⁴</p>		

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the HL French B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 12

Sample 12 was selected as it provides a useful example of a low range performance of an HL student that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate extended hesitation, resulting in limited quantity of output.

Task analysis

The stimulus material with which the student was presented in Sample 12 was in the text type of a literary extract from *Carmen* by Prosper Mérimée. There were no written instructions included in the sample material, however, the IB Language B document indicates that students are given 20 minutes to prepare a presentation based on the literary extract. The student presentation of the literary extract, the associated follow up discussion and the ensuing teacher-student conversation about general topics, included a wide range of IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics including, but not limited to, the following: identities, beliefs and values, subcultures, language and identity, lifestyles, experiences, life stories, holidays and travel, and migration.³³⁹ More specifically, the task covered the public and educational CEFR domains.³⁴⁰

³³³ Ibid. p. 140.

³³⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 142.

³³⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp.18-20.

³⁴⁰ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this student sample include presentation skills, sharing opinions and interpretations of a stimulus, analysing a literary extract, explaining cultural phenomena, expressing views and opinions, developing an argument, and describing advantages and disadvantages. During the second and third stages of the internal oral assessment, the teacher asked questions to the student, including questions related to both the literary extract but other IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics from the syllabus. The analysis of the input text in this sample indicated that the examiner questions were formulated concisely, with linguistic and grammatical accuracy, and clear pronunciation in the target language. The examiner had evidently planned the questions in order to match with the ability of the student and allow the fulfilment of examination requirements such as describing, using opinions, analysis of a literary extract and of multiple IB syllabus prescribed themes. The questions posed by the teacher included a combination of basic and more complex grammatical structures, including several structures aligning with CEFR A1 level language. For instance, demonstrative adjectives (*'ce'*), common prepositions (*'pour'*, *'dans'*, *'en'*, *'par'*), direct and indirect object pronouns (*'vous'*, *'la'*), questions with subject-verb inversion (*'comment est-ce qu'il voit'*) and the present simple tense (*'vous commencez'*). Furthermore, there are examples of language which align with CEFR A2 language, such as definite and indefinite articles (*'la'*), adverbs (*'vraiment'*, *'physiquement'*, *'seulement'*, *'tellement'*, *'encore'*), the superlative (*'le sens le plus large'*) and modal verbs (*'il veut'*). Examples of more complex linguistic structures include the conditional tense (*'j'aimerais'*), an example of CEFR B1 level language, relative clauses (*'qui'*, *'que'*, *'ce qui'*) and emphatic pronouns (*'lui'*), which are both reflective of CEFR B2 level.

Regarding vocabulary and grammatical structures, the input text of the literary extract uses complex grammar and vocabulary including low frequency lexis (*'minois'*, *'la bar lachi'*, *'balivernes'*) and dialectical expressions from the Basque region of Spain with no explanatory notes or French translation (*'ene bihotsarena'*). In addition, there are examples of poetic devices such as simile (*'douce comme un mouton'*) and idiomatic language (*'Carmen donc n'eut pas de peine'*). The extract features adverbial negation of verbs (*'à ne montre qu'un seul de ses grands yeux'*), subject verb inversion in reported speech (*'ma soeur lui dis-je poliment'*) and relative clauses (*'qui vous fera aimer de toutes les femmes'*). Furthermore, the literary extract features multiple verb tenses, including the imperfect (*'elle me reconnaissait'*), the future (*'je vous donnerai un morceau'*) and the past historic (*'elle me lança'*), whose usage is exclusive to written language. As a result, the analysis of the input text indicated that the literary extract included a wide range of complex grammatical structures and vocabulary. The CEFR analysis of the input text indicated that this literary extract reflects elements of C1 and C2 level.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment, the student used a wide range of common grammatical structures, combined with a limited number of those which are more complex; the student committed errors in both instances. The student used some basic grammatical structures including demonstrative adjectives (*'cet'*), common prepositions (*'dans'*), intensifiers (*'très'*), direct object pronouns (*'les'*), simple quantifiers (*'un peu'*) and the present simple tense (*'j'ai'*, *'se trouve'*), all of which align with CEFR A1 level language. There were also examples of language which reflects CEFR A2 level, such as definite and indefinite articles (*'un'*, *'le'*),

adverbs (*'quelquefois'*, *'beaucoup'*), adverbial phrases of location (*'au milieu de'*, *'ici'*, *'autour de'*), modal verbs (*'il veut'*, *'il doit'*, *'elle peut'*) and the imperfect tense (*'[elle] savait'*, *'j'étais'*). Finally, the student utilised examples of more complex grammatical structures, including connectives expressing cause and effect (*'parce que'*), the passive voice (*'il est décrit'*), both typical of CEFR B1 level, and relative clauses (*'que'*, *'où'*) which reflect CEFR B2 level language. In terms of pronunciation, the student's accent and intonation were generally clear in the use of more common and familiar language, but in some cases, there was interference from a mother tongue accent that made utterances harder to distinguish and has a minor impact on intelligibility.

Marking analysis

The IB awarded a mark of 3/12 marks for Criterion A: language, indicating that 'command of the language is limited'.³⁴¹ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A; vocabulary usage was sometimes appropriate to the task, with the communication of certain messages interrupted by incorrect word choice or anglicisms. As expected at this level, the student employed a range of basic and complex language structures, yet not in a consistently accurate manner. As analysed in the output text analysis, grammatical structures employed range from A1 to B2 CEFR level and include correctly used examples of the present simple tense, the imperfect, modal verbs, the passive voice, and relative clauses. The IB expects there to be errors in both basic and complex structures, both of which can be found in this sample. For example, the student had incorrectly used infinitives instead of conjugated verbs, and vice versa, including after the use of modal verbs. There were also instances of incorrect relative pronoun choice (*'qui'* instead of *'que'*) and use of the indicative where the subjunctive is required (after *'bien que'*). The pronunciation and intonation were generally clear, yet mispronunciations sometimes interfere with communication. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to CEFR B1 level.

Regarding Criterion B1: message-literary extract, the IB awarded a mark of 2/6 marks for the presentation relating to the literary extract, meaning that the 'presentation is mostly irrelevant to the literary extract', with only superficial references and generalised, unsupported observations.³⁴² Indeed, the student provided only a basic description of the events in the extract, without supplementary analysis; the student seemingly relied on previous knowledge of the characters, by describing them without specific reference to the extract. The judgement by the IB correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding this criterion. This mark is equivalent to CEFR A2 level, based on the mark scheme analysis.

For Criterion B2: message-conversation, the student was awarded 2/6 marks for the conversation section, meaning that 'the student consistently struggles to address the questions'; this aligns with the findings of the sample analysis, as the student hesitated and reformulated answers on a regular basis throughout.³⁴³ At this level, the IB expects that some responses are 'appropriate and are rarely developed'.³⁴⁴ Indeed, the student provided surface level descriptions and explanations for both their opinions and for cultural phenomena, without developing a deeper analysis. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement is equivalent to a CEFR A2 level.

³⁴¹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. pp. 54-55.

³⁴² International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 55.

³⁴³ Ibid. p. 56.

³⁴⁴ Ibid.

Finally, for Criterion C: interactive skills-communication, the IB awarded the student 3/6 marks for their interactive skills and communication; this signifies that ‘comprehension and interaction are mostly sustained’.³⁴⁵ This judgement aligns with Ecctis’ findings, as the student demonstrated good comprehension of most questions, yet ready responses were not always evident. Furthermore, the student fulfilled other expectations of the IB descriptor at this level, by maintaining use of the target language in their responses, although frequently inaccurate. The student also sustained their participation for the most part, although frequent hesitation did occur. Ecctis has found that this level of achievement is equivalent to CEFR A2+ level.

CEFR analysis

The sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student’s output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. The CEFR analysis found that the output text of sample 12 corresponds to a wide range of level descriptors. These descriptors range from A2 to B1 levels, a range that generally aligns with those corresponding to the mark scheme analysis. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this sample is CEFR A2+ level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of sample 12.

Table 41: Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL internal assessment (Sample 12)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL internal assessment (Sample 12)			
Sample Number	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
12	<p>Conversation: A2+: ‘Can participate in short conversations in routine contexts on topics of interest’.³⁴⁶</p> <p>Overall oral interaction: A2+: ‘Can interact with reasonable ease in structured situations and short conversations, provided the other person helps if necessary. Can manage simple, routine exchanges without undue effort; can ask and answer questions and exchange ideas and information on familiar topics in predictable everyday situations’.³⁴⁷</p> <p>Understanding an interlocutor: A2+: ‘Can understand enough to manage simple, routine exchanges without undue effort’.³⁴⁸</p>	A2+	This sample is not lower than A2+ because the Fluency descriptor at A2 level mentions the use of only short exchanges, yet the student is able to extend most responses. At A2, the Sustained monologue: describing experiences descriptor mentions topics such as weekend plans, hobbies, and people, yet the topics covered in this exchange are more complex, e.g., literature, culture, and language. The Understanding an interlocutor descriptor at A2 includes ‘everyday conversation’, however, even a simplistic discussion of literature exceeds this. ³⁶⁰ Overall oral interaction at A2 only alludes to routine tasks and routine or social exchanges, whereas this sample includes conversations on a broader range of topics. The Conversation descriptor at A2 only mentions likes and dislikes, stock

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ Ibid. pp. 73-74.

³⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 72.

³⁴⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 73.

³⁶⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 72.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL internal assessment (Sample 12)

Sample Number	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>Overall oral production: A2: 'Can give a simple description or presentation of people, living or working conditions, daily routines, likes/dislikes, etc. as a short series of simple phrases and sentences linked into a list'.³⁴⁹</p> <p>Sustained monologue: describing experience: A2+: 'Can tell a story or describe something in a simple list of points'.³⁵⁰</p> <p>Expressing a personal response to creative texts (including literature): A2: 'Can express their reactions to a work, reporting their feelings and ideas in simple language'.³⁵¹</p> <p>Analysis and criticism of creative texts (including literature): A2: 'Can identify and briefly describe, in basic formulaic language, the key themes and characters in short, simple narratives involving familiar situations that contain only high frequency everyday language'.³⁵²</p> <p>General linguistic range: B1: 'Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events, but lexical limitations cause repetition and even difficulty with formulation at times'.³⁵³</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with some circumlocutions on most topics pertinent to their everyday life such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events'.³⁵⁴</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: A2: 'Uses some simple structures correctly,</p>		<p>expressions, greetings, and social exchanges; the nature of this conversation exceeds these simple demands.</p> <p>This sample is not higher than A2+ because it fails to meet the expectations of several B1 descriptors. For example, Fluency at B1 requires responding to feelings and being able to maintain a conversation, which this student does not demonstrate entirely due to hesitation, reformulation, and an inability to relate the stimulus material to their own feelings and experiences. The Sustained monologue: describing experiences descriptor at B1 mentions narrating a story, describing hopes, describing their reactions to a story, and using fluency to give detailed accounts; the analysis from this student is too superficial to fulfil this descriptor. At B1, the Overall oral interaction descriptor at B1 requires a wide range of simple language and expressing personal opinions; the range of language is impeded by the lack of accuracy and is repetitive at times. Finally, the Conversation descriptor at B1 also mentions responding to feelings and being able to maintain a conversation, which this student does not demonstrate, as mentioned in the marking analysis.</p>

³⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 62.

³⁵⁰ Ibid. pp. 62-62.

³⁵¹ Ibid. pp. 106-107.

³⁵² Ibid. pp. 223-224.

³⁵³ Ibid. pp. 130-131.

³⁵⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the French HL internal assessment (Sample 12)

Sample Number	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>but still systematically makes basic mistakes; nevertheless, it is usually clear what they are trying to say'.³⁵⁵</p> <p>Vocabulary control: B1: 'Uses a wide range of simple vocabulary appropriately when discussing familiar topics'.³⁵⁶</p> <p>Overall phonological control: A2: 'Pronunciation is generally clear enough to be understood, but conversational partners will need to ask for repetition from time to time. A strong influence from the other language(s) they speak on stress, rhythm and intonation may affect intelligibility, requiring collaboration from interlocutors. Nevertheless, pronunciation of familiar words is clear.'³⁵⁷</p> <p>Thematic development: A2: 'Can tell a story or describe something in a simple list of points'.³⁵⁸</p> <p>Fluency: A2+: 'Can make themselves understood in short contributions, even though pauses, false starts and reformulation are very evident'.³⁵⁹</p>		

³⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 132.

³⁵⁶ Ibid. pp. 132-133.

³⁵⁷ Ibid. pp. 134-135.

³⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 140.

³⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 142.

Appendix 4: German Language B Review and Comparative Analysis

Reading

Standard Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL German B reading comprehension examination of N20 to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text B

Text B of German SL paper 2 of the N20 reading comprehension examination is a 405-word extract from an article focusing on an interview with a firefighter.³⁶¹ The article is adapted from an authentic online source. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the Language B syllabus including the themes of identities and more specifically the optional recommended topics of beliefs and values, sub-cultures, language and identity, personal attributes and personal relationships, the theme of experiences covering the optional recommended topics of life-stories, customs and traditions, and the theme of social organisation focusing on the optional recommended topics of community, social engagement, the working world and the neighbourhood.³⁶² The CEFR domains covered in this text include the personal, public and occupational domains.³⁶³ More specifically, text B includes 14 assessment items included in five sets of questions. The first set of questions involves one multiple choice question, the second set of questions includes three matching questions, the third set of questions includes four matching questions, the fourth set involves two multiple choice questions, and the fifth set of questions includes three open questions which require a short answer.

To correctly respond to the first set of questions the task is requiring the students to carefully read the article to demonstrate thinking skills. The students need to identify and choose the correct answer amongst the options in the multiple choice in order to gain the mark. Additionally, in order to find the answers to the second set of questions and get the marks, the students should need to identify and choose the correct questions amongst the options provided, in order to gain the 3 marks (one mark for each question). Similarly, in the third set of questions the students are required to carefully read the article and identify the words to be substituted in the sentences in order to correctly answer the questions and gain the 4 marks (one for each correct reference). In addition, regarding the fourth set the students need to carefully read the article and to identify and choose the correct answer (amongst the options

³⁶¹ DorfstattStadt, n.d. Ohne Feuerwehr kein Dorfleben. [online] Available at: <<https://dorfstattstadt.de/dorfkinder/ohne-feuerwehr-kein-dorfleben/>> [Accessed 4 November 2019]. Openclipart, 2019. Firefighter with flames. [image online] Available at: <<https://publicdomainvectors.org/en/free-clipart/Firefighter-with-flames/81755.html>> [Accessed 25 November 2019].

³⁶² International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

³⁶³ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

in the multiple choice) to gain the 2 marks (one for each question). Additionally, in the fifth set of questions, the task requires the students to carefully read the article and to identify the passages in the text in order to correctly answer the questions and gain the marks. The third and fourth set of questions in text B indicate the specific lines that the answers to the questions can be found within the text which helps students find the responses to the questions easier as it directs them to the specific paragraphs that the answers are located within the text.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text B includes a variety of grammatical structures and vocabulary. Some examples of grammatical structures used in the input text of Text B include subject personal pronouns (*'ich', 'du', 'sie', 'wir', 'ihr'*) reflecting elements of A1 level, possessive pronouns (*'mein'*) reflecting elements of A1 and A2 levels, common adjectives (*'guten', 'gefährlich', 'offenen', 'eng'*) (A1 level), and time adverbs (*'schon', 'früher', 'damals', 'wenn', 'später', 'einmal', 'jedes', 'mittlerweile', 'trotzdem', 'dann', 'oft', 'immer'*) (A1 and A2 level). Additionally, some more complex grammatical structures included in the input text of text B include superlatives (*'Die wichtigsten Leute / das große Glück'*) and reported speech (*'Sie gibt mir ein Wir-Gefühl und jeder hilft dem anderen'*) which reflect elements of B1 level, figurative language (*'am Hut'*) aligning with B2 and C1 levels, past simple (*'erreichten', 'hatte', 'konnte', 'war'*) (B1 level), past tense (*'ist ... vorgekommen', 'überholt habe', 'hab ... pausiert', 'bin ... angekommen', 'erschöpft ist'*) (B1 level), conditional (*'ich hätte jederzeit mit dem Zug nach Hause fahren können'*) (B1 level), modals in present (*'musst', 'kann', 'darf', 'muss'*) (B1 level), modals in past (*'konnte', 'musste'*) (B2 level), and phrasal verbs (*'strampeln sich ... ab', 'ziehe an ... vorbei'*) (B1 and B2 levels). Furthermore, some more complex grammatical structures in the input text of text B which reflect elements of B2 level include relative clauses (*'weswegen', 'wo', 'dass', 'wenn'*) and word order inverted after relative clauses (*'weswegen ich immer noch in dem Ort lebe', 'wo ich aufgewachsen bin'*).

Additionally, the input text of text B includes a variety of language functions including describing habits and routines (*'Früher haben wir einmal im Monat Dienst gemacht.'* / *'Außerdem organisieren wir im Ort den Tag der offenen Tür', 'den Sankt Martins Umzug', 'eine Nikolausfeier', 'und holen jedes Jahr den Maibaum'*), and giving personal information (*'Ich hatte früher gar nichts mit Feuerwehr am Hut.'* / *'Ich arbeite in einer Firma und wir haben viele Maschinen'*). Some additional language functions included in the input text of text B include introducing self, others (*'Nils Hanewinkel, der schon mit dreißig Jahren Feuerwehrmeister im Dorf Jakobsberg ist'*), clarifying (*'Nein, viele von uns fahren eher mit dem Auto'*), describing past experiences (*'Der Vater von einem guten Freund war damals der Feuerwehrmeister.'* / *'ich folgte ihm in die einzige Löschgruppe hier im Dorf'*), expressing opinions (*'Ich bin ganz froh' / 'fühlt sich das komisch an.'* / *'Sie gibt mir ein Wir-Gefühl'*), and reporting facts and actions (*'Oft läuft es eher so, dass wir uns um alles kümmern und die Stadt zahlt nur die Ersatzteile.'* / *'Früher haben wir einmal im Monat Dienst gemacht'*).

The CEFR analysis of text B indicated that different sets of questions target different CEFR levels. More specifically, the review and analysis found that the first, third, fourth and fifth sets of questions align with B1+ level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Reading for orientation, Reading for information and argument, Identifying cues and inferring and Grammatical accuracy, and the third set of questions aligns with B1 level descriptors in the same CEFR scales.

For example, in the first set of questions the students are required to understand a straightforward text on a subject which is likely to be relatively familiar (community, fire service), which is characteristic of Reading for information and argument at B1+ level. Similarly, students are required to scan through a straightforward text to identify what it is about and select the correct answer, which is a characteristic of Reading for orientation at B1+ level. The table below presents the summary of the findings of the CEFR analysis of the first set of questions.

Table 42: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (1st Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	13	Multiple-choice question	<p>Reading for orientation: B1+: 'Can scan longer texts in order to locate desired information, and gather information from different parts of a text, or from different texts in order to fulfil a specific task'.³⁶⁴</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: B1+: 'Can recognise the line of argument in the treatment of the issue presented, though not necessarily in detail. Can understand short texts on subjects that are familiar or of current interest, in which people give their points of view'.³⁶⁵</p>	B1+	The overall CEFR level of the first set of questions is not B1 because the B1 level descriptor at the CEFR scale of Reading for orientation involves assessing whether an article, report or review is on the required topic. This is slightly too surface-level, as in this task students are required to identify the general topic from a range of options. The overall CEFR level of the first set of questions is not B2 because the B2 level descriptor at the Reading for orientation scale requires the student to quickly identify the content and relevance of news items, articles and reports on a wide range of professional topics. This is more advanced than what is expected from students at this set of questions, as the scope of the text is limited to a familiar, and relatively everyday topic.

³⁶⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.55-56.

³⁶⁵ Ibid. pp. 56-57.

Additionally, the CEFR analysis of the second set of questions found that this reflects elements of the B1 level descriptors as students are required to recognise significant points in a straightforward article on a familiar subject to be able to select which question is best fit to given paragraphs in the text. This is a characteristic of the CEFR scale of Reading for information and argument at B1 level. The table below presents the summary of the findings of the CEFR analysis of the second set of questions.

Table 43: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (2nd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	14-16	Matching question	Reading for information and argument: B1: 'Can understand the main points in descriptive notes such as those on museum exhibits and explanatory boards in exhibitions. Can understand straightforward, factual texts on subjects relating to their interests or studies. Can recognise significant points in straightforward news articles on familiar subjects'. ³⁶⁶	B1	The CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions is not lower than B1 as the A2+ level descriptor at the CEFR scale of Reading for information and argument involves understanding the main points of short texts dealing with everyday topics. Although there is some element of this reflected in this set of questions, this is a little too surface-level, as the text is relatively long and the topic, although likely to be familiar, extends slightly beyond simple everyday topics such as weather and sports.

Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the third set of questions of text B corresponds to B1+ level as students may need to extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words from the context and deduce the meaning of the phrase to select the correct word from the text which is on a familiar topic. This is characteristic of B1+ level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the third set of questions.

Table 44: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (3rd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
3	17-20	Matching question	Identifying cues and inferring: B1+: 'Can exploit different types of	B1+	The third set of questions is not higher than B1+ level because in the instructions is specified that students must use the words as

³⁶⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 56-57.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			connectors (numerical, temporal, logical) and the role of key paragraphs in the overall organisation in order to better understand the argumentation in a text. Can extrapolate the meaning of a section of a text by taking into account the text as a whole. Can extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words/signs from the context and deduce sentence meaning, provided the topic discussed is familiar'. ³⁶⁷		they appear in the text and the lines to find them are also provided (e.g. 'dort' = there, it's an adverb which on row 6 refers to 'Feuerwehr'= fire department). Additionally, the B2 level descriptor of the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring involves using a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues. This is beyond what is required from applicants in this set of questions.

The CEFR analysis of the fourth set of questions found that it also reflects elements of B1+ level descriptors in the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring as it requires students to extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words identifying the meaning of unfamiliar words from the context on topics related to their field and interests. If students are unfamiliar with the meaning of the selected phrases in the question, they will need to use the context in order to deduce the meaning of the selected phrase. Additionally, in this set of questions the number of the line within the text that students should look at in order to find the answer is provided at the beginning of this set of questions. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the fourth set of questions.

Table 45: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (4th Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
4	21-22	Multiple-choice question	Identifying cues and inferring: B1+: 'Can exploit different types of connectors (numerical, temporal, logical) and the role of key paragraphs in the overall organisation in order to better understand the argumentation in a text.	B1+	The task is not lower than B1+ because the students should be able to understand the meaning of the sentences and the meaning of the words provided within the context of the text and then try and identify the synonyms of those words within the context of the text. Additionally, the fourth set of questions does not reflect

³⁶⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			Can extrapolate the meaning of a section of a text by taking into account the text as a whole. Can extrapolate the meaning of occasional unknown words/signs from the context and deduce sentence meaning, provided the topic discussed is familiar'. ³⁶⁸		elements of B2 level descriptor as the B2 level descriptor of the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring involves using a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues. This is beyond what is required from students in this instance.

The CEFR analysis of the fifth set of questions found that it also reflects elements of B1+ level descriptor as students are required to understand a straightforward text on a subject which is likely to be relatively familiar (community, fire service), which is characteristic of Reading for information and argument at B1+ level. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the fifth set of questions.

Table 46: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Paper 2 reading comprehension Text B (5th Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
5	23-25	Short answer to open question	Reading for information and argument: B1+: 'Can recognise the line of argument in the treatment of the issue presented, though not necessarily in detail. Can understand short texts on subjects that are familiar or of current interest, in which people give their	B1+	This set of questions is not higher than B1+ because the CEFR scale of Reading for orientation at B2 level involves scanning quickly through long and complex texts, locating relevant details. This is too advanced, as the text is neither overly long nor complex. Additionally, this set of questions is not lower than B1+ because the B1 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Reading for orientation involves picking out important information from basic text, such as information about preparation and usage on the labels on foodstuff and medicine. The text students are required to engage with is more complex.

³⁶⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

points
view.³⁶⁹ of

Higher Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL German B reading comprehension examination of N20 to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text C

Text C of the German HL paper 2 of the N20 reading comprehension examination is a 393-word extract taken from a story narrative of a creative writing piece which focuses on a story about a girl who is packing, and she is ready to leave her home. The article is taken from an authentic source which is the book entitled *'Ankunft im Alltag'* from the author Heyne I. from 1986.³⁷⁰ The subject matter of the extract of the book is consistent with the prescriptive themes listed in the Language B syllabus including identities, and more specifically the optional recommended topics of beliefs and values, language and identity, personal attributes, and personal relationships.³⁷¹ Additionally, text C is consistent with the theme of experiences and more specifically the optional recommended topics of life stories, rites of passage, customs and traditions and migration.³⁷² The CEFR domain covered in this text is the personal domain.³⁷³

More specifically, text C includes 13 assessment items included in five sets of questions. The first set of questions includes two multiple choice questions where the student should have good reception and thinking skills for carefully reading the article and going back to the text, in order to be able to identify the correct answers. The second set of questions is a closed question which requires students to provide a short answer. This task requires students to carefully read the article and go back to the text, in order to be able to identify the correct answer. Students need to pick the one and only right word to gain the mark. The third set of questions includes four closed questions which require short answers. The task requires students to carefully read the article and go back to the text on the lines provided, to be able to identify the correct answers. Students need to pick the right word (which refers to the underlined words to substitute) for each one of the four sentences, to gain the four marks. The fourth set of questions includes three multiple choice questions where the students should carefully read the article and go back to the text, in order to be able to identify the three correct answers. The students need to pick the right multiple-choice letter/option amongst those provided, in order to gain the three marks. The fifth set of questions of text C requires the students to provide short answers to three open questions by carefully reading the article to demonstrate their thinking skills. More specifically, the students need to identify the passages in the text to correctly answer the questions and gain the three marks.

³⁶⁹ Ibid. pp.56-57.

³⁷⁰ Heyne, I., 1986. *Ankunft im Alltag*. Freiburg: Herder.

³⁷¹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

³⁷² Ibid.

³⁷³ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text C includes a wide range of simple but also more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary. More specifically, examples of some simple grammatical structures of the input text of text C include possessive pronouns (*'ihr', 'Ihre', 'ihren', 'ihrem', 'deinen'*), common adjectives (*'Unschlüssig', 'halbgepackten', 'lange', 'neuen', 'rückgängig'*), common prepositions (*'in', 'zu', 'von', 'über', 'Für', 'auf', 'bei', 'mit', 'nach'*), time adverbs (*'bisheriges', 'zuerst', 'kurzen Zeit', 'vorhin', 'vorige', 'Zum ersten Mal', 'Tagen und Wochen', 'plötzlich', 'endgültig', 'bisher', 'schon wieder', 'seit', 'längst', 'seitdem'*), comparatives (*'andere Sachen als für sie', 'wichtiger sein sollte als', 'so etwas wie', 'etwas anderem ... als', 'mehr', 'voller', 'mehr als', 'sah aus wie'*), and present simple (*'wegmüssen', 'kommt'*) which all reflect elements of A1 and A2 level. Additionally, the input text of text C includes some complex grammatical structures such as the conditional (*'In achtundvierzig Stunden hätten sie die DDR zu verlassen'*) (B1 and B2 levels), imperative (*'Das Wichtigste pack in deinen Koffer' / 'Trödle nicht so rum. Beeil dich!'*) (A2 and B1 level), past perfect (*'ausgemacht hatte', 'hatte gesagt', 'hereingekommen war', 'gesehen hatte', 'gekauft hatten', 'war vergangen'*) (B1 and B2 levels), passives (*'gesprochen worden war', 'genehmigt wurden', 'war gesagt worden', 'war vorbereitet worden', 'gestellt worden waren'*) (B1 and B2 levels), modals in present (*'können', 'wegmüssen'*) (B1 level), modals in past (*'sollte', 'konnte', 'wollten'*), (B2 level) modals with infinitive (*'tun sollte', 'sollte entscheiden', 'mitnehmen wollten'*) and phrasal verbs (*'stand(en) ... herum, Trödle ... rum', 'standen ... bereit'*) (B2 level). In terms of vocabulary, text C includes examples of more complex vocabulary such as figurative language and metaphors which align with B2 and C1 levels (*'alles hinter sich zu lassen' / 'Hals über Kopf' / 'die Nerven durchgegangen' / 'Abschiedsschmerz' / 'Kopf voller Probleme' / 'Packerei' / 'Die Wohnung sah aus wie nach einem Erdbeben'*).

Furthermore, the input text of text C includes a variety of language functions such as describing habits and routines (*'die lange Hose oder der Pullover. 'Darin fühlte sie sich wohl, das wußte sie.'* / *'Da standen längst gepackte Kisten bereit'*), seeking, granting or denying permission (*'Sie wußte nicht', 'was sie zuerst tun sollte.'* / *'Wie sollte man in dieser kurzen Zeit entscheiden', 'was die wichtigsten Sachen waren?'*), and expressing opinions including agreement and disagreement (*'Für ihre Mutter waren das bestimmt ganz 10 andere Sachen als für sie.'* / *'Grit begriff nicht' / 'Darin fühlte sie sich wohl', 'das wußte sie. Von dem neuen Kleid wußte sie es noch nicht'*). Additionally, some other language functions included in text C including reporting facts and actions (*'Nun war es entschieden, endgültig.'* / *'Seit mehr als einem Jahr standen sie herum' / 'Aber soviel Besuch kam seitdem nicht mehr zu ihnen'*) and describing feelings and emotions (*'Grit geriet fast in Panik.'* / *'Unschlüssig stand sie in ihrem Zimmer herum.'* / *'waren ihr beinahe die Nerven durchgegangen' / 'Grit begriff nicht' / 'Darin fühlte sie sich wohl' / 'Abschiedsschmerz'*).

The CEFR analysis of text C indicated that all five sets of questions of text C align with C1 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Reading for information and argument, Identifying cues and inferring, Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range. For example, in the first set of questions the students are required to identify the meaning of *'Hals über Kopf'*, which is used in the text. Therefore, students are required to use contextual and lexical cues to infer mood, which is a characteristic of the C1 level in the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring, and also use synonyms in order to

answer the question correctly. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the first set of questions of text C.

Table 47: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (1st Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	27-28	Multiple-choice question	Identifying cues and inferring: C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'. ³⁷⁴	C1	<p>The first set of questions was not found lower than C1 as the student needs to be able to understand the meaning of simple but also more complex vocabulary ('Gedankenlosigkeit' which means thoughtlessness, 'sprunghaft' which means erratic/by leaps and bounds) which is not related to everyday expressions, have good knowledge of simple and more complex grammatical languages (use of figurative language and idiomatic expression such as '<i>Hals über Kopf</i>') and be able to infer and identify meaning from the text.</p> <p>Students are required to identify the meaning of '<i>Hals über Kopf</i>', which is used in the text. Students are therefore required to use contextual and lexical cues to infer mood (characteristic of C1-level Identifying cues and inferring) and a synonym to answer the question correctly.</p>

Additionally, elements of C1 level are also evident in the second set of questions, especially in the CEFR scales of Identifying cues and inferring, Overall reading comprehension, Grammatical accuracy, Vocabulary range and Reading for information and argument. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the second set of questions of text C.

Table 48: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (2nd Set of Questions)

³⁷⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	29	Short answer to closed question	Identifying cues and inferring: C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'. ³⁷⁵	C1	Students are required to identify the synonym for 'hilfflos' which is used in the text. Students are therefore required to use contextual and lexical cues to infer mood (characteristic of C1 level Identifying cues and inferring) and thereby identify the exact word used in the text in order to answer the question correctly. The task is not lower than C1 because the students need to be able to understand the meaning of simple but also more complex vocabulary ('hilfflos' which means helpless, 'unschlüssig' which means undecided and unsure) which is not related to everyday expressions, have good knowledge of simple and more complex grammatical language (double relative clauses) and be able to infer and identify meaning from the text in order to provide the correct answer.

Similarly, the third set of questions was also found to reflect elements of C1 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Identifying cues and inferring, Grammatical accuracy, Vocabulary range, Overall reading comprehension and Reading for information and argument. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the third set of questions of text C.

Table 49: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (3rd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
3	30-33	Short answer to closed question	Identifying cues and inferring: C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical	C1	Students are required to understand a range of grammatical structures as well as idiomatic language ('die Nerven durchgehen'). Students may use contextual, grammatical and lexical cues, which is a

³⁷⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'.		characteristic of C1 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Identifying cues and inferring, to infer meaning and thereby identify the correct word from the text.

Additionally, the fourth set of questions was also found to align with the C1 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Reading for information and argument, Identifying cues and inferring, Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the fourth set of questions of text C.

Table 50: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (4th Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
4	34	Multiple-choice question	Overall reading comprehension: C1: 'Can understand in detail lengthy, complex texts, whether or not these relate to their own area of speciality, provided they can reread difficult sections'. ³⁷⁶	C1	The task reflects elements of C1 level descriptor at the CEFR scale of Overall reading comprehension as it requires students to demonstrate their understanding of a wide variety of texts including literary writings provided there are opportunities for rereading. Students are required to have a good overall understanding of this literary excerpt to be able to select the three correct statements.

Finally, the fifth set of questions of text C also reflects elements of the C1 level descriptor in the CEFR scales of Overall reading comprehension, Reading for information and argument, Identifying cues and inferring, Grammatical accuracy and Vocabulary range. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the fifth set of questions of text C.

Table 51: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C (5th Set of Questions)

³⁷⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (5th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
5	35-37	Short answer to open question	Overall reading comprehension: C1: 'Can understand in detail lengthy, complex texts, whether or not these relate to their own area of speciality, provided they can reread difficult sections'. ³⁷⁷	C1	Students are required to have a good overall understanding of this literary excerpt (including idiomatic language such as ' <i>Kopf voller Probleme</i> ', ' <i>Die Wohnung sah aus wie nach einem Erdbeben</i> ') to be able to answer the questions.

The findings of the CEFR analysis indicate that text C doesn't not reflect elements of C2, as the C2 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Overall reading comprehension involves understanding virtually all types of texts including abstract, structurally complex, or highly colloquial literary and non-literary writings. In this case, text C is not abstract and, although containing some colloquial and figurative language which students are required to engage with is not highly colloquial. More specifically, text C also does not align with the C2 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Reading for information and argument as the C2 descriptor in this scale involves understanding the finer points and implications of a complex report or article even outside their area of specialisation. This extends beyond what is required from students in text C, as they are required to only identify what the text is about in this instance and not engage in-depth with the text.

Listening

Standard Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL German B listening comprehension examination of N20 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text C

In text C of the German B SL N20 listening comprehension examination (paper 2) the student is asked to listen to a radio interview about plastic in the sea. Text C includes two sets of questions. The first set of questions includes five gap fill close with selected closed response questions and the second set of questions includes five multiple choice questions. The subject matter of the audio recording of text C is consistent with the prescriptive theme listed in the Language B syllabus including the theme of sharing the planet and more specifically the

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

optional recommended topics of the environment and global issues.³⁷⁸ The CEFR domains covered in this audio recording include the occupational, the public and educational domains.³⁷⁹ The total number of marks allocated to this task is 10 marks, five marks allocated to the first set of questions and five marks allocated to the second set of questions. In order to respond to both sets of questions and get the marks the student should be able to carefully listen to the dialogue in the audio recording to demonstrate receptive and thinking skills and make notes in order to answer to the first five questions by filling the gaps with no more than three words, and by putting a cross under the name of the person who says the statements in the five multiple choice questions.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of text C is a short dialogue and discussion between a radio presenter and another person exploring the issue of plastic in the sea. The analysis found that the total wordcount of the input text of text C is 376 words. There are two speakers, a man who is speaking in a medium pace and a woman who is speaking in a fast pace. However, both speakers have standard German accent. The quality of the audio recording is clear. As the input text of text C is a radio interview, the audio recording includes some jingles which indicate pauses and breaks during the radio interview. During the interview, the speakers use a wide range of simple but also more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary. Some examples of simple grammatical structures included in the input text of text C are present simple (*'sind', 'landet', 'ist'*), adjectives (*'richtig', 'schlecht', 'schrecklich', 'persönlich'*), time adverbs (*'heute', 'jährlich', 'Heutzutage', 'selten', 'jetzt', 'während', 'gleich', 'selten'*), indefinite pronouns (*'Man kann', 'Das hört man', 'Man sollte'*), and conjunctions (*'ja', 'doch', 'und', 'auch', 'also', 'oder', 'deswegen', 'Solange'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the input text of text C includes some more complex grammatical structures such as passive form of the verb (*'wie dargestellt wird'*), superlatives (*'am katastrophalsten', 'das größte Problem', 'Im schlimmsten Fall', 'die größte Verantwortung', 'das Schlimmste'*), infinitive sentences (*'Die Folgen sind überall zu spüren', 'den Verpackungsmüll zu reduzieren', 'Deswegen ist es jetzt an der Zeit', 'unser Konsumverhalten zu verändern'*), modals with infinitive (*'kann es dazu kommen', 'Man sollte also auf keinen Fall Fisch essen'*), modals in present (*'können', 'kann', 'muss', 'sollte'*), and phrasal verb (*'Denken wir mal darüber nach'*) which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels.

Additionally, the speakers used a variety of language functions including correcting information (*'Nicht so schnell', 'Ob das unsere Gesundheit gefährdet', 'ist bisher noch nicht klar', 'daher muss man noch abwarten', 'was wissenschaftliche Studien zeigen'*), describing feelings and emotions (*'ich kann mir persönlich nicht vorstellen', 'dass die Lage wirklich so katastrophal ist', 'wie dargestellt wird'*), reporting facts, actions (*'Circa 13 Millionen Tonnen Plastikmüll landen jährlich in den Weltmeeren' / 'in jedem Quadratkilometer Meer heute mehrere hunderttausend Teile Mikroplastik und Plastikmüll treiben'*), and expressing opinions (*'Meiner Meinung nach', 'Leider doch!', 'Nicht so schnell'*). Furthermore, some additional language functions used in the input text of text C include speculating and hypothesising (*'Das muss doch auch negative Auswirkungen für den Menschen haben, oder?' / 'Man sollte also auf keinen Fall Fisch essen, oder?'*), and providing suggestions (*'die Industrie und Politik*

³⁷⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

³⁷⁹ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

sollten versuchen, *‘den Verpackungsmüll zu reduzieren’* / *‘Man kann im Supermarkt unverpacktes Obst und Gemüse kaufen’*).

CEFR analysis findings

The first set of questions of text C includes five gap fill questions. The CEFR analysis of the first set of questions of Text C indicated that this reflects elements of B2 level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding conversation between other people and Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the first set of questions of text C.

Table 52: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text C (1st Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1 st Set of Questions)					
Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	12-16	Gap fill/Close with selected/closed response	<p>Understanding conversation between other people: B2: ‘Can identify the main reasons for and against an argument or idea in a discussion conducted in clear standard language or a familiar variety. Can with some effort catch much of what is said around them, but may find it difficult to participate effectively in discussion with several users of the target language who do not modify their language in any way’.³⁸⁰</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: B2: ‘Can understand most documentaries and most other recorded or broadcast material delivered in the standard form of the language and can identify mood, attitude, etc’.³⁸¹</p>	B2	<p>There is some alignment with B2, as students are required to understand the main ideas of a relatively complex discourse delivered in standard language regarding a topic which is not common. The key terms contained in the question signal to the student the key points contained in the dialogue.</p> <p>Understanding conversation between other people contains elements of B2, as students are required to follow the sequence of the extended discourse (radio interview) to be able to complete the gap-fill task.</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings is at B2 level as the discussion involves a topic typically outside the realm of personal interest.</p>

³⁸⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.49.

³⁸¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 52.

The second set of questions of text C includes five multiple choice questions. The CEFR analysis of the second set of questions of text C found that it reflects elements of B2 in the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding conversation between other people and Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the second set of questions of text C.

Table 53: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text C (2nd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension (2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	17-21	Multiple-choice question	<p>Overall oral comprehension: B2: 'Can follow extended discourse and complex lines of argument, provided the topic is reasonably familiar, and the direction of the argument is signposted by explicit markers. Can understand the main ideas of propositionally and linguistically complex discourse on both concrete and abstract topics delivered in standard language or a familiar variety, including technical discussions in their field of specialisation'.³⁸²</p> <p>Understanding conversation between other people: B2: 'Can follow chronological sequence in extended informal discourse, e.g. in a story or anecdote. Can identify the main reasons for and against an argument or idea in a discussion conducted in clear standard language or a familiar variety'.³⁸³</p> <p>Understanding audio (signed) media and recordings: B2: 'Can understand most documentaries and most other recorded or broadcast material delivered in the standard form of the language and</p>	B2	<p>The CEFR analysis found that as the topic covered in the recording extends beyond the common every day or job-related topics associated with B1, there is some alignment with B2, as students are required to understand the main ideas of a relatively complex discourse delivered in standard language. The key terms contained in the question signal to the student the key points contained in the dialogue.</p> <p>This set of questions contains elements of the B2 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of understanding conversation between other people as students are required to follow the sequence of the extended discourse (radio interview) in order to identify who said what.</p> <p>This set of questions reflects elements of B2 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings, as the discussion involves a topic typically outside</p>

³⁸² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

³⁸³ Ibid. p. 49.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension (2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			can identify mood, attitude, etc.' ³⁸⁴		the realm of personal interest.

The CEFR analysis of both sets of questions of text C indicated that the questions are not lower than B2. This is because the B1+ level descriptor in the CEFR scale Overall oral comprehension involves understanding straightforward factual information about common or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided people articulate clearly in a generally familiar variety. In this case, the topic of the questions extends beyond being a common everyday topic. Additionally, both sets of questions do not reflect elements of B1+ in the CEFR scale of Understanding conversation between other people as this involves following much of everyday conversation and discussion, provided it is clearly

³⁸⁴ Ibid. p.52.

articulated in standard language or in a familiar variety. Although students are required to do this, they are also required to follow a chronological sequence in extended informal discourse, characteristic of B2, to complete the gap-fill exercise in the first set of questions, and in order to identify who said what in the second set of questions.

In addition, the CEFR analysis found that text C does not reflect elements of B2+ level descriptors in the CEFR scale of Overall oral comprehension as the B2+ level requires students to understand standard language or a familiar variety, live or broadcast, on both familiar and unfamiliar topics normally encountered in personal, social, academic, or vocational life. At this level, only extreme auditory or visual background noise, inadequate discourse structure and/or idiomatic usage influence the student's ability to understand. This alludes to a greater level of understanding than what is expected from the students at text C. Furthermore, the B2+ level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Understanding conversation between other people involves keeping up with an animated conversation between proficient users of the target language. In text C, students are required to follow key points of the discussion only. Regarding the CEFR scale of understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings, the analysis found that text C does not reflect elements of the B2+ level descriptor as this involves understanding of recordings in the standard form of the language likely to be encountered in social, professional, or academic life and identifying viewpoints and attitudes as well as the information content. In text C, students are expected to complete the sentences in the first set of questions and identify who said what in the second set of questions, with the key viewpoints being provided to the student in the question.

Higher Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL German B listening comprehension examination of N20 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text C

In text C of German B HL listening comprehension examination (paper 2), the student is required to listen to a job interview and a conversation and dialogue between two people. Text C includes two sets of questions. In the first set of questions the students are asked to complete five multiple choice questions by putting a cross under the name of the person who said the specific statements outlined in the questions. In the second set of questions the students are asked to select the correct answers to the five multiple-choice questions. From the IB documentation and more specifically the Language B syllabus, the theme explored in this text is social organisation and the specific optional recommended topics covered in this text include the ones of social relationships, the working world and the workplace.³⁸⁵ The CEFR text domains covered in this text include the personal and the occupational domains.³⁸⁶ The total number of marks allocated to text C is 10 marks, with five marks allocated to the first set of questions and five marks allocated to the second set of questions. To respond to both

³⁸⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

³⁸⁶ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

sets of questions of text C the students should carefully listen to the job interview to demonstrate receptive and thinking skills for answering the questions as well as make notes during the interview.

Input text analysis findings

The input text of text C is a job interview. The analysis of the input text indicated that the total wordcount of the transcript of the audio recording is 463 words. There are two speakers in the audio recording including a man who is speaking in a medium pace and a woman who is speaking in a fast pace. However, both speakers have standard German accent. The quality of the audio recording is clear. As the input text of text C is an interview, the audio recording includes some pauses where one of the speakers is sipping coffee. During the job interview the speakers use both simple but also more complex grammatical language and vocabulary. In terms of simple grammatical structures included in the input text of text C, examples of these involve adjectives (*'planmäßig', 'durstig', 'dreisprachig', 'beruhigend', 'belastbar', 'tatsächlich'*), time adverbs (*'in letzterZeit', 'während meiner Schulzeit', 'schon immer', 'stets', 'das erste Mal', 'gerade', 'Manchmal', 'gleichzeitig', 'Momentan', 'heute', 'dann in circa einer Woche'*), place adverbs (*'aus aller Welt', 'nach/in Indien', 'da', 'dort', 'in der ganzen Welt'*), past tense (*'hat geklappt', 'haben zugesagt', 'bin aufgewachsen'*), present simple (*'hoffe', 'hat', 'sind', 'denke', 'macht'*), and the indefinite pronoun (*'dass man sich falsch versteht' / 'auf den man sich stets verlassen kann'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the input text of text C included several examples of more complex grammatical structures such as comparatives (*'lieber', 'größeren'*), superlatives (*'Meine größte Stärke'*), conditional tense (*'würde', 'würden'*), infinitive sentences (*'meine Zeit besser zu nutzen und einzuteilen'*), modals in present (*'Kann', 'können'*) modals in the past (*'wollte', 'konnte'*), modals with infinitive (*'Kann ... anbieten?' / 'wollte ... zusammenarbeiten' / 'wollte ... finden' / 'nutzen kann' / 'können ... erzählen' / 'kann ... arbeiten' / 'arbeiten kann' / 'konnte ... machen'*), and phrasal verbs (*'stimme ich Ihnen vollkommen zu.' / 'Welche drei Stärken zeichnen Sie aus?'*) which are common at B1 and B2 levels. More specifically, the input text of text C included some more complex vocabulary such as figurative language (*'zum Glück' / 'der Schlüssel zur Welt.' / 'Kulturschock'*), and specific nouns (*'Vorstellungsgespräch', 'Personalchefin', 'Bewerber', 'Bewerbungsunterlagen', 'Arbeit', 'Team', 'Studium', 'Projekte', 'Institut', 'Stelle', 'Neuorientierung', 'Ruf und Kontakte', 'Stärken/Schwächen', 'Mitarbeitern', 'Einladung'*).

Moreover, the analysis of the input text of text C found that it includes a variety of language functions such as asking questions for confirmation, identification and information (*'Ich hoffe', 'mit Ihrer Anreise hat alles gut geklappt?'*), describing habits and routines (*'Ich würde lieber einen Kaffee nehmen', 'Kaffee hat auf mich eine beruhigende Wirkung' / 'bei mir verursacht Koffein genau das Gegenteil'*), giving personal information (*'ich bin ein Mensch', 'auf den man sich stets verlassen kann'.', 'Ich bin belastbar'*) and introducing self, others, and family (*'Ich bin dreisprachig aufgewachsen', 'Meine Mutter ist Deutsche', 'Mein Vater ist Franzose und während meiner Schulzeit haben wir in England gelebt'*). Additionally, some other language functions included in text C involve describing hopes and plans (*'Ich wollte vor allem eine Stelle finden', 'in der ich meine Sprach- und Kulturkenntnisse nutzen kann'*) and reporting facts and actions (*'Ich habe an einem Sprachenzentrum gearbeitet und war dort für die Koordination der Deutschkurse und verschiedene kulturelle Projekte verantwortlich.' / 'Manchmal fehlt mir die Geduld und ich möchte alles gleichzeitig erledigen'*).

CEFR analysis findings

The first set of questions of text C included five multiple-choice questions and the second set of questions included additional five multiple choice questions. The CEFR analysis of the first and second sets of questions found that they both align with the B2+ level descriptors in the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding conversation between other people, Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings and Vocabulary range. The table below presents the summary of the CEFR analysis findings of the first and second sets of questions of text C.

Table 54: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension					
Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	12-16	Multiple-choice question	Overall oral comprehension: B2+: 'Can understand standard language or a familiar variety, live or broadcast, on both familiar and unfamiliar topics normally encountered in personal, social, academic or vocational life. Only extreme [auditory/visual] background noise, inadequate discourse structure and/or idiomatic usage influence the ability to understand'. ³⁸⁷	B2+	Regarding Overall oral comprehension, the task aligns with the B2+ descriptor as it involves understanding standard language or a familiar variety, live or broadcast, on both familiar and unfamiliar topics normally encountered in personal, social, academic or vocational life. The topics covered in the interview are those normally encountered in vocational life (e.g. previous work experience, personal qualities, the prospective work team). The task reflects elements of B2+ level in Vocabulary range as students are required to understand and use topic-specific terminology presented in the
2	17-21		Understanding conversation between other people: B2+: 'Can keep up with an animated conversation between proficient users of the target language'. ³⁸⁸ Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: B2+: 'Can understand recordings in the standard form of the language likely to be encountered in social, professional or academic life and identify viewpoints and attitudes as well as the information content'. ³⁸⁹ Vocabulary range: B2+: 'Can understand and use the main technical terminology of their field, when discussing their area of specialisation with other specialists'. ³⁹⁰		

³⁸⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

³⁸⁸ Ibid. p.49.

³⁸⁹ Ibid. p. 52.

³⁹⁰ Ibid. p.131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
					recording but they are not required to use idiomatic expressions.

The CEFR analysis found that both sets of questions of text C do not reflect elements of the B2 level descriptor in the scales of Overall oral comprehension and Understanding conversation between other people. This is because the B2 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Overall oral comprehension involves following extended discourse and complex lines of argument, provided the topic is reasonably familiar. However, in text C students at upper secondary level may be relatively unfamiliar with this topic. Additionally, in relation the B2 level descriptor in the CEFR scale of Understanding conversation between other people involves following chronological sequence in an extended informal discourse. However, in this case, the job interview is an extended formal discourse which includes formal register.

At the same time, the CEFR analysis of both sets of questions of text C do not align with the C1 level descriptors at the CEFR scales of Overall oral comprehension, Understanding conversation between other people, and Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings. More specifically, the C1 level descriptor of the Overall oral comprehension scale requires students to follow an extended discourse on abstract and complex topics beyond their own field. Although relatively complex, the topic discussed in text C is not abstract. Additionally, the C1 level descriptor in the same scale includes following extended discourse even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. However, in text C, the discussion between the interviewer and the interviewee is clearly structured and explicitly articulated, focusing on one main theme which is the job interview, and as the interview moves on other relevant topics are being covered such as previous work experience, personal qualities, and prospective work team. In terms of Understanding conversation between other people, text C does not reflect elements of the C1 level descriptor as in that level students are required to easily follow complex interactions between third parties in group discussions and debates, even on abstract, complex, unfamiliar topics. Although text C is a relatively complex topic, the interactions between the interviewer and the interviewee are not overly complex and the topic is not abstract as outlined in the C1 level descriptor. Furthermore, the CEFR analysis found that text C does not reflect elements of the C1 level descriptor in the scale of Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings as the students are not required to identify finer points of detail including implicit attitudes and relationships between people.

Writing

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the SL German B writing

assessment (Paper 1) of the M21 examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 2

Sample 2 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a high range performance in the SL writing assessment that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate a high knowledge and skills in writing production and interaction as well as high linguistic competence at SL.

Input text analysis:

In task three this specific student selected to write a text in a text type of an interview asking a linguist about the advantages of language courses and possible alternatives to financing these courses. The writing skills that students are required to demonstrate to complete the task include writing to persuade, identifying a problem, providing a solution to a problem, and presenting and justifying an argument by providing the reasons behind the argument. Additionally, other writing skills that are assessed in this task include providing and explaining advantages and disadvantages and providing a summary at the end of the task to summarise and conclude their thoughts and arguments. Additionally, the input text of option three includes a variety of language functions such as requests or responding to requests, expressing opinions, expression reaction or interest, comparing things, speculating, and hypothesising and persuading. Furthermore, the input text of option three includes some additional language functions such as compromising, describing feelings and emotions, conceding a point or argument, giving advice, and expressing wishes.

In task three, the language used in the input text varies subtly in complexity throughout the question. Some of the grammatical structures of the input text of task three include regular and common irregular plurals (*'Fremdsprachenkurse'*, *'Sprachkursen'*, *'Alternativen'*, *'Vorteile'*), subject personal pronouns (*'Sie'*), common prepositions (*'in'*, *'für'*, *'über'*, *'von'*, *'zur'*), and prepositional phrases of place (*'In Ihrer Stadt'*), time (*'neu'*), and movement which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. In addition, the input text of task three includes grammatical structures such as definite and indefinite articles (*'der'*, *'dem'*, *'einen'*, *'die'*), the use of conjunctions (*'aber'*, *'und'*), demonstrative adjectives (*'dafür'*, *'in dem'*), and present simple (*'sollen'*, *'befragen'*) which reflect A1 and A2 levels, and imperatives and negative imperatives (*'Bearbeiten Sie'* / *'Schreiben Sie'*), and conditionals (*'sollen werden'*) which align with B1 and B2 levels.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 2 selected the interview text type in order to complete task three. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions, grammatical structures, vocabulary and linguistic forms. More specifically, in this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. They introduced others (*'Peter Neugebauer ist ein Sprachwissenschaftler seit zwanzig Jahren'*), they understood and used numbers (*'zwanzig (zwanzig)'*, *'die erste'*, *'vier'*), they used greetings (*'Hallo allzusammen'* / *'Hallo'*), and they asked questions for confirmation, identification and information (*'wie gehts ihnen?'* / *'Was sind die Vorteile von Sprachkursen?'*). Additionally, the student expressed

gratitude (*'vielen Dank!'* / *'Vielen Dank für eure Zeit'*), opinions (*'Meiner Meinung nach'* / *'Ich finde es'*), provided clarifications (*'Das heißt'* / *'zum Beispiel'* / *'heißt das'*), expressed reaction and interest (*'Das finde ich toll!'* / *'Das ist eine sehr interessante Perspektive!'*), and compared things (*'mein Beispiel ist nochmal Luxemburg'* / *'Wir müssen das auch in Bern haben'*). Some additional language functions used by the student in this sample include speculating and hypothesising (*'Jeder kann ein bisschen bezahlen'*), persuading (*'es ist praktisch wenn'* / *'Ihr könnt auch darüber ... schreiben'*), describing feelings and emotions (*'es freut mich'* / *'Es ist eine tolle Idee!'*), conceding a point or argument (*'Wir haben aber ein Problem'*), giving advice (*'es gibt viele Alternativen aber die erste Lösung würde...'*) and expressing wishes (*'Hoffentlich wird das interessant.'* / *'Viel Glück für ...'*).

In addition, the grammatical structures and vocabulary used by the student in this sample varies throughout, ranging from simple to complex structures. For example, some simple grammatical structures used by the student in this sample include regular and common irregular plurals (*'Fremdsprachenkurse'*, *'Alternativen'*, *'Fragen'*, *'Vorteile'*, *'Freunde'*, *'Sprachen'*, *'Einwohnern'*), subject personal pronouns (*'wir'*, *'ich'*, *'ihr'*, *'sie'*, *'ihnen'*, *'es'*), possessive pronouns (*'meiner'*, *'mein'*, *'eure'*, *'unsere'*), common prepositions (*'über'*, *'in'*, *'nach'*, *'für'*, *'mit'*, *'von'*, *'zu'*, *'auf'*), definite and indefinite articles (*'ein'*, *'eine'*, *'einen'*, *'die'*, *'der'*, *'den'*, *'das'*), and determiners (*'ein paar'*, *'noch einmal'*, *'alle'*, *'ein bisschen'*, *'viel'*, *'viele'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, some other simple grammatical structures used by the student in this sample include common adjectives (*'neu'*, *'Interessant'*, *'wichtig'*, *'multikulturell'*, *'toll'*), adverbs of time and place (*'heute'*, *'in Bern'*), present simple (*'ist'*, *'hat'*, *'sind'*, *'kommt'*, *'lernt'*, *'finde'*, *'geht'*), and futures (*'angeboten werden'*, *'wird'*) which are common at A2 CEFR level. However, the student also made attempts to use more complex grammatical structures such as the conditional (*'ob Leute freiwillig sind ...'* / *'würde die Kurse nicht Gratis zu machen'*), modals (*'sollen'*, *'kann'*, *'könnt'*, *'müssen'*, *'können'*), relative clauses (*'Ich finde es wichtig, dass ...'* / *'Es ist praktisch, wenn ...'*), infinitive sentences (*'um den Project zu finanzieren'* / *'um die Kurse finanzieren zu können'*) and negatives (*'keine Luxemburger'*, *'nicht gratis'*, *'kein Problem'*) which reflect elements of B1 and B2 CEFR levels.

Marking analysis:

The IB assigned 9/12 marks in Criterion A: language indicating that this student's 'command of the language is effective and mostly accurate'.³⁹¹ This judgement correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A. More specifically, the marking analysis of Criterion A found that the student used a variety of grammatical structures including present and future simple, conditionals (*'sollen angeboten werden'*), modals, relative and infinitive sentences (*'um ... zu diskutieren'*), use of double conjunction (*'nicht nur... sondern auch'*) with minor errors which did not interfere with understanding and communication (*'ob Leute freiwillig sind, um den Project zu finanzieren sind'*). Regarding vocabulary, the student used a good variety of common and complex words and vocabulary (*'Perspektive'*), greatly applying and including fixed phrases (*'zum Beispiel'*, *'Meiner Meinung nach'*, *'viel Glück'*, *'ich wünsche euch einen schönen Tag'*). However, the analysis found that the student made some minor mistakes in relation to spelling (*'zwanzig'* instead of *'zwanzig'* / *'Yahren'* instead of *'Jahren'* / *'praktich'* instead of *'praktisch'*). At this level, the IB expects that 'occasional errors in basic and complex grammatical structures do not impede communication'; the analysis found that this sample

³⁹¹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

was intelligible throughout, with only minor errors which did not prevent understanding.³⁹² According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion A: language is equivalent to CEFR B2 level.

Regarding Criterion B: message the IB allocated 6/12 marks indicating that ‘the task is generally fulfilled’ with some ideas relevant to the task but not fully developed, clearly presented in a structured and logical manner allowing the successful delivery of the message.³⁹³ Again, this marking is consistent with Ecctis judgement, as the analysis of the sample found that the message that the student wanted to convey through the interview was clearly delivered. This is because the student presented a situation, a couple of examples of benefits (learning a new culture and having holiday in a ‘*Fremdland*’ which means foreign land/country), a potential obstacle around the possible ways to finance the courses, and provided suggestions on how to finance the language courses in the city. However, the student did not give reasons nor expand their arguments and therefore the analysis found that the student could have elaborated more in some areas, especially in addressing the issue and proposing a solution on how the city could finance the language courses. Although elaboration of the arguments was missing from this student’s sample, the message that the student wanted to convey was clearly presented and articulated throughout the sample. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion B: message reflects elements of CEFR B1 level.

In relation to Criterion C: conceptual understanding, the IB allocated 5/6 marks to this student sample indicating that the ‘conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated’.³⁹⁴ This judgement correlates with Ecctis’ findings regarding Criterion C as the choice of text type, register and tone was found to be appropriate to the context, purpose and audience of the task and the students’ response incorporated the conventions of the chosen text type. More specifically, the analysis found that although the structure and the tone used throughout most of the interview were appropriate, it was not clear who the target audience of the interview was. One can deduct from the content that the target audience were Bern inhabitants, but this was not completely clear from the sample. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion C: conceptual understanding reflects elements of CEFR B2 level. The total number of marks assigned to this sample by the IB were 20/30 marks.

CEFR analysis:

The sample was analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student’s output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. This student sample reflected elements of the B1+ and B2 level descriptors in the CEFR activities and competences of General linguistic range, Grammatical accuracy, Thematic development, Reports and essays, Overall written production, Overall written interaction, Coherence and cohesion and Vocabulary range. The table below presents the summary of the findings of the CEFR analysis of student sample 2.

Table 55: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German SL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 2

³⁹² International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

³⁹³ *Ibid.* p. 34.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 35.

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
Sample 2	<p>General linguistic range: B1+: 'Has a sufficient range of language to describe unpredictable situations, explain the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision and express thoughts on abstract or cultural topics such as music and film'.³⁹⁵</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B2: 'Has a good command of simple language structures and some complex grammatical forms, although they tend to use complex structures rigidly with some inaccuracy. Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make mistakes which lead to misunderstanding'.³⁹⁶</p> <p>Reports and Essays: B2: 'Can produce an essay or report which develops an argument, giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view and explaining the advantages and disadvantages of various options'.³⁹⁷</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'.³⁹⁸</p> <p>Orthographic control: B2: 'Spelling and punctuation are reasonably accurate but may show signs of mother-tongue influence'.³⁹⁹</p> <p>Thematic development: B2: 'Can develop a clear description or narrative, expanding and supporting their main points with relevant supporting detail and examples'.⁴⁰⁰</p> <p>Coherence and cohesion: B2: 'Can produce text that is generally well-organised and coherent, using a range of linking expressions and cohesive devices'.⁴⁰¹</p>	B2	<p>In terms of General linguistic range, this sample reflects elements of the B1+ level descriptor because the student demonstrates a sufficient range of language to explain the main points in an idea with reasonable precision.</p> <p>Regarding Grammatical accuracy, this sample reflects elements of the B2 level descriptor as the student shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control and does not make mistakes which lead to misunderstanding. As the teacher commentary notes, the student sometimes uses complex structures rigidly (<i>'viel Glück für die Kursen finanzieren zu können'</i>). Grammatical accuracy at B1+ involves communicating with reasonable accuracy in familiar contexts; generally good control, though with noticeable mother-tongue influence. Mother-tongue influence is not particularly noticeable in this sample and on the whole the student demonstrates good accuracy with simple and complex grammatical structures. Grammatical accuracy at B2+ states occasional slips or non-systematic errors and minor flaws in sentence structure may still occur, but they are rare and can often be corrected in retrospect. The B2+ level was considered too high, because there are several instances in the sample where the longer sentence constructions were a little burdensome (<i>'dass sich Leute mehr kultivieren'</i>).</p> <p>In terms of Thematic development, this sample aligns with the B2 level descriptor which involves developing a clear argument, expanding and supporting their points of view at some length with subsidiary</p>

³⁹⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.130-131.

³⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 132.

³⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 68.

³⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 131.

³⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 136.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid. p. 140.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid. p. 141.

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>points and relevant examples. Although the student does construct a clear narrative, the expansion and support of points, particularly regarding the financing options, is not fully developed. Thematic development at B1+ involves developing an argument well enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time. This is slightly too low, as the student develops a clear narrative which can be followed and contains points which are to some extent backed up. Thematic development at B2+ involves being able to develop an argument systematically with appropriate highlighting of significant points, and relevant supporting detail. This is too high, as the student does not elaborate or provide comprehensive relevant supporting detail to back up the argument.</p>

The CEFR analysis found that the overall CEFR level of this student sample is not lower than B2 level because the student used a wide range of simple but also complex grammatical structures, with only minor and rare mistakes which did not impede communication and articulation of meaning. The student used a wide range of lexis, words and vocabulary including common but also more complex vocabulary, including some examples and phrases of figurative language, non-literary phrases as well as idiomatic expressions. The student conveyed the meaning clearly, the structure and the overall presentation of the essay was clear and effective, and the purpose and the meaning of the essay were clearly passed to the reader. Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the overall CEFR level of this student sample was not higher than B2 level because the student made some minor grammatical errors, although these did not impede the communication and the understanding of the meaning and the message of the text. Additionally, the analysis found that the overall CEFR level of this sample is not higher than B2 because the target audience of the essay was not clearly articulated, and some arguments lacked elaboration and in-depth analysis.

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the HL German B writing assessment (Paper 1) of the M21 examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 5

Sample 5 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a high range performance in the HL writing assessment.

Input text analysis:

In task one this specific student selected to write a text in a text type of email addressing the pressure that social media can put on teenagers by explaining and justifying their concerns about a girlfriend or boyfriend. In this task the student needs to write an email that demonstrates their ability to write to persuade, present and justify an argument by providing the reasons behind this argument, provide a summary at the end of the task to summarise their argument and any concluding thoughts. Additionally, the input text of option one includes a variety of language functions such as describing habits, routines, people, feelings and emotions, expressing opinions, developing an argument, persuading, speculation and hypothesizing, synthesizing, evaluating, defending a point of view and emphasizing a point or an issue. In task one, the language used in the input text varies subtly in complexity throughout the question. Some of the simple grammatical structures of the input text of task one include but are not limited to regular and common irregular plurals (*'Median', 'Fotos', 'Jugendliche', 'Bedenken'*), subject personal pronouns (*'Sie', 'er/sie'*), possessive pronouns (*'Ihre', 'seine/ihre'*), common prepositions (*'in', 'aus', 'von', 'auf', 'mit'*), the use of conjunctions (*'und'*), definite and indefinite articles (*'ein', 'eine', 'den', 'einer', 'die', 'der', 'einen', 'dem'*), common adjectives (*'stark bearbeitet'*) and present simple (*'haben, lebt'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the input text of task one includes some more complex grammatical structures such as imperatives and negative imperatives (*'Bearbeiten Sie' / 'Verwenden Sie' / 'Schreiben Sie'*), present perfect (*'haben ... gefunden', 'bearbeitet sind'*), and conditionals (*'ausüben können'*) which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 5 selected the email text type to complete task one. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions, grammatical structures, vocabulary and linguistic forms. More specifically, in this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. Some of the language functions used by the student in the output text include describing habits and routines (*'Du hast immer viel Wert drauf gelegen' / 'Ich habe immer gedacht'*), giving personal information (*'mehr für dein Körper machen wolltest' / 'nicht genug Zeit hast'*), describing people (*'du siehst ja toll aus!' / 'blonde Haare' / 'proper' / 'schlanker' / 'Beine länger' / 'schlank und hübsch'*) and expressing likes and dislikes (*'du siehst super aus' / 'das stimmt aber nicht'*). Additionally, some other language functions used by the student in the output text of the student sample include emphasizing or exemplifying a point, feeling, or an issue (*'Ich Weiss ich habe dir diese Geschichte schon erzählt aber hier sage ich dir das nochmal'*), expressing opinions (*'ich verstehen das wirklich nicht' / 'Ich denke schon dass du irgendwas gemacht hast' / 'Es ist schon Traurig'*), speculating and hypothesizing (*'ist es wirklich echt?' / 'ob alles ok ist'*), giving advice (*'Suzie bitte tun mir ein Gefallen', mach das nicht weiter'*), persuading (*'ich hoffe dass diese E-mail dich aufwächst'*), and expressing certainty, doubt, and probability (*'ich Weiss dass du besser als das bist!' / 'Du solltest sehr glücklich sein'*).

In addition, the grammatical structures and vocabulary used by the student in sample 5 varied throughout, ranging from simple to complex structures. For example, some simple grammatical structures used by the student include regular and common irregular plurals (*'Medien' / 'Schuhe' / 'Fotos'*), subject personal pronouns (*'ich', 'du', 'wir', 'ihr'*), possessive pronouns (*'unsere Gesellschaft', 'dein Körper', 'ihre Bilder', 'deine Fotos'*), common prepositions (*'ohne', 'mit', 'an', 'von', 'nach', 'auf', 'vor'*), common adjectives (*'toll', 'echt', 'traurig', 'glücklich', 'böse', 'Ernst'*), adverbs (*'weiter', 'immer', 'zu letzt', 'schon', 'jetzt', 'überhaupt nicht'*), present simple (*'ist', 'siehst', 'denke', 'hoffe', 'sagt', 'bist'*) and impersonal pronouns (*'jemand', 'jeder', 'alle Leute'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the student used some more complex grammatical structures including but not limited to present perfect (*'haben ... gesprochen', 'habe ... gedacht', 'habe ... erzählt', 'habe ... benutzt'*), conditional (*'würdest', 'wünsche'*), modals (*'mögen', 'willst', 'wollte', 'solltest', 'können', 'müssen', 'wolltest', 'kannst', 'will', 'soll'*), phrasal verbs (*'siehst ... aus', 'nehme ... an, an'/'ziehen'*) and comparatives and superlatives (*'besser', 'sehr', 'mehr', 'schlanker', 'länger', 'als', 'drei mal so viel wie uns'*) which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels.

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark 6/12 in Criterion A: language indicating that the 'command of the language is partially effective'.⁴⁰² This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A. More specifically, the marking analysis of Criterion A found that the student's vocabulary was appropriate to the task, and varied, including the use of idiomatic and colloquial expressions, which were numerous throughout the sample (*'du siehst ja toll aus!' / 'Wie geht es dir denn?' / 'Ist das wirklich dein ernst?' / 'als ob' / 'verstehe mich nicht falsch, du siehst super aus, alles tip top' / 'nicht böse gemeint'*). Additionally, the analysis found that the student used a variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures effectively including imperative (*'Suzie bitte tun mir ein Gefallen, mach das nicht weiter'*). In addition, the student's language was mostly accurate with only occasional spelling errors that occurred, which could have been occasional slips for some words which did not interfere with communication and understanding. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in Criterion A: language is equivalent to CEFR B2 level.

Regarding Criterion B: message, the IB awarded 8/12 marks, meaning that 'the task is fulfilled' and that most ideas were well developed, relevant to the task and clearly presented and structured to successfully deliver the message that the student wanted to pass.⁴⁰³ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion B. The findings of the analysis against Criterion B indicated that the ideas presented by the student in this sample were relevant to the task, fully developed and the student provided relevant examples about their experience with social media, which supported their main ideas and arguments. The message that the student wanted to convey through the text was always clear, even when the answer mainly contained reflections on the pressure of social media, the photos of the friend's appearance were mentioned, although information about the friend's personality was only hinted by the student. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion B: message is equivalent to CEFR B2 level.

⁴⁰² International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 37.

⁴⁰³ Ibid. p. 38.

Additionally, in relation to Criterion C: conceptual understanding, the IB awarded 6/6 marks, meaning that the 'conceptual understanding is fully demonstrated' indicating that the choice of text type, the register and tone were appropriate to the context, purpose, and target audience.⁴⁰⁴ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion C. More specifically, the findings of the analysis against Criterion C indicated that the structure and the tone used by the student throughout the writing sample were appropriate for the text type and the email text type chosen by the student. An informal register was used, and the tone was serious and worried in places, successfully delivering the message that was asked by the student to convey. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion C: conceptual understanding is equivalent to CEFR B2+ level. The total number of marks assigned to this sample by the IB were 20/30 marks.

CEFR analysis:

The sample was analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. This student sample reflected elements of the B2 level descriptors in the CEFR activities and competences of Overall written production, Reports and essays, Grammatical accuracy, Overall written interaction, Correspondence, General linguistic range, Vocabulary range, Thematic development, Coherence and cohesion and Propositional precision. The table below presents the summary of the findings of the CEFR analysis of student sample 5.

Table 56: Summary of CEFR analysis of the German HL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 5

⁴⁰⁴ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 39.

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
Sample 5	<p>Overall written production: B2: ‘Can produce clear, detailed texts on a variety of subjects related to their field of interest, synthesising and evaluating information and arguments from a number of sources’.⁴⁰⁵</p> <p>Reports and Essays: B2: ‘Can produce an essay or report which develops an argument, giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view and explaining the advantages and disadvantages of various options’.⁴⁰⁶</p> <p>Overall written interaction: B2: ‘Can express news and views effectively in writing, and relate to those of others’.⁴⁰⁷</p> <p>Correspondence: B2: ‘Can compose letters conveying degrees of emotion and highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences and commenting on the correspondent’s news and views’.⁴⁰⁸</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: ‘Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics’.⁴⁰⁹</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B2: ‘Has a good command of simple language structures and some complex grammatical forms, although they tend to use complex structures rigidly with some inaccuracy. Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make mistakes which lead to misunderstanding’.⁴¹⁰</p> <p>Thematic development: B2: ‘Can follow the conventional structure of the communicative task concerned when communicating their ideas’.⁴¹¹</p>	B2	<p>Regarding Correspondence, at B1+ involves being able to compose letters giving detailed accounts of personal feelings and experiences. Although there is an element of this, there is an aspect of conveying degrees of emotion and highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences, which is characteristic of B2. Correspondence at B2+ involves being able to maintain a relationship through personal correspondence using the language fluently and effectively to give detailed descriptions of experiences, pose sympathetic questions and follow up issues of mutual interest. This is a little too high, as the points outlined are not overly detailed.</p> <p>In terms of Grammatical accuracy, at B1+ involves communicating with reasonable accuracy in familiar contexts; generally good control, though with noticeable mother-tongue influence. This is a little low, as, on the whole, the student demonstrated good grammatical accuracy with simple and pertinent complex structures, albeit with some notable errors (<i>‘das’</i> instead of <i>‘dass’</i>). Mother-tongue influence was not overly noticeable in this sample. Grammatical accuracy at B2+ states occasional ‘slips’ or non-systematic errors and minor flaws in sentence structure may still occur, but they are rare and can often be corrected in retrospect. This is too high, as there are some repeated errors (<i>‘das’</i> instead of <i>‘dass’</i>).</p>

⁴⁰⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 66.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid. p. 68.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 82.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid. pp. 82-83.

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid. p. 131.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid. p. 132.

⁴¹¹ Ibid. p. 140.

More specifically, the CEFR analysis found that the overall CEEFR level of this student sample is not lower than B2 because the student used a wide range of simple but also complex grammatical structures (conditional and imperative), with only minor spelling mistakes which did not impede communication, understanding and articulation of meaning. The student used a wide range of lexis, words and vocabulary including common but also more complex vocabulary, including some examples and phrases of figurative language, non-literary phrases and idiomatic expressions. The student conveyed the meaning clearly, the structure and the overall presentation of the essay was clear and effective, and the purpose of the essay was clearly passed to the reader. Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the overall CEFR level of this student sample is not higher than B2 level because there were still some minor grammatical errors which occurred systematically, although they did not impede the communication and the understanding of the meaning and the message of the text.

Speaking and Interactive skills

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the SL German B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 7

Sample 7 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a low range performance that raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate extended hesitation, resulting in limited quantity of output.

Task analysis

The visual stimulus for this sample was a picture of what appear to be school children sitting together in a staircase – perhaps in a school – and interacting with each other while also each holding or looking at an electronic device such as a phone or tablet. The phrase ‘Menschliche Erfindungsgabe’ (Human Ingenuity) – the key IB theme of the prompt – is superimposed on the image. The discussion focused on issues surrounding this key theme and then moved onto wider prescribed themes such as experiences and sharing the planet. Thus, the key language domains covered were personal and public, with some limited reference to the educational domain as well.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this student sample include describing a photo, inferring information, relating conversation to target cultures, explaining cultural phenomena, sharing opinions and interpreting a stimulus. Following the initial presentation given by the student, the teacher asked a number of questions – firstly on the topic of human ingenuity and the prompt, before moving on to other experiences and the theme of sharing the planet. The teacher’s questions were generally clear and concise. They initially contained some more

complex grammatical structures and faster delivery, however, as it became apparent that the student was struggling to answer questions and resorting to one/two-word answers, the questions gradually become simpler and delivered with less pace. Some of the teachers' questions could have benefited from slower delivery or simpler construction. The teacher provided a number of gentle prompts, such as suggested words, when the student was clearly stalling in their response. Multiple tenses and language structures were deployed by the teacher within the questions, spanning typical features of A1-B2 levels.

Output text analysis

The initial stages of the presentation from the student showed some signs of fluency and some use of simple but technical vocabulary ('Technologie', 'Handy'), however, the student struggled to maintain this momentum, resulting in significant hesitation, many lengthy pauses, and reliance on repeating certain key items of vocabulary. The student used mostly simple grammatical structures and introduced a significant number of errors in relation to grammatical structures such as gender agreement and correct ordering of verbs within sentences. These errors did not always impede understanding but did so in some cases. In terms of pronunciation, the student's accent and intonation was found to be generally clear, with the impeding of meaning being caused more by the struggles with vocabulary or through hesitation, rather than through accent and intonation.

Marking analysis

An overview of the mark scheme analysis can be found in Appendix 1. The total score of the student was 9 marks out of a possible 30. More specifically, the teacher allocated 2 marks for Criterion A: language which reflects A1-A2 proficiency, 3 marks for Criterion B1: message-visual stimulus which reflects B1 level, 2 marks for Criterion B2: message-conversation reflecting A2 level, and 2 marks for Criterion C: interactive skills-communication reflecting A2 level.

Ecctis agreed with the majority of marks given here by the marking, though it could be argued that 3 marks out of a possible 6 for message – visual stimulus was at the top end of what the student demonstrated. Ecctis found that 2 marks here might have been a more accurate reflection of the fact that no real links were made to the target culture, with the exception of a comment that the children were likely in Germany '*weil es ist einem Land mit viel Technologie*'.

The analysis of the student's sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample was just within the A2 level, though dropped towards A1 in relation to some specific activities and competences.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis indicated that a range of CEFR levels have been identified for different descriptors, ranging from A1 to A2. For Conversation, Understanding an interlocutor, Overall oral production, Vocabulary range and Overall phonological control, Ecctis found that the student demonstrated A2 level proficiency. Although the conversation was stilted due to the interruptions in understanding on the student's part, there is still alignment with the A2 descriptor idea of expressing feelings using basic or stock expressions. Oral production proficiency was judged to, overall, exceed the A1 descriptor which relates to use of isolated phrases. Although the student did mostly demonstrate disjointed responses to questions,

there were so examples of linked or listed features within the presentation – thus aligning better with the A2 descriptor.

There were also some strategies, activities, and competences where the A2 descriptor was, on balance, judged to be the best-fit, though there would be a valid argument for the student falling between A2 and A1 levels in the internal assessment as a whole. Notably, Sustained monologue: describing experience and General linguistic range, were overall judged to be at A2 level, but with some overlap into A1 as well. In relation to describing experience, the A2 descriptor deploys the idea of being able to describe one's family and one's family life. The student did make some efforts to do this, and aspects of their meaning eventually came through, though this was not without some supportive offering of vocabulary from the teacher. Regarding General linguistic range, there was some evidence in the presentation particularly of exceeding the A1 descriptor's focus on concrete, personal details. However, the full extent of the A2 descriptor was only exemplified at times, and was not sustained for the whole conversation.

Finally, there were also some strategies, activities, and competences where the A1 descriptor was judged by Ecctis to be the best fit for the internal assessment as a whole. These were Overall oral interaction and Fluency. The A1 descriptor for fluency includes a focus on both pre-packaged utterances (which effectively encapsulates the student's repeated reliance on certain key vocabulary) and frequent pauses to search and repair (which is an accurate description of the conversations segment of the assessment). The Overall oral interaction A1 descriptor encapsulates the notion of conversation being reliant on repetition, slow speed, and much rephrasing/repair. Again, this is an accurate description of the conversational component of the assessment.

Overall, this places the sample at A2 level as a whole, though leaning towards A1 in a number of places. It is interesting to note that where the Ecctis project team disagreed with the marking, this raised a consideration about the features of the mark scheme. In general, it may be difficult for the mark scheme descriptors as they currently stand to engage with a student who provides some material of merit in the oral assessment, but overall provides a surprisingly small amount of output due to the number and length of hesitations. To some extent, the lowest bands of the mark scheme can respond to this challenge by viewing this as inconsistent addressing of the question or limited interaction. However, the actual shortcoming here is not in the student's engagement with the task/topic but in the fluency/conversation proficiency being notably low. There may therefore be scope to consider if the lowest bands for Criterion A have sufficient engagement with those particular activities and strategies that limit the *quantity* as well as the *quality* of what is communicated.

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the HL German B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 11

Sample 11 was selected because, in the context of some other examples displayed in this report, it demonstrates a high performing student, though one that dropped some marks, particularly in relation to Criterion A.

Task analysis

The literary extract used for this stimulus broadly addressed the theme of human ingenuity through a conversation between three famous scientists, with an underlying parable linking science to the differing philosophies of great powers in the twentieth century. It is an extract from *Die Physiker*, a play by Friedrich Dürrenmatt.

The presentation of the literary extract and the follow up discussion on the extract as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics, most prominently human ingenuity and sharing the planet.⁴¹² The task covered the public and educational language domains.⁴¹³

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this student sample include the student's control of grammar and vocabulary including the use of common and more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary, the student's use of prosodic features such as pronunciation and intonation, the student's propositional accuracy and task relevancy, the development of ideas, as well as the student's ability to start and maintain a conversation and interaction with the teacher.

Regarding the language features of the input text, some of these are relatively simple questions, exclamations, and short statements – resulting from the play-format – whereas other parts include complex grammatical structures and less common or archaic vocabulary ('Irrenhaus'). The CEFR analysis of the input text indicated that this literary extract reflects elements of B2-C1 levels.

Output text analysis

The analysis of the student's output found that this was a very capable student, with effective fluency and relatively few errors which would impede understanding. The student did not need many prompts, interruptions, or support from the teacher in order to offer well-ordered and coherent opinions and arguments about the content of the extract and the related theme. There were some grammatical errors throughout both the presentation and conversation (particularly in relation to verb conjugation and placement), however, this would have rarely impeded understanding and was within the context of some more complex grammatical structures that are typical of B2 proficiency.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed

⁴¹² International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁴¹³ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings. The total score of the student sample was 22 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 7 marks for Criterion A: language which reflects B2/C1 level, 5 marks for Criterion B1: message-literary extract which reflects B2 level, 5 marks for Criterion B2: message-conversation reflecting B1+ level, and 5 marks for Criterion C: interactive skills-communication reflecting B2 level. Ecctis agreed with how the student sample was marked by the teacher. There were some errors and issues in grammatical structures and pronunciation, and some instances where breadth of vocabulary made articulating an idea difficult, however, the student made logical, relevant, and coherent contributions to the conversation as well as providing a presentation that showed understanding of nuance and interpretation.

The analysis of the student's sample indicated that the overall CEFR level of the marked sample is B2.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis of the student sample found that, across a range of competences, activities, and strategies, B2 level was the best fit descriptor. In relation to the presentation component, this was particularly apparent in relation to Thematic development, Overall oral production, and Analysis and criticism of creative texts. The B2 descriptor for Thematic development has a well-aligned focus on the ability to make coherent and ordered presentations of argument, opinion, and ideas. Similarly, for Overall oral production, the B2 descriptor contains the notion of being able to develop subsidiary points within a wider context, which was well exemplified by the students ordered and nuanced presentation. The B2 descriptor for creative text criticism often reflects on how this area of proficiency might draw upon comparisons between texts. This isn't a required feature of the internal assessment, however, the descriptor does contain pertinent descriptions of how analysis would be reasoned, include examples, and give reference to opinions and arguments.

In relation to the conversational and interactive part of the internal assessment, the most pertinent activities, strategies, and competences were Conversation, Fluency, and Understanding an interlocutor. For all three of these, the B2 descriptor was judged to be best aligned with the student's performance. For Fluency, the descriptor's emphasis on conversation being possible without strain for either party was well aligned with the smoothness of the interaction here. For Conversation, the B2 descriptor includes reference to clear participation, which accurately represents the organic nature of the exchange. Regarding Understanding an interlocutor, the B2 descriptor contains the pertinent description of how the student can understand details.

Overall, the student's output was judged to be B2 level. Some of the key reasons that it did not drop to B1 or B1+ overall relate to the fact that conversation was sustained without struggle from either party and that the ability to engage with detail and nuance enabled the student to discuss issues of complexity beyond the everyday. The key reasons why the overall level was not judged to exceed B2 was that despite not substantially impeding understanding, small grammatical errors were frequent and there were not a large number of examples of complex linguistic features such as idioms.

Appendix 5: Spanish Language B Review and Comparative Analysis

Reading

Standard Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL Spanish B reading comprehension examination of N20 to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text C

Text C of Paper 2 of the N20 reading comprehension examination is a 387-word extract from an article introducing ‘*El carnaval de Santiago*’, in the Dominican Republic.⁴¹⁴ The article is adapted from an authentic online source, the website of the Dominican Ministry of Education. The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes and optional recommended topics listed in the Language B syllabus including identities, subcultures, experiences, customs and traditions, social organisation, community, and social engagement.⁴¹⁵ The CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and education domains.⁴¹⁶ More specifically, text C includes 13 assessment items included in four sets of questions. The first set of questions requires students to fill spaces in a paragraph that summarises the key messages of the text; there are five gaps to fill, using a list of ten possible words. In the second set of questions, students must answer three multiple choice questions, with a choice of four possible answers from which to choose. In the third set of questions, students are presented with sentence starters, which they must complete by lifting a verbatim phrase from the text. The final section of questions includes one multiple choice question regarding the intentions of the author; students have a choice of four phrases.

To correctly respond to the first set of questions, the student should read the first two paragraphs of the text, skimming, and scanning for key details mentioned in the gap-fill paragraph, before deciding on the most appropriate missing word from the list. Additionally, in order to find the answers to the second set of questions, and obtain the marks, the student should again focus on the first and second paragraphs of the text. Once again, the student should employ skimming and scanning skills to decide the presence or absence of key details mentioned in the multiple-choice options. In the third set of questions, students are required to locate phrases that are synonymous with those used in the sentence starters, in order to find the appropriate material that can be lifted from the text and used to complete each sentence in questions 32 to 35. In the final question, students will need to employ their

⁴¹⁴ Ministerio de Educación de la República Dominicana, 2007. *El carnaval de Santiago*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.educando.edu.do/articulos/generico/carnaval-de-santiago/>> [Accessed 7 October 2019]. source adapted.[Carnaval], n.d. [image online] Available at: <<https://i.pinimg.com/originals/64/46/5e/64465ef7080a5914f6e328286276c789.jpg>> [Accessed 28 May 2020].

⁴¹⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁴¹⁶ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

inferencing skills to determine the principal purpose of the text. Although the paragraphs of the input text are labelled, these markers are not used to indicate the specific paragraphs in which the corresponding answers can be found.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text C includes a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as common prepositions (*en*, *para*), demonstrative adjectives (*estas*, *este*), possessive adjectives (*sus*), adverbs (*orgullosamente*, *como*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels, the superlative (*lo más común*) and adverbial and prepositional expressions (*delante de*, *por detrás*, *hasta*) which are common at B1 CEFR level. There is also a wide range of verb tenses employed, including present simple (*impiden*, *se llaman*, *conserva*), modal verbs in the present tense (*puede*, *pueden*), the preterite (*sacudió*, *se dividió*), and the imperfect (*iban*, *se celebraba*), which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Furthermore, the text employs conjunctions that express both contrast, and cause and effect (*aunque*, *sin embargo*, *debido a*), relative clauses (*que*, *los que*) and the present subjunctive (*lleven*), which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the input text of text C employs a variety of language functions including the description of habits and routines, past experiences, people, things, feelings, and emotions. There are also instances of comparison, as the text compares past customs with present day interpretations of the carnival.

The CEFR analysis of text C indicates that the four different sets of questions target the same overall CEFR level. More specifically, the review and analysis found that the first and second sets of text C questions align with a range of B1, B1+ and B2 level descriptors, due to the varying complexity of the gap-fill statements in the first section of the task and the multiple-choice statements in the second. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for both sets of questions is B2. This judgement is predominantly due to the variety of strategies needed to achieve comprehension, the breadth of vocabulary knowledge required and the length and complexity of the text, coupled with the independence that students need to locate relevant details. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the first and second sets of questions.

Table 57: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C (1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1 st and 2 nd Set of Questions)					
Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	24-28	Gap-fill/cloze with closed response	Identifying cues and inferring: B1+: 'Can exploit different types of connectors (numerical, temporal, logical) and the role of key paragraphs in the overall organisation in order to better understand the	B2	These sets of questions are not below B2 level because at B1, the Reading for information and argument

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension
(1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	29-31	Multiple-choice question	<p>argumentation in a text.’ (SET 1: Questions 24 and 26) (SET 2: Question 30)</p> <p>B2: ‘Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues.’⁴¹⁷ (SET 1: Questions 25, 27 and 28) (SET 2: Questions 29 and 31)</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: B1: ‘Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to their field of interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension.’ (SET 1: Question 24) (SET 2: Question 30)</p> <p>B2: ‘Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary, but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms.’⁴¹⁸ (SET 1: Questions 25, 26, 27 and 28) (SET 2: Questions 29 and 31)</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: B1+: ‘Can understand straightforward, factual texts on subjects relating to their interests or studies’.⁴¹⁹</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B2: ‘Can scan quickly through long and complex texts, locating relevant details’.⁴²⁰</p>		<p>descriptor mentions an understanding of main points, whereas a greater understanding of specific details is required in these tasks. In addition, the Overall reading comprehension descriptor and the Identifying cues and inferring descriptor at B1 expect students to demonstrate a ‘satisfactory level’ of understanding and to make ‘basic inferences’; in the majority of questions in this section, a greater understanding of specific details is required, such as those relating to the history of the festival, the people involved and the traditional clothing. Furthermore, the students undoubtedly reach B2 level on the Reading for orientation scale, amongst others, due to the fact that the passage in which the answers are found spans two paragraphs and does not signpost students to a specific area in the text.</p> <p>These sets of questions are not above B2 level because the</p>

⁴¹⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

⁴¹⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

⁴¹⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 56-57.

⁴²⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.55-56.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension
(1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'. ⁴²¹		Vocabulary range scale at C1 mentions an understanding of colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions, which this text does not have in abundance. Additionally, the Reading for orientation scale at B2+ mentions reading multiple texts in parallel, which students are not required to do in these tasks. At C1, identifying cues and inferring expects students to infer mood and attitude; this does not feature in any of the questions in this section, which concern purely factual information. The Overall reading comprehension descriptor at C1 mentions the use of a 'specialised academic or professional publication'; as a cultural article, this text is not specialised enough to satisfy this descriptor.

The CEFR analysis of the third and fourth sets of questions for text C revealed the presence of B1+ level descriptors on the Reading for orientation scale and B2 level descriptors on a range of other scales. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for both sets of questions is B2. This judgement is predominantly due to the broad active reading vocabulary required to address the questions accompanying the text, the need to skim longer passages of text to identify information relevant to two contrasting parties, and the obligation in the final question to analyse the principal purpose of the text. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the third and fourth sets of questions.

Table 58: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C (3rd and 4th Set of Questions)

⁴²¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension
(3rd and 4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
3	32-35	Sentence completion	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: B2: 'Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues'.⁴²²</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: B2: 'Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary, but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms.'⁴²³</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: B1+: 'Can understand straightforward, factual texts on subjects relating to their interests or studies'. (SET 1: Questions 32, 34 and 35)</p> <p>B2: 'Can recognise different structures in discursive text: contrasting arguments, problem–solution presentation and cause–effect relationships'.⁴²⁴ (SET 1: Question 33)</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B2: 'Can scan quickly through long and complex texts, locating relevant details'.⁴²⁵</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'.⁴²⁶</p>	B2	<p>These sets of questions are not below B2 level because at B1, the Reading for information and argument descriptor mentions an understanding of main points, whereas a greater understanding of specific details is required in these tasks. In addition, the Overall reading comprehension descriptor and the Identifying cues and inferring descriptor at B1 expect students to demonstrate a 'satisfactory level' of understanding and to make 'basic inferences'; in the majority of questions in this section, a greater understanding of specific details is required, such as those relating to forms of celebration and implicit references to overall purpose. In terms of Vocabulary range, there are a number of vocabulary items in this article that are contextually specific and not encountered in day-to-day studies or conversation, as mentioned in the B1 descriptor.</p>
4	36	Multiple-choice question			

⁴²² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

⁴²³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

⁴²⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 56-57.

⁴²⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.55-56.

⁴²⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text C of Paper 2 reading comprehension
(3rd and 4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
					<p>Furthermore, the Reading for orientation descriptor at B1 expects an understanding of material found on labels and in short documents; the context of this text is markedly more complex.</p> <p>Similarly, to the first two sets of questions, the Vocabulary range scale at C1 mentions an understanding of colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions, which this text does not have in abundance. Additionally, the Reading for orientation scale at B2+ mentions reading multiple texts in parallel, which students are not required to do in these tasks. At C1, the descriptors for Identifying cues and inferring and for Reading for information and argument expect students to infer mood and attitude; this does not feature in any of the questions in this section, which are purely factual. The Overall reading comprehension descriptor at C1 mentions the use of a 'specialised academic or professional publication'; as a cultural article, this text is not specialised enough to satisfy this descriptor.</p>

Higher Level

The section below provides a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL Spanish B reading comprehension examination of N20 to the CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks, question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the reading skills assessed to the CEFR reading comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text B

Text B is a 437-word article adapted from an authentic public domain source, a photography website.⁴²⁷ The website article discusses the development of a photography application that allows the user to print photographs from a mobile device.⁴²⁸ The subject matter of the input text is consistent with the prescriptive themes and optional recommended topics listed in the syllabus, such as experiences, leisure activities, holidays and travel, customs and traditions, human ingenuity, artistic expressions, and technology.⁴²⁹ The CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and education domains.⁴³⁰

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text B includes a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as demonstrative pronouns (*'aquello'*), possessive adjectives (*'mis'*), common prepositions (*'sin'*, *'para'*, *'con'*, *'a'*, *'por'*, *'entre'*), adverbs (*'después'*), adverbial and prepositional expressions (*'tal vez'*, *'qué tal'*, *'aunque'*, *'sobre todo'*, *'hoy en día'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. There are also a range of verb tenses employed in the text, including present simple (*'llevo'*, *'ahorramos'*) which is common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels, modal verbs in the present and conditional tenses (*'querer'*, *'podrían'*), perfect tense (*'hemos perdido'*, *'han apostado'*), imperfect (*'llevaba'*, *'iba'*), conditional (*'podrían'*), pluperfect (*'habían quedado'*), the present subjunctive (*'pasen'*) and the perfect subjunctive (*'hayan sido'*) which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels. Instances of more complex lexical and grammatical structures also occur, such as conjunctions expressing cause and effect (*'ya que'*, *'para que'*, *'mientras que'*) and relative clauses (*'que'*) which are common at B2 CEFR level. Additionally, the input text of text B includes a variety of language functions including giving instructions, describing habits and routines, past experiences, people, places, and things. The text also features the expression of likes and dislikes, opinions, comparisons, critiquing and reviewing, and justification.

The CEFR analysis of text B indicated that different sets of questions target marginally different CEFR levels. Certain assessment items in the first set of questions generally correspond to a range of descriptors from B1+ to C1. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for the first set of questions is B2. This judgement is predominantly because a B2 student would be well positioned to access content from B1+ to C1 and obtain the

⁴²⁷ García, A., 2014. Mimento, una app para revelar tus fotos desde el móvil. [online] Available at: <<https://naturapixel.com/2014/02/11/mimento-una-app-para-revelar-tus-fotos-desde-el-movil/>> [Accessed 11 May 2020]. source adapted.

⁴²⁸ García, A., 2014. Mimento, una app para revelar tus fotos desde el móvil. [online] Available at: <<https://naturapixel.com/2014/02/11/mimento-una-app-para-revelar-tus-fotos-desde-el-movil/>> [Accessed 11 May 2020]. source adapted.

⁴²⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁴³⁰ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

majority of marks at a middle level. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the first set of questions.

Table 59: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B (1st Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	10-12	Short answer to closed question	<p>Identifying cues and inferring: B2: 'Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues.' (Question 10)</p> <p>C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next.'⁴³¹ (Questions 11 and 12)</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: B2: 'Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms.'⁴³²</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B1+: 'Can scan longer texts in order to locate desired information, and gather information from different parts of a text, or from different texts in order to fulfil a specific task.'⁴³³</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of</p>	B2	<p>This set of questions is not lower than B2 because it exceeds the expectations of certain scales at B1 or B1+. For example, Reading for information and argument at B1 requires students to merely understand the main points, whereas these questions require an understanding of very specific details, such as the recognition of to which noun a pronoun refers. Similarly, a student would need a greater understanding of the text than the 'basic inferences' mentioned at B1 on the Identifying cues and inferring scale. As demonstrated above, for the majority of questions in this section, the student needs more than a 'satisfactory level' of understanding, as mentioned in the Overall reading comprehension descriptor at B1. In order to access the text needed to answer the questions, students also need a fairly broad vocabulary knowledge; there are a number of vocabulary items in this article that are not encountered in day-to-day studies or conversation, as referenced at B1.</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than B2</p>

⁴³¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

⁴³² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

⁴³³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.55-56.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (1st Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics. ⁴³⁴		because the Vocabulary range scale at C1 mentions an understanding of colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions, which do not feature frequently in this text. At C1, the descriptors for Identifying cues and inferring and for Reading for information and argument expect students to infer mood and attitude; this does not feature in any of the questions in this section, which are purely grammatical and lexical. The Overall reading comprehension descriptor at C1 mentions the use of a 'specialised academic or professional publication'; as an article related to photography and past times, this text is not specialised enough to satisfy this descriptor.

Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the second set of questions of text B corresponds to a range of B2 and C1 descriptors. All questions in this section were found to align with Identifying cues and inferring at C1 CEFR level, with both Reading for information and argument, and Reading for orientation at B2 CEFR level in all questions. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for this set of questions is B2+, due to the majority of questions aligning with B2 descriptors on multiple scales, with the added complexity of some C1 elements. The table below presents the summary of CEFR analysis of the second set of questions.

Table 60: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B (2nd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
2	13-16	Sentence completion	Identifying cues and inferring: C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and	B2+	This set of questions is not lower than B2+ because there are elements of C1 descriptors present in certain questions, which

⁴³⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>anticipate what will come next'.⁴³⁵</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: B2: 'Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary, but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms.' (Questions 14, 15 and 16)</p> <p>C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'.⁴³⁶ (Question 13)</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: B2: 'Can understand articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which particular stances or viewpoints are adopted'.⁴³⁷</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B2: 'Can quickly identify the content and relevance of news items, articles and reports on a wide range of professional topics, deciding whether closer study is worthwhile'.⁴³⁸</p>		<p>push the task beyond a simple B2 level. For example, all questions align with the Identifying cues and inferring scale at C1, meaning that the use of context and grammatical clues is necessary to identify information appropriately accurate for sentence completion. In addition, question 13 requires the student to use a skill level akin to the Overall reading comprehension descriptor at C1; students need to use the context and grammatical clues to predict what comes next in the sentence as there are few similarities between the sentence starter and the relevant input text. Furthermore, question 16 requires students to use the Vocabulary range scale at C1 level, specifically the ability to recognise idiomatic and colloquial expressions. For example, the expression '<i>todo lo que tienes que hacer</i>' features a structure that expresses necessity (<i>tener que + infinitive</i>), which needs to be interpreted as an informal recommendation in this context.</p> <p>This set of questions is not higher than B2+ because, although there are C1 elements which add complexity, there is still a majority of skills which align more</p>

⁴³⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

⁴³⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

⁴³⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 56-57.

⁴³⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.55-56.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'. (Questions 13, 14 and 15)</p> <p>C1: 'Has a good command of common idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; can play with words/signs fairly well'. ⁴³⁹ (Question 16)</p>		appropriately with B2 level. There are also certain scales that do not satisfy the requirements of C1 descriptors. For example, at C1, the descriptor for Reading for information and argument expects students to infer attitude; some of the questions in these sections refer to opinions, but they are expressed explicitly in the text, meaning that inference is not necessary. Additionally, the Reading for orientation scale at B2+ mentions reading multiple texts in parallel, which students are not required to do in these tasks.

The CEFR analysis of the third and fourth sets of questions for text B revealed the exclusive presence of B2 level descriptors on the Overall reading comprehension, Reading for orientation, Reading for information and argument, and the Vocabulary range scales. There was a range of B2 and C1 level descriptors found in both sets, but these are only applicable to the Identifying cues and inferring scale. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgement for both sets of questions is B2. This judgement is predominantly due to the broad active reading vocabulary required to address the questions accompanying the text, the need to recognise certain viewpoints expressed and to skim longer passages of text in order to summarise it in the final questions. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the third and fourth sets of questions.

Table 61: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B (3rd and 4th Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension (3rd and 4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
3	17-18	Short answer to open question	Identifying cues and inferring: B2: 'Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension,	B2	These sets of questions are not lower than B2 because they exceed the expectations of many lower descriptors. For

⁴³⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension
(3rd and 4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
4	19-22	Gap-fill/ cloze with selected closed response	<p>including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues'. (SET 3: Question 17)</p> <p>C1: 'Is skilled at using contextual, grammatical and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood and intentions and anticipate what will come next'.⁴⁴⁰ (SET 3: Question 18) (SET 4: all questions)</p> <p>Overall reading comprehension: B2: 'Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary, but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms.'⁴⁴¹</p> <p>Reading for information and argument: B2: 'Can understand articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which particular stances or viewpoints are adopted'.⁴⁴²</p> <p>Reading for orientation: B2: 'Can quickly identify the content and relevance of news items, articles and reports on a wide range of professional topics,</p>		<p>example, students are required to discern specific details regarding the development of an application and the opinions of the author, which goes beyond the 'main points' described in the B1 descriptor for the Reading for information and argument scale or the 'basic inferences' in the Identifying cues and inferring descriptor at B1. For this reason, the tasks also exceed the B1 descriptor for Overall reading comprehension, which requires only a 'satisfactory level' of understanding.</p> <p>As a published review of a technological product, this article also exceeds the 'labels and short documents' mentioned in the Reading for orientation descriptor at B1. The vocabulary used in certain parts of this article would likely be encountered in a discussion of technology, rather than in day-to-day studies or conversation, requiring a wider range of knowledge than the Vocabulary range descriptor at B1.</p> <p>Although there are a few descriptors that reach C1 level, these sets of questions cannot be higher than B2, as the majority of elements in each question satisfy B2 level skills. The Vocabulary range scale at C1 mentions an understanding of colloquialisms and</p>

⁴⁴⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

⁴⁴¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 54.

⁴⁴² Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 56-57.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text B of Paper 2 reading comprehension
(3rd and 4th Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			deciding whether closer study is worthwhile'. ⁴⁴³ Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'. ⁴⁴⁴		idiomatic expressions, which do not feature frequently in this text. At C1, the descriptors for Identifying cues and inferring and for Reading for information and argument expect students to infer mood and attitude; some of the questions in these sections refer to opinions, but they are expressed explicitly in the text, meaning that inference is not necessary. The Overall reading comprehension descriptor at C1 mentions the use of a 'specialised academic or professional publication'; as an article related to photography and past times, this text is not specialised enough to satisfy this descriptor.

Listening

Standard Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the SL Spanish B listening comprehension examination of N20 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text B

In text B of the N20 Spanish B listening comprehension examination (Paper 2) the student is asked to listen to a television interview, in which the presenter asks questions of an actress about her environmental activism. Text B includes two sets of questions. In the first set, students are presented with five multiple choice questions, each presenting three options from which to choose. In the second set of questions, students must respond to a series of closed questions, with a relatively short answer. From the IB documentation, the topics discussed during the conversation focus on identities, beliefs, and values, sharing the planet and the

⁴⁴³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.55-56.

⁴⁴⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

environment.⁴⁴⁵ The CEFR domain covered in this text includes the public domain.⁴⁴⁶ To respond to both sets of questions and obtain the marks, the students should be able to listen for detail and make notes on key points in order to obtain relevant information for the answers.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text B includes a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as common adjectives (*'locales', 'pequeños'*), adverbial and prepositional expressions (*'además de', 'aparte de', 'antes de', 'ya'*), comparatives (*'menos', 'mejor'*), and the simple present tense (*'hay', 'es', 'sirve', 'venden'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Furthermore, the input text of text B includes some more complex grammatical structures such as imperatives (*'hable'*), simple past tense (*'comenzamos'*), present perfect (*'ha comenzado'*), the gerund (*'hablando'*), future tense (*'servirá'*), modal verbs in the present and conditional tenses (*'pueden', 'debería'*) and the present subjunctive (*'que los niños vean', 'haya'*) which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the input text of text B includes a variety of language functions including greetings, asking questions for confirmation and information, clarifying, and describing things. Furthermore, there are also instances of expressing wishes and opinions, reporting facts and actions, obligation, and necessity, and defending a point of view.

The CEFR analysis of text B indicates that the two different sets of questions both target an overall B1 CEFR level. More specifically, the review and analysis found that both sets of text B questions align exclusively with B1 descriptors, on all scales. This overall judgement is predominantly due to the presence of some extended passages of speech, narratives, and identification of specific details, covering fairly complex topic content at times, including following a line of argumentation and a sequence of past events; this allows students the opportunity to demonstrate a B1 level of competence in multiple skills areas. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the first and second set of questions.

Table 62: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text B (1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1 st and 2 nd Set of Questions)					
Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	6-10	Multiple choice	Identifying cues and inferring: B1: 'Can follow a line of argumentation or the sequence of events in a story, by focusing on common logical connectors (e.g. however, because) and temporal connectors (e.g. after that, beforehand)'. ⁴⁴⁷	B1	These sets of questions are not lower than B1 because at A2+, the Identifying cues and inferring descriptor references 'short expressions' and 'routine everyday contexts.' However, this interview includes some extended spoken passages and the student is required to follow the sequence of
2	11-15	Short answer to closed question			

⁴⁴⁵ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁴⁴⁶ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

⁴⁴⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension
(1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>Overall oral comprehension: B1: 'Can understand the main points made in clear standard language or a familiar variety on familiar matters regularly encountered at work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives'.⁴⁴⁸</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: B1: 'Can understand the main points and important details in stories and other narratives (e.g. a description of a holiday), provided the delivery is slow and clear'.⁴⁴⁹</p> <p>Understanding conversation between other people: B1: 'Can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around them, provided it is clearly articulated in standard language or a familiar variety'.⁴⁵⁰</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B1: 'Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations'.⁴⁵¹</p>		<p>events in a story, in the form of past experiences, with argumentation regarding contamination, materials and reasons for teaching children about the environment. The student also needs to use the logical connector 'además' to help them with question 6 and temporal connectors, such as 'ahora' and references to plans for the future. Overall oral comprehension at A2+ mentions understanding language used for 'concrete needs'; the topic of this conversation and the range of content exceeds those expectations.</p> <p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings at A2+ only covers topics such as free time, whereas the topic of this section of the interview includes the interviewee detailing environmental problems and past campaign experiences, using past tenses and the subjunctive. At A2+, the Understanding between other people descriptor requires students to identify the topic of a conversation, yet in these tasks students are listening out for main points and identifying specific details, as in B1. The Vocabulary range descriptor at B1 describes familiar topics and everyday situations;</p>

⁴⁴⁸ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

⁴⁴⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 52.

⁴⁵⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.49.

⁴⁵¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension
(1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
					<p>the topic of the environment is an everyday topic, and the majority of key vocabulary would likely be encountered as part of a student's studies e.g., '<i>medioambientales</i>', '<i>calentamiento global</i>', '<i>los problemas</i>', '<i>las consecuencias</i>'.</p> <p>These sets of questions are not higher than B1 because the Identifying cues and inferring descriptor at B1+ mentions deducing the meaning of a whole sentence or of a whole paragraph. These tasks are multiple-choice or requiring short answers to very specific, closed questions, where the student is only required to identify the meaning of main points. At B1+, the Overall oral comprehension descriptor expects students to identify general messages and specific details, yet little identification is needed in these tasks, as the answers are so heavily signposted by large similarities in the input text of the questions and the answers to be found in the transcript. Vocabulary range at B2 requires students to have a good range of vocabulary for general topics and specialist vocabulary in their field; the language necessary to answer the questions in these sections does not use this complexity. At B2, the Understanding conversation between other people descriptor expects students to follow chronological sequencing; the independent use of this skill is not required here,</p>

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Text B of Paper 2 listening comprehension
(1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
					as the questions are in the same order as the information in the transcript and focus on detecting opinions and reasoning.

Higher Level

The sections below provide a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the HL Spanish B listening comprehension examination of N20 to CEFR, including a review of the input text, tasks and question types included in the assessment and associated mark schemes and a comparative analysis of the listening comprehension skills assessed to the CEFR oral comprehension activities, strategies and competences.

Text C

In text C of the N20 Spanish B listening comprehension examination (paper 2), the student is asked to listen to a radio programme, in which the presenter discusses the working world. Text C includes two sets of questions. In the first set of questions students must respond to a series of closed questions, with a relatively short answer. The second set of questions includes a gap-fill activity, whereby students must fill gaps in a paragraph of text with phrases of no more than three words, in order to summarise key pieces of information. From the IB documentation the topics discussed during this monologue focus on social organisation and the working world.⁴⁵² The CEFR domains covered in this text include the public and occupational domains.⁴⁵³ To respond to both sets of questions and obtain the marks, the students must be able to understand general messages in the text and discern specific details to complete the sentences in the gap fill questions with the correct wording. They must also be able to decipher low frequency lexis, synonymous expressions, and idiomatic language in order to answer the second set of questions.

Input text and CEFR analysis

The input text of text C includes a wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary such as common adjectives (*'humildes', 'sencillos'*), present simple (*'pensamos', 'logran'*), adverbs (*'lógicamente', 'incluso'*) and adverbial expressions (*'no obstante', 'además de'*) which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the input text of text C includes some more complex grammatical structures such as the gerund (*'trabajando'*), modal verbs in the present and conditional tenses (*'no se debe', 'podría'*), phrasal verbs (*'tener en cuenta', 'prestar atención'*), present continuous (*'se están preparando'*), present perfect (*'ha investigado'*), conjunctions expressing cause and effect (*'debido a'*), future tense (*'serán', 'dependerá'*), the present subjunctive (*'sepa', 'vaya'*) and relative clauses (*'a lo que se pregunta'*) which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels. Furthermore, there are examples of idiomatic language which students are required to comprehend in order to support the answering of questions

⁴⁵² International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁴⁵³ Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

(*'se pilla antes a un mentiroso que a un cojo'*) which reflect elements of B2 and C1 CEFR levels. The input text of text C includes a variety of language functions including giving instructions and simple advice, describing people, reporting facts and actions, and expressing obligation and necessity. There are also instances of expressing opinions and justification, as well as comparisons of a more complex nature.

The CEFR analysis of text C indicates that the two different sets of questions both target the same overall CEFR level. More specifically, the review and analysis found that the first and second sets of text C questions align with a range of B1+ and B2 level descriptors, due to certain questions within the tasks assessing certain skills at higher levels than others; students are expected to use contextual clues to deduce meaning, identify general and specific messages, and interpret factual and opinion-based material. Despite the range of descriptors, the overall judgements for both sets of questions is B2. The table below presents a summary of the CEFR analysis for the first and second sets of questions.

Table 63: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text C (1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension (1 st and 2 nd Set of Questions)					
Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
1	12-15	Short answer to closed question	<p>Identifying cues and referring: B1+: 'Can extrapolate the meaning of a section of a text by taking into account the text as a whole'. (SET 2: all questions).</p> <p>B2: 'Can use a variety of strategies to achieve comprehension, including watching out for main points and checking comprehension by using contextual clues'. (SET 1: all questions).⁴⁵⁴</p> <p>Overall oral comprehension: B1+: 'Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided people articulate clearly in a generally familiar variety'.⁴⁵⁵</p>	B2	<p>These sets of questions are not lower than B2 because in terms of Identifying cues and inferring, there is less signposting of answers and similarities between question structure and transcript, meaning that a variety of strategies must be used. Students need to listen out for main points, but by using synonyms (e.g. <i>desmoralizador</i> = <i>desalentadora</i>, <i>error</i> = <i>descuido</i>) and context, in the first set. The Vocabulary range descriptor at B1, only mentions vocabulary related to familiar topics and the everyday. However, there are many synonyms that students need to recognise, or deduce, in order to find the answers. For example, in question 18, <i>'las preguntas serán diferentes'</i> = <i>'las preguntas pueden</i></p>
2	16-21	Gap-fill/ cloze with open response			

⁴⁵⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.60.

⁴⁵⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p.48.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension
(1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
			<p>Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings: B2: 'Can understand most documentaries and most other recorded or broadcast material delivered in the standard form of the language and can identify mood, attitude, etc'.⁴⁵⁶</p> <p>Vocabulary range: B2: 'Has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to their field and most general topics'.⁴⁵⁷</p>		<p><i>cambiar</i>', which even includes two different tenses. Also, question 15 uses the subjunctive and students would need to make the connection between <i>'sepa'</i> and <i>'saber'</i> in order to get the relevant information for the answer. There are also less commonly used terms, such as an idiomatic expression and verbs like <i>'despedirse'</i>. At B1+, the Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings descriptor expects an understanding of the majority of recorded material but does not account for opinion-based content. However, there are certain questions which seem more opinion-based and subjective than merely factual, e.g. question 12, <i>'según el programa...'</i>, <i>'prefieren los empresarios'</i>.</p> <p>These sets of questions are not higher than B2 because the Identifying cues and inferring scale at higher levels requires the ability to anticipate what will come next, which the student is not required to do whilst searching for very specific details. Understanding audio (or signed) media and recordings at B2+ mentions an understanding of language encountered in social, professional, and academic life. The content of this task is not technical enough to fulfil this requirement. Vocabulary range at</p>

⁴⁵⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 52.

⁴⁵⁷ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Text C of Paper 2 listening comprehension
(1st and 2nd Set of Questions)

Set of Questions	Question Number	Question Type	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
					higher levels requires the recognition of technical terminology and idiomatic expressions, which are not used in abundance in this task.

Writing

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the SL Spanish B writing assessment (Paper 1) of the M21 examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 2

Sample 2 was selected as an example, as it demonstrates a medium range performance in the SL writing assessment.

Input text analysis:

In task one this specific student has selected to write a text in the text type of a brochure explaining an environmental group, from the first-person perspective and asking permission for an environmental protection campaign to take place within a school. The writing skills that students are required to demonstrate to complete the task include writing to ask for permission, writing an informative correspondence to obtain permission, and adopting the conventions of a formal correspondence. Additionally, other writing skills that students are required to demonstrate to complete the task include being able to express themselves with clarity and precision using language flexibly, accurately, and effectively, marking the relationship between ideas in clear connected text, and using an appropriate register. In task one, the language used in the input text varies subtly in complexity throughout the question. Some of the grammatical structures of the input text of task one include active voice in present indicative (*'nuestro grupo planea una campaña'*), present subjunctive (*'es importante que+verb'*), regular and irregular verbs (*'soy de un grupo ambientalista'*), relative clauses (*'el grupo en el cual...'*), and adverbs of place (*'aquí en el colegio'*) which are common in A2, B1 and B2 CEFR levels.

Additionally, the input text of task one includes a variety of language functions such as describing things, describing facts and actions, making requests, expressing aspirations, desires and preferences, and narrating and describing future events. The purpose of the language in task one is to give instructions to the student. The language also functions as an expression of wishes and persuasion, on behalf of the student, as they need to convince the

school and the educational community to give them permission to conduct the environmental protection campaign. Lastly, the language provides suggestions to the student of certain elements to cover in the task.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 2 selected the brochure text type in order to complete task one. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions, grammatical structures, vocabulary and linguistic forms. More specifically, in this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. They described things using key questions ('¿Cuál? la organización ¿Qué [es]?: 'el grupo ambiental es...'), described situations and actions, and made specific requests. In addition, the grammatical structures and vocabulary used by the student vary throughout, ranging from simple to complex structures. For example, some simple structures include present indicative ('Yo soy una 'lídera' [líder]..la comunidad necesita ayuda'), indefinite articles ('una manera de ayudar el mundo...un grupo ambientalista...da [a] otras personas un [una] mano'), definite articles ('el grupo es por el medio ambiente'), and demonstrative adjectives ('una campaña de protección ambiental este semestre...Acción [acción] y más metas para mejorar el medioambiente en este colegio') which are common at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, some examples of more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary used by the student in this sample include relative clauses ('otras estudiantes del colegio 'cual' [los cuales] quieran [quieren] mejorar [mejorar] la situación del ambiente), irregular verbs (tú puedes recicló [reciclar]'), modal verbs ('durante [las] clases debes limitar el uso de papel'), simple conditional indicative ('si fuera un estudiante nuevo quería [querria] tener un grupo ambientalista') and order and placement of adjectives ('el grupo pueden [puede] participar en similar actividades [actividades similares]') which are common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels.

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark 8/12 in Criterion A: language, indicating that the 'command of the language is effective and mostly accurate'.⁴⁵⁸ This judgement correlates with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A. More specifically, the marking analysis of Criterion A found that the student uses a range of grammatical structures and vocabulary throughout the task. In spite of the student making errors with basic grammatical structures (e.g. 'el grupo cree en preservación' instead of 'en la preservación'; 'mejorar vida de los estudiantes' instead of 'la vida de los estudiantes'; 'similar actividades' instead of 'actividades similares' and 'necesito más planear' instead of 'necesito planear más') as well as with some more complex grammatical structures (e.g. 'estudiantes del colegio cual'; instead of 'los cuales'; 'los miembros les di cuenta' instead of 'los miembros se dieron cuenta'; 'si más personas expresan interesa, el grupo son más oficial' instead of 'si más personas expresan interés, el grupo sería más oficial'), the reader is still able to follow the student's ideas. At this level, the IB expects that 'occasional errors in basic and complex grammatical structures do not impede communication'; this sample is intelligible throughout, with only minor errors which do not prevent understanding.⁴⁵⁹ According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion A: language is equivalent to CEFR B2 level.

⁴⁵⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

⁴⁵⁹ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.33.

Additionally, the student was awarded the mark of 9/12 in Criterion B: message which means that the student fulfilled the task, the message was conveyed, and most ideas were well developed, relevant to the task with some additional details and examples, presented in a structured and logical manner which supported the delivery of the message. Again, this marking is consistent with Ecctis judgement, as most of the ideas presented in the brochure are related to the chosen task. However, the language used when trying to obtain permission was not completely accurate, which means the message was not successfully delivered. Ideas were developed well with some detail and examples. For example, the student introduced several examples of how the project will be delivered (*'reciclaje de botellas, el uso de agua en el baño...el uso de papel, usa tu computadora'*). According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion B: message reflects elements of CEFR B1+/B2 level.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 3/6 in Criterion C: conceptual understanding which means that they mostly demonstrated conceptual understanding, a finding which is generally in line with Ecctis judgement regarding the student's choice of text, context, purpose, target audience, register and tone. More specifically, the marking analysis indicated that choosing a more formal type of text would have helped the student to achieve the aim of obtaining permission more successfully from the school for the environmental campaign. The text type of the brochure does not allow the student to either address a specific person or use a register that corresponds with the formality needed to approach educational authorities. However, the student's ability to adhere to the conventions for writing brochures (using headings and columns) allows the reader to understand what the environmentalist group does. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion C: conceptual understanding reflects elements of CEFR B1 level. The total number of marks allocated to this student sample by the IB were 20/30 marks.

CEFR analysis:

The sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. This student sample reflects elements of the B1+ and B2 level descriptors in the CEFR activities and competences of Overall written interaction, Propositional precision, Grammatical accuracy, Correspondence, Orthographic control, Thematic development and Reports and essays. The table below presents the summary of the findings of the CEFR analysis of student sample 2.

Table 64: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 2

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
Sample 2	<p>Overall written interaction: B1+: 'Can convey information and ideas on abstract as well as concrete topics, check information, and ask about or explain problems with reasonable precision'.⁴⁶⁰</p> <p>Propositional precision:</p>	B1+	<p>Regarding Propositional precision, the sample reflects B1+ level, as the student can 'explain the main points of an idea, or problem, with reasonable precision'.</p> <p>In terms of Correspondence, the sample reflects elements of B1+ level as the student is capable of</p>

⁴⁶⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 82.

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>B1+: 'Can explain the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision. Can convey simple, straightforward information of immediate relevance, getting across the point they feel is most important. Can express the main point they want to make comprehensibly'.⁴⁶¹</p> <p>Correspondence: B1+: 'Can compose basic formal e-mails/letters (e.g. to make a complaint and request action)'.⁴⁶²</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B1+: 'Communicates with reasonable accuracy in familiar contexts; generally good control, though with noticeable mother-tongue influence. Errors occur, but it is clear what they are trying to express'.⁴⁶³</p> <p>Orthographic control: B2: 'Spelling and punctuation are reasonably accurate but may show signs of mother-tongue influence. Can produce clearly intelligible, continuous writing which follows standard layout and paragraphing conventions'. B1+: 'Can develop an argument well enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time'.⁴⁶⁴</p> <p>Reports and essays: B1+: 'Can produce short, simple essays on topics of interest'.⁴⁶⁵</p>		<p>composing 'basic formal emails/letters' to make a complaint or request action.</p> <p>The sample aligns with the B1+ level descriptor in the Grammatical accuracy scale because the student shows generally good control with mother-tongue influence, it is clear what they are trying to express; there are incorrect verb conjugations, but only in the sense that the student has used the third person plural to address a third person singular noun.</p> <p>This sample aligns with the B2 level descriptor in the scale of Orthographic control as there are instances where vocabulary is misspelt or words from the mother tongue have been used, but most of the text is 'reasonably accurate'.</p> <p>In the scale of Thematic development, this sample reflects elements of the B1+ level descriptor because the student can 'develop an argument well enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time'.</p>

The CEFR analysis found that the overall CEFR level of this student sample is not higher than B1+ level because the student still needs to develop the ability to adjust to the style of using formal texts to successfully obtain permission. Furthermore, the description of the environmental group was made with limited precision. Despite being able to correct some mistakes made in the brochure, the learner did not seem to be conscious of a considerable number of grammatical and vocabulary slips and errors. For a B2 level, the text would have to give a 'clear and detailed description'; the student would be expected to express themselves 'effectively'; and the text would be written using the appropriate register and conventions. However, a brochure is not appropriate for requesting permission.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid. pp.141-142.

⁴⁶² Ibid. pp. 82-83.

⁴⁶³ Ibid. p. 132.

⁴⁶⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 136.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 68.

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the input text, marking analysis and student sample analysis of the HL Spanish B writing assessment (Paper 1) of the M21 examination to the CEFR writing production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 5

Sample 5 was selected as an example to demonstrate here in the report because it provides a useful example of a high range performance in the HL writing assessment.

Input text analysis:

In task one this specific student has selected to write a text in the text type of an email to the school board to share their experiences and talk about the advantages of the language exchange programmes but also provide recommendations for future language exchange programmes in which the school can participate. In this task, the student is asked to write an email and demonstrate their ability to describe past experiences, explain advantages, and present recommendations to educational authorities. The writing skills that the students are required to demonstrate to complete the task include writing to persuade, identifying a problem but also a solution to a problem, and presenting and justifying an argument by providing the reasons behind the argument. Additionally, the student should be able to demonstrate their ability to provide and explain advantages, provide a summary at the end of the task to summarise and conclude, adopt the conventions of a formal correspondence, and express themselves with clarity and precision. Furthermore, the students should be able to demonstrate their ability to use language flexibly, accurately, and effectively, to mark the relationship between ideas in clear connected text and to use an appropriate register.

In task one, the language used in the input text varies subtly in complexity throughout the question. Some of the simple grammatical structures of the input text of task one include but are not limited to regular and irregular verbs (*'necesité usar español'*), personal pronouns (*'nosotros visitamos muchos lugares'*), simple conditional indicative (*'Les recomendaría que vayan a un intercambio'*), and nouns (*'amigos, lugares, oportunidades'*) which reflects elements of A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, the input text of task one includes some complex grammatical structures such as past perfect simple indicative (*'decidí postularme aun programa de intercambio'*) which is common at B1 and B2 CEFR levels. Furthermore, the input text of task one includes a variety of language functions such as expressing wishes, describing situations and past experiences, making suggestions, explaining advantages, and making recommendations. The language also functions as an expression of wishes and persuasion, on behalf of the student, as they need to convince the school and the educational community to participate in more language exchange programmes in the future by presenting and justifying their arguments around the advantages of these programmes. Lastly, the language invites students to synthesise their opinions and make suggestions for future language programmes in which the school can participate.

Output text analysis:

The author of sample 5 selected the email text type in order to complete task one. The output text was analysed, in much the same way as the input text, for language functions, grammatical structures, vocabulary and linguistic forms. More specifically, in this sample, the student used the language for a wide range of functions. Some of the language functions used by the student in the output text include providing greetings, describing past experiences, facts, actions, things, places, situations, and people, emphasising, or exemplifying a point, feeling or an issue, expressing opinions, and explaining advantages and disadvantages of the language exchange programmes. In addition, other language functions used by the student include expressing recommendations, expressing certainty, doubt, probability, and degrees of opinion as well as narrating and describing past, present, and future events.

In addition, the grammatical structures and vocabulary used by the student vary throughout, ranging from simple to complex structures. For example, some simple structures include adverbs of quantity (*'he conocido muchos amigos nuevos', 'he aprendido mucho'*), simple conditional (*'sería importante para muchos estudiantes en el cole'*), common adjectives (*'un verano tan bueno...es bueno para los estudiantes...una experiencia positiva...va a ser difícil...es algo importante'*) and present continuous (*'durante el verano los estudiantes están aprendiendo'*) which are common grammatical structures at A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Additionally, some examples of more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary used by the student include past perfect simple indicative (*'fui a Mexico para dos semanas...aprendí mucho...visité a monumentos maravillosas [visité monumentos maravillosos], tenía unas experiencias'*), present perfect compound indicative (*'mi español ha mejorado...he conocido muchos amigos nuevos...he aprendido que los países hispanohablantes son ricos en cultura...he escrito este correo'*), future periphrastic (*'me va a ayudar en el futuro...van a mejorar su español...van a volver del verano con'*), unstressed possessives (*'vivir sin mi familia...vivir sin su familia'*), phrases starting with 'I recommend+that+subjunctive' (*'recomiendo que el colegio pueba [pruebe] una [un] programa'*), and real conditional sentences (*'si hacen esto en muchos países los estudiantes van a tener mas diversidad'*) which are common grammatical structures at B1, B2 and C1 levels.

Marking analysis:

The IB awarded a mark 10/12 in Criterion A: language, indicating that the student's 'command of the language was mostly accurate and very effective'.⁴⁶⁶ This judgement aligns with Ecctis' findings regarding Criterion A. More specifically, the marking analysis of Criterion A found that a variety of basic and more complex grammatical structures are used to express present, past and future situations such as *'pretérito perfecto compuesto de indicativo and condicional simple'*. Despite the presence of some minor mistakes, communication was not hindered. A wide range of vocabulary was used to describe the experience of living in a Spanish speaking country. This included an attempt to use an idiomatic expression (*'para mi no importa un pepino'*, which was used instead of *'para mi no me importa un pepino'* [I don't care at all]), which in spite of not being used in formal contexts, serves as proof of the use of idiomatic expressions. However, the student needs to practice the use of agreement between articles, adjectives, and the corresponding nouns (*'una experiencia positivo'* is used instead of *'experiencia positiva'*; *'este experiencia'* is used instead of *'esta experiencia'*; *'una experiencia rico'* is used instead of *'experiencia rica'*). In addition, several omissions of articles were found

⁴⁶⁶ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.p.37.

throughout the text (e.g. '*prepara a estudiantes para vida...es bueno para estudiantes*' instead of '*prepara a los estudiantes para la vida...es bueno para los estudiantes...*'), which in spite of not impeding communication, constitute examples of basic grammatical errors. Additionally, there are also some vocabulary errors in the student sample which are minor and do not impede communication and understanding ('*encuentra*' instead of '*descubri*'; '*al primero*' instead of '*al principio*'). According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in Criterion A: language is equivalent to CEFR B2+ level.

Regarding Criterion B: message, the IB awarded a mark of 6/12 for the communication of message, meaning that 'the task is generally fulfilled' where 'some ideas are relevant to the task'.⁴⁶⁷ The findings of the marking analysis of Criterion B indicate that the student successfully described the experience of living in a Spanish speaking country. The student also described how living in a country where the target language is spoken would be advantageous for other learners and provided further explanation on how this would also benefit the school. The idea '*prepara a los estudiantes para [la] vida*' (prepare students for life) was mentioned twice in the text, using nearly the exact words, which highlights how ideas are not always relevant or clearly presented. In addition, the fact that the purpose of the email was not stated until the student was halfway through the text made it difficult for the reader to understand the reasons why this person was writing in the first place. This means that the message of the text was difficult to be determined and understood until reading half the text. The student briefly mentioned that the school should try to incorporate such exchange programs, yet they did not try to persuade them any further. Instead, they stated some additional and previously mentioned advantages, which indicates that the student's ideas were not always fully developed. In addition, the text was not organised in paragraphs. The student wrote the whole text leaving an empty line to correct mistakes, which implies that two empty lines would be needed between paragraphs so that the reader can clearly identify where a given idea starts or ends. Additionally, the analysis found that the student did not signpost enough. Only two basic linking words ('*también*' and '*aunque*') were found at the start of phrases. Most ideas within the text were connected using basic vocabulary such as '*y*' and '*pero*'. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion B: message is equivalent to CEFR B1 level.

Finally, the student was awarded a mark of 3/6 in Criterion C: conceptual understanding. This judgement suggests that 'conceptual understanding is mostly demonstrated', a finding that is generally in line with Ecctis judgement regarding the student's choice of text, context, purpose, target audience, task conventions, register and tone.⁴⁶⁸ More specifically, the marking analysis indicated the formality of the register and tone used in this text generally coincided with the context, purpose, and audience. However, there was a slight fluctuation of the tone when the expression '*[me] importa un pepino*' was introduced as this phrase is used in more informal contexts. Despite the student stating that this was an email, there were several aspects showing a limited understanding of the conventions used when writing emails. Firstly, the initial greeting ('*Hola a todos*' ['Hello everyone']) corresponded more to the conventions used in a social media post or informal group e-mail. Secondly, the student failed to introduce themselves when starting the text. Thirdly, the student started describing their experience without expressing the rationale for writing the text in the first place. The student did not close the text

⁴⁶⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 38.

⁴⁶⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*. p. 39.

with *'atentamente'* (kind regards), which would have been an appropriate form of concluding a formal e-mail. However, the writer thanked the audience at the end of the text, demonstrating some familiarity with the conventions of the chosen text type. According to the mark scheme analysis, this level of achievement in the Criterion C: message is equivalent to CEFR B1 level. The total number of marks assigned to this student sample by the IB were 19/30 marks.

CEFR analysis:

The sample has been analysed and compared to specific CEFR scales and descriptors in order to ascertain the overall CEFR level of the student's output text and verify the generalised level attributed by comparison to the mark scheme analysis. This student sample reflects elements of B1+, B2 and B2+ level descriptors in a wide range of CEFR activities and competences including Overall written production, Orthographic control, General linguistic range, Grammatical accuracy, Vocabulary control, Thematic development, Coherence and cohesion, and Propositional precision. The table below presents the summary of the findings of the CEFR analysis of student sample 5.

Table 65: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Writing (Paper 1) Student sample 5

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
Sample 5	<p>Overall written production: B2: 'Can produce clear, detailed texts on a variety of subjects related to their field of interest'.⁴⁶⁹</p> <p>General linguistic range: B2+: 'Can express themselves clearly without much sign of having to restrict what they want to say'.⁴⁷⁰</p> <p>Vocabulary control: C1: 'Occasional minor slips, but no significant vocabulary errors. Uses less common vocabulary idiomatically and appropriately'.⁴⁷¹</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: B2+: 'Good grammatical control; occasional 'slips' or non-systematic errors and minor flaws in sentence structure may still occur, but they are rare and can often be corrected in retrospect'.⁴⁷²</p> <p>Thematic development: B2: 'Can develop a clear description or narrative, expanding and supporting their main points with relevant supporting detail and examples'.⁴⁷³</p>	B2	<p>In the CEFR scale of Orthographic control this sample demonstrates elements of the B2 level descriptor as the spelling and punctuation are clearly intelligible.</p> <p>In the CEFR scale of General linguistic range this sample reflects elements of the B2+ level descriptor as the student can express themselves clearly without much sign of having to restrict what they want to say.</p> <p>Regarding Grammatical accuracy this sample aligns with the B2+ level descriptor as the student demonstrates good grammatical control of a range of tenses (at least 7 tenses) and the subjunctive, with only occasional errors that occur and do not impede understanding and communication.</p> <p>Regarding Vocabulary control, this sample reflects elements of the C1 level descriptor as there are only occasional and minor vocabulary slips.</p>

⁴⁶⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 66.

⁴⁷⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.130-131.

⁴⁷¹ Ibid. pp.132-133.

⁴⁷² Ibid. p. 132.

⁴⁷³ Ibid. p. 140.

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>Coherence and cohesion: B1+: ‘Can introduce a counterargument in a simple discursive text (e.g. with ‘however’). Can form longer sentences and link them together using a limited number of cohesive devices’.⁴⁷⁴</p> <p>Orthographic control: B2: ‘Spelling and punctuation are reasonably accurate but may show signs of mother-tongue influence’.⁴⁷⁵</p> <p>Propositional precision: B1+: ‘Can explain the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision’.⁴⁷⁶</p>		<p>In terms of Thematic development this sample reflects elements of the B2 level descriptor as the student presents clear arguments with examples, advantages and disadvantages.</p> <p>In terms of Coherence and cohesion this sample aligns with the B1+ level descriptor as the student presents the counter arguments by discussing disadvantages and difficulties.</p>

The CEFR analysis found that the overall CEFR level of this student sample is not lower than B2 because the learner was able to provide concrete information about their experience living in Mexico. The learner was also able to mention the advantages of living in a Spanish-speaking country. Additionally, the learner accurately used a variety of simple and more complex grammatical structures (*presente de indicativo, condicional simple, pretérito perfecto simple and pretérito perfecto compuesto*) that corresponded to this level. The student also used a good range of vocabulary. While there were a handful of basic errors, they were relatively minor, and they were only evident when the student tried using more complex grammatical structures. These minor errors did not often interfere with communication or the understanding of the message that the student aimed to convey.

In addition, the CEFR analysis found that the overall CEFR level of this student sample is not higher than B2. This is because the learner failed to follow the conventions that are typical of formal letters. The student seemed to be unaware of the need to introduce the purpose of the letter in the first paragraph and did not use the conventions expected for opening and closing an e-mail. In addition to this, the text lacked paragraphing conventions. The use of more complex linking devices to link sentences together smoothly into clear, connected discourse were also needed to achieve a higher CEFR level. The analysis also found that there is some repetition and underdevelopment of ideas. Therefore, this student sample does not demonstrate elements higher than B2 CEFR level.

⁴⁷⁴Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 141.

⁴⁷⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 136.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid. pp.141-142.

Speaking and Interactive skills

Standard Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the SL Spanish B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 9

Sample 9 was selected as it exemplifies a high range performance in the SL speaking assessment. The sample raises some complex issues about the ability of the mark scheme to engage with the performance of students who demonstrate a high linguistic competence and successfully engage and interact with the teacher by maintaining the interaction throughout the conversation.

Task analysis

In student sample 9 the student was asked to describe a picture entitled ‘Sharing our planet and deforestation’ (*Compartiendo nuestro planeta y la deforestación*) as part of the first component of the assessment. In the second component of the assessment the student answered questions related to the future of the planet and whether violence is justified when indigenous communities are trying to defend their territories. In the third component of the assessment the student explained the reasons for and benefits of travelling. The student also answered some questions related to how the freedoms of indigenous communities are restricted by the tourist industry. The presentation of the visual stimulus and the follow up discussion on the photograph as well as the conversation about general topics between the student and the teacher covered a wide range of IB prescribed themes including the themes of identities, social organisation and sharing the planet.⁴⁷⁷ More specifically, the task covered the public, personal and educational CEFR domains.⁴⁷⁸ The total number of marks available for this task were 30 marks.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this student’s sample include presentation skills, the ability to describe pictures and photographs, the ability to develop an argument, support a specific point of view and express views, opinions, and preferences. During the whole internal oral assessment, the teacher asked questions to the student, including questions related to both the photograph but also other IB prescribed themes and optional recommended topics from the syllabus. Additionally, the teacher used a very engaging and approachable tone of voice. There were a couple of occasions in which the teacher noticed that the question needed to be contextualised and provided additional information in order to help the student better understand the question. Throughout the speaking assessment the teacher paraphrased the questions making a connection with what the student mentioned. The teacher also checked if

⁴⁷⁷ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁴⁷⁸ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

the student was ready to make the transition to the third part of the oral assessment. Additionally, the teacher used ordinal numbers to indicate that a new question was coming. The teacher asked the student to use examples to elaborate on their answer. Additionally, the questions posed by the teacher included a combination of basic and more complex grammatical structures. Some examples of simple grammatical structures used by the teacher include present continuous (*'el señor está cuidando el bosque'*), nouns (*'arma', 'árboles', 'selva', 'montana', 'bosque', 'deforestación', 'peligro', 'indígena'*), present indicative (*'la imagen muestra una persona... pienso que los jóvenes si se toman este problema es serio...pienso que los indígenas son muy buenas personas'*), simple future (*'posiblemente tendremos muchos problemas'*), simple conditional (*'podríamos tener un futuro sin árboles'*), and adjectives (*'nativo de la región', 'es un hombre de estatura mediana', 'usa chores cortos y una camisa de colores'*) which are common in A1, A2, B1 CEFR levels.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment, the student used a wide range of common grammatical structures and also more complex grammatical structures with minor and rare errors when using more complex grammatical structures. More specifically, the student used some basic grammatic structures including present indicative (*'La imagen representa los efectos de la deforestación en América latina...Podemos ver un bosque latinoamericano con un par de árboles talados...Vemos a un hombre con un arma'*), demonstrative pronouns (*'Este hombre es probablemente uno de los indígenas'*), simple conditional (*'El aumento de la temperatura podría dañar mucho al planeta...especialmente porque el turismo perjudicaría la tierra'*), and adverbs of manner (*'La tala de árboles puede dañar fácilmente la naturaleza'*) which reflect elements of A1, A2 and B1 CEFR levels.

Furthermore, the student effectively used some complex grammatical structures including present subjunctive (*'Es importante que tratemos de proteger el medio ambiente...espero que podamos ayudar al medio ambiente'*), future simple indicative (*'Tendremos que ayudarlo a reponerse de todo el daño'*), passive voice (*'Es una organización crea [creada] por un youtuber..Su tierra puede ser tomada para ser utilizada'*), and real conditional sentences (*'Si no empezamos a ayudar al medio ambiente ahora podría llevar a consecuencias...el turismo puede crear mucha contaminación si las personas no tienen cuidado'*) which are common at B2 and C1 CEFR levels. Furthermore, the student effectively used some complex nouns such as *'indígenas, hombre, deforestación, imagen, refugio'*, some adjectives such as *'los problemas ambientes [ambientales] globales'* and some idiomatic expressions such as *'El gobierno necesita tirar la casa por la ventana en [para] ayudar al medio ambiente'*. Overall, it is evident from this sample that the student used both basic and some more complex grammatical structures and vocabulary effectively, with minor and rare errors when using more complex grammatical structures which did not impede communication. Additionally, the analysis of the output text indicated that the students' pronunciation and intonation were sometimes affected by mother-tongue influences, but generally these did not affect intelligibility.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings. The mark

scheme analysis of the speaking assessment criteria can be found in Appendix 1. The total score of the student sample was 29 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 11 marks for Criterion A: language which reflects B2+/C1 level, 6 marks for Criterion B1: message-visual stimulus which reflects B2+ level, 6 marks for Criterion B2: message-conversation which reflects B2 level and 6 marks for Criterion C: interactive skills-communication which reflects B2 level.

Ecctis agreed with the examiner's marking of this student sample. More specifically, regarding Criterion A: language, the learner produced utterances that demonstrate a mostly accurate command of the language with some minor mistakes being made that did not impede communication. This ranges from using basic structures such as '*presente de indicativo*' (e.g. '*La imagen representa los efectos de la deforestación en América latina*' [the image depicts the effects of deforestation in Latin America]) to using more complex structures such as passive voice ('*ser+participio*') '*su tierra puede ser tomada para ser utilizada*' (your land can be taken to be used). The learner was able to express simple probabilities (e.g. '*este hombre es probablemente uno de los indígenas*' [this man is probably one of the indigenous people]) as well as complex ones such as '*la pérdida de árboles puede hacer que el clima cambie*' (the loss of trees can bring about climate change). The student accurately used both simple conditional (e.g. '*el turismo perjudicaría la tierra*' [tourism would harm the land]) and real conditionals (e.g. '*si no empezamos a ayudar al medio ambiente ahora podría llevar a consecuencias*' [if we don't start to help the environment now it can lead to consequences]).

The student also produced sentences using the '*presente de subjuntivo*' ('*es importante que tratemos de proteger el medio ambiente*' [it's important that we try to protect the planet]) which is a more complex grammatical structure. In spite of some mistakes being made when using definite articles (e.g. '*la salud del tierra*' instead of '*la salud de la tierra*'; '*las glaciares*' instead of '*los glaciares*'), sentences such as '*esto incluye las ubicaciones más desconocidas y remotas*' (this includes more obscure and remote places) and '*muchos turistas van por todo el mundo*' (many tourists have gone to every part of the world) serve to prove not only the wide range of vocabulary used by the student, but also their command of the agreement between noun, gender, number and case. Despite some mistakes being made when using definite articles (e.g. '*los personas indígenas*' instead of '*las personas indígenas*'), the student used the definite article correctly when referring to '*el clima*' and '*los árboles*'. The student also used idiomatic expressions such as '*tirar la casa por la ventana*' [to go overboard] and more complex collocations such as '*Árboles talados*' (felled trees), '*efecto invernadero*' (greenhouse effect), '*dióxido de carbono*' (carbon dioxide) and '*recursos naturales*' (natural resources). Additionally, the analysis found that the student's pronunciation and intonation was accurate and contributed to the understanding of the message. However, there was some ellipsis of sounds as the student pronounced /*organizacions*/ instead of /*organizaciOnes*/ and /*entendo*/ instead of /*entlendo*/. Therefore, for all of these reasons, Ecctis agreed with the mark allocated to this student sample by the IB examiner.

Regarding Criterion B1: message-visual stimulus, the analysis found that the stimulus provided by the teacher was accurately described by the student using the elements found in the picture as well as the student's previous knowledge and interpretations. The introduction of statements such as '*en el fondo de la imagen*' (at the bottom of the image) or '*en el primer plano*' (in the foreground) helped the student to clearly describe their impressions. The student set this picture in a Latin American forest and explained how deforestation is affecting

communities in the continent. Therefore, the message was clearly and effectively articulated and conveyed by the student, and as a result Ecctis agreed with the mark allocated to the student sample regarding this criterion. In terms of Criterion B2: message-conversation, Ecctis also agreed with the mark given by the examiner to this sample as all the responses provided by the student were relevant to the questions and were further explained drawing on the student's understanding of the topic. The student was capable of not only demonstrating a clear understanding of what is happening in Latin American forests, but also expressed empathy with the struggles that indigenous people face. Additionally, Ecctis also agreed with the mark allocated by the examiner to this sample in relation to Criterion C: interactive skills-communication. This is because the student understood most of the questions except those which did not have a clear context. The student's interaction was sustained throughout the assessment. The student was very eager to expand their answers to the point that they presented further comments even when the time limit of the first part had expired.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis indicated that the student sample mostly aligned with the C1 level, with the student demonstrating a very high level of language proficiency. More specifically, this is because the student used a lot of language features, a wide range of grammar including a variety of tenses, passives, and complex vocabulary including idiomatic expressions. This student sample reflects elements of C1 level descriptors in a wide range of CEFR activities and competences including Overall oral interaction, Understanding an interlocutor, Interviewing and being interviewed, General linguistic range, Grammatical accuracy, Vocabulary range, Propositional precision, and Fluency. The table below presents the summary of the findings of the CEFR analysis of student sample 9.

Table 66: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish SL Internal assessment (Speaking) Student sample 9

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
Sample 9	<p>Overall oral interaction: C1: 'Can express themselves fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly. Has a good command of a broad lexical repertoire allowing gaps to be readily overcome with circumlocutions. There is little obvious searching for expressions or avoidance strategies; only a conceptually difficult subject can hinder a natural, smooth flow of language.'⁴⁷⁹</p> <p>Understanding an interlocutor: C1: 'Can understand an interlocutor in detail on abstract and complex topics of a specialist nature beyond their own field, though they may need to confirm occasional details, especially if the variety is unfamiliar'.⁴⁸⁰</p> <p>Conversation:</p>	B2+	The CEFR analysis found that the CEFR level is not lower than C1 because the student demonstrated a broad repertoire of language which enables fluent, spontaneous communication. Despite some minor mistakes being made, the learner showed very good grammatical control overall, for instance when using different forms to express conditional sentences and the accurate use of subjunctive, which is a rather challenging grammatical structure to use. The student also used passive voice accurately. The student shows command of a wide range of vocabulary, including the use of idiomatic expressions. Overall phonological control was also demonstrated in this assessment

⁴⁷⁹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 72.

⁴⁸⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 73.

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>C1: 'Can use language flexibly and effectively for social purposes, including emotional, allusive and joking usage'.⁴⁸¹</p> <p>Overall oral production: C1: 'Can give clear, detailed descriptions and presentations on complex subjects, integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion'.⁴⁸²</p> <p>General linguistic range: C1: 'Can use a broad range of complex grammatical structures appropriately and with considerable flexibility. Can select an appropriate formulation from a broad range of language to express themselves clearly, without having to restrict what they want to say'.⁴⁸³</p> <p>Vocabulary range: C1: 'Has a good command of a broad lexical repertoire allowing gaps to be readily overcome with circumlocutions; little obvious searching for expressions or avoidance strategies. Has a good command of common idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; can play with words fairly well'.⁴⁸⁴</p> <p>Grammatical accuracy: C1: 'Consistently maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy; errors are rare and difficult to spot'.⁴⁸⁵</p> <p>Propositional precision: C1: 'Can qualify opinions and statements precisely in relation to degrees of, for example, certainty/uncertainty, belief/doubt, likelihood, etc. Can make effective use of linguistic modality to signal the strength of a claim, an argument or a position'.⁴⁸⁶</p> <p>Fluency: C1: 'Can express themselves fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly. Only a conceptually difficult subject can hinder a natural, smooth flow of language'.⁴⁸⁷</p>		<p>apart from a couple of unnecessarily elided sounds, which did not hinder communication.</p> <p>Additionally, the CEFR analysis found that the CEFR level of this sample is not higher than C1 because the learner needs to master their ability to produce accurate sentences that show agreement between the noun, gender, number, and case. This will allow the student to convey finer shades of meaning precisely. Also, the student needs to integrate the use of more colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions in order to achieve a C2 level. At C2 level consistent grammatical control of complex language is required.</p>

⁴⁸¹ Ibid. pp. 73-74.

⁴⁸² Ibid. p. 62.

⁴⁸³ Ibid. pp. 130-131.

⁴⁸⁴ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

⁴⁸⁵ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 132.

⁴⁸⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp.141-142.

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 142.

Higher Level

The section below presents a detailed overview of the review and comparative analysis of the task, input text, marking analysis, output text analysis of the student samples of the HL Spanish B speaking and interactive skills assessment (internal assessment) of the M21 examination to the CEFR oral production and interaction activities, strategies and competences.

Student sample analysis

Sample 11

Sample 11 was selected as an example to demonstrate a medium range performance in the HL speaking assessment, where the student dropped some marks, particularly in relation to Criterion A as they tried using more complex vocabulary and grammatical structures but made errors which impeded communication and understanding.

Task analysis

In the first part of the assessment of sample 11 the student discusses a literary extract entitled 'Like water for chocolate' (*Como agua para chocolate*). In the second part of the assessment, the student answered questions related to the characters and speculates on how the story could have been different. In the third part of the assessment, the student answered some questions about the advantages and disadvantages of using the internet. The presentation of the literary extract, the follow up discussion of the literary extract and other general topics between the student and the teacher included a wide range of IB prescribed themes such as the theme of identities, experiences, and human ingenuity.⁴⁸⁸ More specifically, the task covered the public, personal, and educational CEFR domains.⁴⁸⁹ The total number of marks available for this task were 30 marks.

Input text analysis

The speaking skills assessed in this task include students' presentation skills, their ability to describe complex texts such as literary extracts, their ability to develop an argument and support a specific point of view, as well as express views, opinions, and preferences. During the whole internal oral assessment, the teacher contextualised the questions and paraphrased them when needed. Additionally, the teacher provided examples related to the student's experience of using the internet to help the learner understand the question. However, a clearer formulation of the question related to the advantages and disadvantages of using the internet by the teacher could have facilitated the student's initial understanding. The questions posed by the teacher included several basic grammatical structures, including indefinite quantifiers (*Usar el internet tiene muchas ventajas y desventajas*), nouns (*comida, prima, tradiciones, personas, familia*), present indicative (*veo mucho amor entre ellas*), unreal or impossible conditional sentences (*si ellos no hubiesen muerto*, *la historia sería diferente*), definite articles (*el internet*, *la inteligencia humana*), and indefinite articles (*una de las ventajas del internet es que...*) which reflect A1 and A2 CEFR levels. Furthermore, the questions posed by the teacher included a variety of language functions such as describing

⁴⁸⁸ International Baccalaureate (2021) *Language B Guide*.pp.18-20.

⁴⁸⁹ Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit, Strasbourg. p. 10.

facts and actions, things, situations, and people, expressing opinions, narrating, and describing past and present events, and developing an argument.

Output text analysis

During all three parts of the speaking assessment the student used a wide range of common grammatical structures such as present indicative (*'Pedro y Tita están en el rancho ...este extracto explicar [explica] que...Ella quiere cambio [cambiar] el lugar...ellos muestran su amor en este extracto... cuando Pedro y Tita no puedan [pueden] controlar su amor...ella explica que su padre vive en los departamento, nosotros podemos exceso [acceder]'*), past perfect simple indicative (*'Cuando Esperanza regresó de su viaje de bodas ella encontró el libro de cocina'*) and prepositions (*'En el rancho...en el [al] fin de este pasaje ellos dependen en [de] las redes sociales para comunicar'*) which are common at A2 and B1 CEFR level. In addition, the output text of the student sample included some additional simple grammatical structures such as common adjectives (*'Si yo pienso que este es un extracto muy bien [bueno] porque...Ellos son felicidades [felices]...es una herramienta útil'*), adverbs of manner (*'Si tu no usas correctamente...El terrano [el terreno]...Ellos son curiosidad [ellos sienten curiosidad]...Realismo mágico...Culturas y tradiciones de generaciones...Usarlo para su beneficio'*) and real conditional sentences (*'si tu sabes que usas, usar esta herramienta tu puedes usarlo para su [tú] beneficio.....si ella tiene niños ella no incluye las tradiciones [si ella hubiese tenido niños, no les habría enseñado las tradiciones]'*) which are common at B1 CEFR level. Furthermore, the student's sample included a wide range of language functions such as understanding and correct use of numbers, describe facts and actions, things, situations, and people, expressing opinions, narrating, and describing past and present events. The student sample also included language functions such as expressing likes and preferences, comparing things, explaining advantages and disadvantages, describing feelings and emotions, expressing speculations and hypotheses, and clarifying.

Marking analysis

During the next step of the student sample analysis, Ecctis conducted a review of how the sample was marked by the teacher on each one of the IB assessment criteria and analysed how these are mapped to CEFR levels based on the mark scheme analysis findings. The mark scheme analysis of the speaking assessment criteria can be found in Appendix 1. The total score of the student sample was 19 marks out of 30 marks. More specifically, the teacher allocated 6 marks for Criterion A: language, which reflects elements of B2 CEFR level, 5 marks for Criterion B1: message-literary extract, which reflects elements of B2 CEFR level, 4 marks for Criterion B2: message-conversation, which aligns with B1 level, and 4 marks for Criterion C: interactive skills-communication, which also reflects elements of B1 level.

Ecctis agreed with the examiner's marking on this student sample. More specifically, regarding Criterion A: language, the student used some complex words and collocations (such as *'realismo mágico'* [magical realism]; *'culturas y tradiciones de generaciones'* [cultures and traditions of generations]; and *'usarlo para su beneficio'* [use it to your advantage]). However, the student made some mistakes when using basic and more complex grammatical structures and specific vocabulary that hindered communication. For example, the student mentioned *'ellos son felicidades'* instead of *'ellos son felices'* (they are happy); *'las fruturas'* instead of *'las frutas'* (the fruit); *'la hija menor no puede amonadiar'* instead of *'la hija menor no puede enamorarse'* (the youngest daughter can't fall in love); *'los adolescentios'* instead of *'los*

adolescentes' (adolescents) and other errors. Some basic grammatical structures such as present indicative (*presente de indicativo*) was accurately used at times such as in the sentence of '*Pedro y Tita están en el rancho*' (Pedro and Tita are at the ranch); and '*ella explica que su padre vive en...*' (she explains that her father lives in...). Nevertheless, the analysis found that some verbs were not conjugated properly by the student such as '*este extracto explicar que*' instead of '*este extracto explica que*' (this extract explains that); and '*nosotros tenemos...toda la información que necesitan*' instead of '*nosotros tenemos toda la información que necesitamos*' (we have all the information we need). A positive aspect to highlight is the student's ability to self-correct their own errors. Additionally, the analysis found that there were also some issues with the agreement between noun, gender, number, and case, for example in the phrases of '*Las verduras es deliciosas*' instead of '*las verduras son deliciosas*' (the vegetables are delicious); and '*la información no es correcto*' instead of '*la información no es correcta*' (the information isn't correct).

The student used some complex structures such as *pretérito imperfecto de indicativo* e.g. '*Tita era la hija menor en su familia...*' (Tita was the youngest child in her family) and the *pretérito perfecto simple de indicativo* such as in the phrase of '*Cuando Esperanza regresó de su viaje de bodas ella encontró el libro de cocina*' (when Esperanza returned from her honeymoon she found the cookbook). However, the student was not able to use more complex structures such as unreal conditionals (*oraciones condicionales irreal o imposibles*). The analysis found that the student's pronunciation was mainly intelligible, yet some errors were noticed that did not impede communication. For example, this was evident when the student said /*habitantes*/ instead of /*abitantes*/ in spite of /h/ being a silent sound in Spanish.

In terms of Criterion B1: message-literary extract, the analysis found that the literary extract provided by the teacher was accurately described by the student using the elements found in the literary extract as well as the student's previous knowledge and interpretations. More specifically, the learner based their presentation on the literary extract provided. The most relevant aspects mentioned in the extract were highlighted, and the student was able both to identify and to refer to the most important moments of the plot development. However, linguistic limitations did not allow the learner to express personal opinions, yet reference was made to the impact social traditions and cultures have on individuals. Regarding Criterion B2: message-conversation, the marking analysis found that the student was able to answer most questions, yet the lack of understanding of some questions resulted in some answers not being developed in depth. More specifically, the student could have referred to their own experience as an internet user to expand the information provided when explaining the advantages and disadvantages of accessing the internet. Finally, in terms of Criterion C: interactive skills-communication, the analysis found that the student was able to respond to most of the teacher's questions and asked for clarification to keep the conversation going. However, breakdowns in understanding limited the student talking time to respond to the questions as the teacher's interventions had to be increased towards the end of the exam in order to provide clarifications to the student and help them respond to the final questions.

CEFR analysis

The CEFR analysis indicated this student sample reflects elements of A2, A2+ and B1 level descriptors in a wide range of CEFR activities and competences used for the analysis such as Overall oral interaction.

Table 67: Summary of CEFR analysis of the Spanish HL Internal assessment (Speaking) Student sample 11

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
Sample 11	<p>Expressing a personal response to creative texts (including literature): B1: 'Can describe a character's feelings and explain the reasons for them'.⁴⁹⁰</p> <p>Overall oral interaction: A2: 'Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters to do with work and free time. Can handle very short social exchanges but is rarely able to understand enough to keep conversation going of their own accord'.⁴⁹¹</p> <p>Conversation: B1: 'Can maintain a conversation or discussion but may sometimes be difficult to follow when trying to express exactly what they would like to'.⁴⁹²</p> <p>Overall oral production: B1: 'Can reasonably fluently sustain a straightforward description of one of a variety of subjects within their field of interest, presenting it as a linear sequence of points'.⁴⁹³</p> <p>Sustained monologue: describing experiences: B1: 'Can describe events, real or imagined'.⁴⁹⁴</p> <p>General linguistic range: B1: 'Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events, but lexical limitations cause repetition and even difficulty with formulation at times'.⁴⁹⁵</p> <p>Vocabulary range:</p>	B1	<p>Regarding Expressing a personal response to creative texts (including literature), this sample reflects elements of B1 level because the student is able to describe the feelings and desire of the characters in the presentation section.</p> <p>In terms of Overall oral interaction, the sample reflects elements of A2 level because the demands of the conversation go beyond 'very short social exchanges'.</p> <p>In terms of Conversation the sample reflects elements of B1 level because the student can maintain a conversation despite difficulties, and can enter a conversation unprepared, as they do in the second and third part of the assessment.</p> <p>In terms of Overall oral production, the sample reflects elements of B1 level, because the student is able to maintain a degree of 'reasonable fluency', although they are a bit more hesitant in the later stages of the assessment, credit should be given for the presentation too.</p> <p>In relation to Sustained monologue (describing experiences), this sample reflects elements of B1 level because in their literary analysis the student can 'describe events, real or imagined'.</p> <p>Regarding General linguistic range, the analysis found that this sample reflects elements of B1 level because the student is capable of using sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with hesitations, they use the present and imperfect tenses and relative pronouns.</p>

⁴⁹⁰ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. pp. 106-107.

⁴⁹¹ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 72.

⁴⁹² Ibid. pp. 73-74.

⁴⁹³ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 62.

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid. pp. 62-62.

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid. pp. 130-131.

Student sample	CEFR activities, strategies and competences	Overall CEFR Level	Evidence
	<p>B1: 'Has sufficient vocabulary to express themselves with some circumlocutions on most topics pertinent to their everyday life such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel and current events. Has a good range of vocabulary related to familiar topics and everyday situations.'</p> <p>⁴⁹⁶</p>		<p>Regarding Vocabulary range, the sampler aligns with the B1 level descriptors because this is more than a routine everyday transaction.</p>

The CEFR analysis found that the CEFR level of this student sample is not lower than B1 level because the student demonstrated the ability to maintain simple conversations. Additionally, the student was able to use their knowledge of basic grammatical structures such as present simple, as well as more complex structures such as conditionals to describe and briefly speculate about the events and activities taking place in the literary extract. Despite such complex texts not being part of an everyday conversation, the student was able to use simple descriptive language to make brief statements about this literary extract. In addition, possessing a clear and mainly accurate pronunciation facilitated the transmission of the message. Some of the words and collocations used (such as 'magical realism' and 'cultures and traditions of generations') showed that the learners' lexical abilities surpass that of a standard basic user of the language.

Furthermore, the CEFR analysis indicated that the CEFR level of this student sample is not higher than B1 because the student should have used more basic and complex grammatical structures with greater level of control in order to convey the message more accurately. For example, the lack of agreement between noun, gender, number, and case in some cases hindered communication significantly as the listener frequently had to try and understand what the student wanted to say. Additionally, the learner needed to work on the conjugation of verbs as making utterances such as '*este extracto explicar que*' instead of '*este extracto explica que*' is evidence of the need to master basic linguistic principles used in Spanish. Being able to use a wider range of simple language more flexibly should result in less grammatical and lexical repair, which in turn will increase the student's fluency.

⁴⁹⁶ Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. p. 131.

Appendix 6: IB Grade Descriptors Analysis

A key process to support Ecctis' overall findings of alignment between IB DP subject grades and CEFR levels was to analyse the overarching grade descriptors that the IB possesses (for internal use). There is one set of descriptors for Group 1 subjects, a second for Group 2 HL, and third for Group 2 SL.

The following tables demonstrate the CEFR scales and descriptors which were judged by Ecctis to be the best fit for each IB DP grade descriptor in the relevant subject groups. Each grade, 1-7, has an accompanying descriptor which is based on common phraseology surrounding the skills and competences that students will display. The variation between each grade's descriptor is largely in small changes to the adjectives used to describe aptitude in each skill or competence. In the tables below, the key areas of each descriptor which articulate the difference from the grades above/below are underlined.

The tables below show a list of CEFR activities, strategies, and competences which have meaningful overlap with the content of the grade descriptors. Rather than listing every single CEFR scale that could have relevance to these descriptors, those with the most noticeable overlap are shown.

As these grade descriptors are very broad in nature, it was rarely possible to identify a single CEFR level and descriptor, within each scale, which was a perfect fit with the IB grade descriptor. However, a small range of best-fit CEFR level descriptors was identifiable for each of these communicative language activities, strategies, and competences. Moreover, the Group 1 descriptors do not only describe language proficiency, but also the other skills and competences developed within Group 1, making direct alignment with a single CEFR level per scale more challenging. As a consequence of this best-fit approach, each IB grade can be narrowed down to a small range of overall CEFR levels that are likely to correspond with students' evidenced language proficiency at that grade. There is overlap between the CEFR levels mapped to each grade through this method, as the differences between each IB grade's descriptors are quite nuanced.

The grade alignment indications developed in the tables below are the first step towards aligning IB subject grades to CEFR levels. Detailed scrutiny of assessment papers, assessment items, student samples, and grade boundaries is also incorporated into the pool of evidence before final conclusions on alignment are reached.

Table 68: Grade alignment indications of the Group 1 IB subject grades to CEFR levels

Group 1 (Studies in Language and Literature) Grade Descriptors			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
7	Demonstrates: <u>excellent</u> understanding and appreciation of the interplay between form and content in regard to the question or task; responses that <u>may be convincing, detailed, independent</u> in analysis, synthesis and evaluation;	Analysis and Criticism of Creative Texts (including literature): C1/C2 Coherence and Cohesion: C1/C2 Expressing a Personal Response to Creative Texts (including literature): C1	C1/C2

Group 1 (Studies in Language and Literature) Grade Descriptors			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
	<u>highly developed</u> levels of expression, both orally and in writing; <u>very good</u> degree of accuracy and clarity; <u>very good</u> awareness of context and appreciation of the effect on the audience/reader; <u>very effective</u> structure with <u>relevant</u> textual detail to support a <u>critical engagement</u> with the thoughts and feelings expressed in the work(s).	Fluency: C1/C2 General Linguistic Range: C1/C2 Grammatical Accuracy: C1/C2 Overall Oral Production: C1/C2 Overall Reading Comprehension: C1/C2 Overall Written Production: C1/C2 Reports and Essays: C1/C2 Thematic Development: C1/C2 Vocabulary Control: C1/C2 Vocabulary Range: C1/C2	
6	Demonstrates: <u>very good</u> understanding and appreciation of the interplay between form and content in regard to the question or task; responses that are, <u>mainly, convincing, as well as detailed and independent to some degree</u> , in analysis, synthesis and evaluation; <u>well-developed</u> levels of expression, both orally and in writing; <u>good degree</u> of accuracy and clarity; <u>good awareness</u> of context and appreciation of the effect on the audience/reader; <u>effective</u> structure with <u>relevant</u> textual detail to support a <u>critical engagement</u> with the thoughts and feelings expressed in the work(s).	Analysis and Criticism of Creative Texts (including literature): C1 Coherence and Cohesion: C1/C2 Expressing a Personal Response to Creative Texts (including literature): C1 Fluency: C1/C2 General Linguistic Range: C1 Grammatical Accuracy: C1/C2 Overall Oral Production: C1/C2 Overall Reading Comprehension: C1/C2 Overall Written Production: C1/C2 Reports and Essays: C1 Thematic Development: C1 Vocabulary Control: C1/C2 Vocabulary Range: C1	C1/C2
5	Demonstrates: <u>good</u> understanding and appreciation of the interplay between form and content in regard to the question or task; responses that offer <u>generally considered and valid</u> analysis, synthesis and/or evaluation; <u>good levels</u> of expression, both orally and in writing; <u>adequate degree</u> of accuracy and clarity; <u>awareness</u> of context and appreciation of the effect on the audience/reader; <u>clear</u> structure with <u>relevant</u> textual detail to support an <u>engagement</u> with the thoughts and feelings expressed in the work(s).	Analysis and Criticism of Creative Texts (including literature): B2 Coherence and Cohesion: B2+ Expressing a Personal Response to Creative Texts (including literature): B2 Fluency: B2+ General Linguistic Range: B2+/C1 Grammatical Accuracy: B2+ Overall Oral Production: B2/B2+ Overall Reading Comprehension: C1 Overall Written Production: B2 Reports and Essays: B2+ Thematic Development: B2/B2+ Vocabulary Control: B2/C1 Vocabulary Range: B2+	B2-B2+
4	Demonstrates: <u>adequate</u> knowledge and understanding of the question or task; responses that are <u>generally valid</u> in analysis and/or synthesis; <u>satisfactory powers</u> of expression, both orally and in writing; <u>few lapses</u> in accuracy and clarity; <u>some awareness</u> of context and appreciation of the effect on the audience/reader; a <u>basic structure</u> within which the thoughts and feelings of the work(s) are <u>explored</u> .	Analysis and Criticism of Creative Texts (including literature): B2 Coherence and Cohesion: B1+ Expressing a Personal Response to Creative Texts (including literature): B1/B2 Fluency: B1+ General Linguistic Range: B2 Grammatical Accuracy: B2	B1+-B2

Group 1 (Studies in Language and Literature) Grade Descriptors			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
		Overall Oral Production: B1/B2 Overall Reading Comprehension: B2 Overall Written Production: B1/B2 Reports and Essays: B1+/B2 Thematic Development: B1+ Vocabulary Control: B2 Vocabulary Range: B2	
3	Demonstrates: <u>some</u> knowledge and some understanding of the question or task; responses that are <u>only sometimes valid and/or appropriately</u> detailed; <u>some appropriate</u> powers of expression, both orally and in writing; <u>lapses</u> in accuracy and clarity; <u>limited awareness</u> of context and appreciation of the effect on the audience/reader; <u>some evidence of a structure</u> within which the thoughts and feelings of the work(s) are <u>explored</u> .	Analysis and Criticism of Creative Texts (including literature): B1 Coherence and Cohesion: B1+ Expressing a Personal Response to Creative Texts (including literature): B1 Fluency: B1 General Linguistic Range: B1/B1+ Grammatical Accuracy: B1+ Overall Oral Production: B1/B2 Overall Reading Comprehension: B1 Overall Written Production: B1 Reports and Essays: B1/B1+ Thematic Development: B1 Vocabulary Control: B1/B2 Vocabulary Range: B1/B2	B1-B1+
2	Demonstrates: <u>superficial</u> knowledge and understanding of the question or task; responses that are of <u>generally limited validity</u> ; <u>limited powers</u> of expression, both orally and in writing; <u>significant lapses</u> in accuracy and clarity; <u>little awareness</u> of context and appreciation of the effect on the audience/reader; <u>rudimentary structure</u> within which the thoughts and feelings of the work(s) are <u>explored</u> .	Analysis and Criticism of Creative Texts (including literature): A2 Coherence and Cohesion: A2+ Expressing a Personal Response to Creative Texts (including literature): A2 Fluency: A2+ General Linguistic Range: A2+ Grammatical Accuracy: A2 Overall Oral Production: A2 Overall Reading Comprehension: A2/A2+ Overall Written Production: A2/B1 Reports and Essays: A2/B1 Thematic Development: A2+ Vocabulary Control: A2 Vocabulary Range: A2+	A2-A2+
1	Demonstrates: <u>very rudimentary</u> knowledge and understanding of the question or task; responses that are of <u>very limited validity</u> ; <u>very limited powers</u> of expression, both orally and in writing; <u>widespread lapses</u> in accuracy and clarity; <u>no awareness</u> of context and appreciation of the effect on the audience/reader; <u>very rudimentary structure</u> within which the thoughts and feelings of the work(s) are <u>explored</u> .	Analysis and Criticism of Creative Texts (including literature): N/A Coherence and Cohesion: A2 Expressing a Personal Response to Creative Texts (including literature): A1 Fluency: A2 General Linguistic Range: A2 Grammatical Accuracy: A1 Overall Oral Production: A2 Overall Reading Comprehension: A2 Overall Written Production: A2 Reports and Essays: A2 Thematic Development: A2+ Vocabulary Control: A2	A1-A2

Group 1 (Studies in Language and Literature) Grade Descriptors			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
		Vocabulary Range: A2	

Table 69: Grade alignment indications of the Group 2 SL IB subject grades to CEFR levels

Group 2 (Language Acquisition) Grade Descriptors – Language B SL			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
7	Students speak <u>clearly, fluently and naturally</u> ; use a <u>varied and idiomatic range</u> of language <u>accurately</u> ; handle ideas <u>effectively with active and full interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>very good understanding of the meaning and purpose</u> of written texts; have <u>little difficulty</u> with more difficult questions; write <u>detailed texts</u> demonstrating a <u>very good command</u> of vocabulary and complex structures with a <u>very good level</u> of grammatical accuracy; adapt their writing <u>effectively</u> to suit the intended audience and purpose; express their ideas and organize their work <u>coherently and convincingly</u> .	Coherence and Cohesion: B2+ Fluency: B2+ General Linguistic Range: B2+ Grammatical Accuracy: B2+ Overall Oral Comprehension: B2+ Overall Oral Interaction: B2+ Overall Oral Production: B2+ Overall Reading Comprehension: B2 Overall Written Production: B2 Overall Written Interaction: C1 Reports and Essays: B2+ Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: B2+ Vocabulary Control: C1 Vocabulary Range: C1 Identifying cues and inferring: B2	B2-B2+
6	Students speak <u>mostly clearly and fluently</u> ; use a <u>varied range</u> of language <u>mostly accurately</u> ; handle ideas <u>mostly effectively, with generally full interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>good understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>some difficulties</u> with more difficult questions; write <u>fairly detailed texts</u> demonstrating a <u>good command</u> of vocabulary with a <u>good level</u> of grammatical accuracy; adapt their writing <u>appropriately</u> to suit the intended audience and purpose; express their ideas and organize their work <u>coherently</u> .	Coherence and Cohesion: B1+/B2 Fluency: B2 General Linguistic Range: B1+/B2 Grammatical Accuracy: B2 Overall Oral Comprehension: B2 Overall Oral Interaction: B2 Overall Oral Production: B2 Overall Reading Comprehension: B2 Overall Written Production: B2 Overall Written Interaction: B2 Reports and Essays: B2 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: B2 Vocabulary Control: B2 Vocabulary Range: B2/ B2+ Identifying cues and inferring: B1+	B1+-B2
5	Students speak <u>generally clearly</u> ; use a <u>basic range</u> of language <u>correctly</u> ; handle ideas <u>adequately with full interaction at times</u> ; demonstrate an <u>adequate understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>some difficulties with almost all</u> difficult questions <u>and some average questions</u> ; write texts demonstrating an <u>adequate command</u> of vocabulary with an <u>adequate level</u> of grammatical accuracy; show a <u>reasonable ability</u> to adapt their writing to suit the intended audience and	Coherence and Cohesion: B1+ Fluency: B1+ General Linguistic Range: B1+ Grammatical Accuracy: B1+ Overall Oral Comprehension: B1+ Overall Oral Interaction: B1+ Overall Oral Production: B1 Overall Reading Comprehension: B1 Overall Written Production: B1 Overall Written Interaction: B1+ Reports and Essays: B1+ Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: B1	B1-B1+

Group 2 (Language Acquisition) Grade Descriptors – Language B SL			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
	purpose; express their ideas and organize their work <u>appropriately</u> .	Vocabulary Control: B1 Vocabulary Range: B1 Identifying cues and inferring: B1	
4	Students speak <u>hesitantly and at times unclearly</u> ; use a <u>simple range</u> of language <u>correctly at times</u> ; handle ideas with <u>some difficulty and with fairly limited interaction</u> ; demonstrate <u>some understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; <u>have difficulties</u> with questions of <u>average difficulty</u> ; write texts demonstrating a <u>basic command</u> of vocabulary and <u>some awareness</u> of grammatical structure; show <u>some ability</u> to adapt their writing to suit the intended audience and purpose; make <u>some attempt</u> at expressing their ideas and organizing their work.	Coherence and Cohesion: B1 Fluency: B1 General Linguistic Range: B1 Grammatical Accuracy: B1 Overall Oral Comprehension: B1 Overall Oral Interaction: B1 Overall Oral Production: A2 Overall Reading Comprehension: A2+ Overall Written Production: A2 Overall Written Interaction: B1 Reports and Essays: B1 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: A2+/B1 Vocabulary Control: B1 Vocabulary Range: A2+ Identifying cues and inferring: A2+	A2+-B1
3	Students speak <u>hesitantly and generally unclearly</u> ; use a <u>limited range</u> of language, <u>often incorrectly</u> ; handle ideas with <u>difficulty and with restricted interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>fairly limited understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; <u>have difficulties</u> with <u>some easy questions</u> ; write texts demonstrating a <u>fairly limited command</u> of vocabulary and <u>little awareness</u> of grammatical structure; produce an <u>identifiable</u> text type; make <u>some attempt at basic</u> organization; content is <u>rarely convincing</u> .	Coherence and Cohesion: A2+ Fluency: A2+ General Linguistic Range: A2+ Grammatical Accuracy: A2 Overall Oral Comprehension: A2 Overall Oral Interaction: A2 Overall Oral Production: A2 Overall Reading Comprehension: A2 Overall Written Production: A2 Overall Written Interaction: A2 Reports and Essays: A2 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: A2+ Vocabulary Control: A2 Vocabulary Range: A2 Identifying cues and inferring: A2	A2+-B1
2	Students speak <u>hesitantly and unclearly</u> ; use a <u>very limited range</u> of language <u>mostly incorrectly</u> ; handle ideas with <u>great difficulty and with very restricted interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>limited understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>difficulties</u> even with <u>easiest questions</u> ; write texts demonstrating a <u>limited command</u> of vocabulary and <u>little awareness</u> of grammatical structure; produce an <u>identifiable</u> text type <u>with limited success</u> ; <u>lack organization</u> to an extent that content is <u>unconvincing</u> .	Coherence and Cohesion: A2 Fluency: A1/A2 General Linguistic Range: A1/A2 Grammatical Accuracy: A1 Overall Oral Comprehension: A1 Overall Oral Interaction: A1 Overall Oral Production: A1 Overall Reading Comprehension: A1 Overall Written Production: A1 Overall Written Interaction: A1 Reports and Essays: A2 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: A2 Vocabulary Control: A2 Vocabulary Range: A2 Identifying cues and inferring: A1	A1-A2
1	Students speak <u>very hesitantly and unclearly</u> ; use a <u>very limited range</u> of	Coherence and Cohesion: A1	A1 or below

Group 2 (Language Acquisition) Grade Descriptors – Language B SL			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
	language <u>incorrectly</u> ; handle ideas <u>unsuccessfully and with very restricted interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>very limited understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>difficulties</u> with <u>almost all</u> questions; write texts demonstrating a <u>very limited command</u> of vocabulary and <u>very little awareness</u> of grammatical structure; produce a <u>barely identifiable</u> text type; <u>lack organization</u> to an extent that content is <u>confusing</u> .	Fluency: Pre-A1/ A1 General Linguistic Range: Pre-A1/ A1 Grammatical Accuracy: Pre-A1 Overall Oral Comprehension: Pre-A1 Overall Oral Interaction: Pre-A1 Overall Oral Production: Pre-A1 Overall Reading Comprehension: Pre-A1 Overall Written Production: Pre-A1 Overall Written Interaction: Pre-A1 Reports and Essays: A2 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: A1 Vocabulary Control: A2 Vocabulary Range: A1 Identifying cues and inferring: Pre-A1	

Table 70: Grade alignment indications of the Group 2 HL IB subject grades to CEFR levels

Group 2 (Language Acquisition) Grade Descriptors – Language B HL			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
7	Students speak with <u>clarity and fluency</u> ; use a <u>richly varied and idiomatic range</u> of language <u>very accurately</u> ; handle ideas <u>effectively and skillfully with active and complex interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>thorough understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>little difficulty</u> with the <u>most difficult</u> questions; recognize <u>almost all the subtleties</u> of specific language usage; write <u>detailed and expressive</u> texts demonstrating an <u>excellent command</u> of vocabulary and <u>complex</u> structures with a consistently <u>high level</u> of grammatical accuracy; demonstrate <u>clarity</u> of thought in the organization of their work and an ability to <u>engage, convince and influence</u> the audience.	Coherence and Cohesion: C1 Fluency: C1 General Linguistic Range: C1 Grammatical Accuracy: C1 Overall Oral Comprehension: C1 Overall Oral Interaction: C1 Overall Oral Production: C1 Overall Reading Comprehension: C1 Overall Written Production: C1 Overall Written Interaction: C1 Reports and Essays: C1 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: C1 Vocabulary Control: C1 Vocabulary Range: C1 Identifying cues and inferring: C1	B2+-C1
6	Students speak <u>clearly, fluently and naturally</u> ; use a <u>varied and idiomatic range</u> of language <u>accurately</u> ; handle ideas <u>effectively with active and full interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>very good understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>little difficulty</u> with <u>more difficult</u> questions; recognize <u>most of the subtleties</u> of specific language usage; write <u>detailed</u> texts demonstrating a <u>very good command</u> of vocabulary and <u>complex</u> structures with a <u>very good level</u> of grammatical accuracy; adapt their	Coherence and Cohesion: B2+ Fluency: B2+ General Linguistic Range: B2+ Grammatical Accuracy: B2+ Overall Oral Comprehension: B2+ Overall Oral Interaction: B2+ Overall Oral Production: B2+ Overall Reading Comprehension: B2 Overall Written Production: B2 Overall Written Interaction: C1 Reports and Essays: B2+ Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: B2+	B2-B2+

Group 2 (Language Acquisition) Grade Descriptors – Language B HL			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
	writing <u>appropriately</u> to suit the intended audience and purpose; express their ideas and organize their work <u>coherently and convincingly</u> .	Vocabulary Control: C1 Vocabulary Range: C1 Identifying cues and inferring: B2	
5	Students speak <u>mostly clearly and fluently</u> ; use a <u>varied range</u> of language <u>mostly accurately</u> ; handle ideas <u>mostly effectively with generally full interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>good understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>some difficulties</u> with <u>more difficult</u> questions; <u>recognize some subtleties</u> of specific language usage; write <u>fairly detailed</u> texts demonstrating a <u>good command</u> of vocabulary with a <u>good level</u> of grammatical accuracy; show a <u>reasonable ability</u> to adapt their writing to suit the intended audience and purpose; express their ideas and organize their work <u>coherently</u> .	Coherence and Cohesion: B2 Fluency: B2 General Linguistic Range: B2 Grammatical Accuracy: B2 Overall Oral Comprehension: B2 Overall Oral Interaction: B2 Overall Oral Production: B2 Overall Reading Comprehension: B2 Overall Written Production: B2 Overall Written Interaction: B2 Reports and Essays: B2 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: B2 Vocabulary Control: B2 Vocabulary Range: B2/B2+ Identifying cues and inferring: B1+	B2
4	Students speak <u>generally clearly</u> ; use a <u>basic range</u> of language <u>correctly</u> ; handle ideas <u>adequately with full interaction at times</u> ; demonstrate an <u>adequate understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>some difficulties</u> with <u>almost all difficult</u> questions and <u>some average</u> questions; <u>recognize a few subtleties</u> of specific language usage; write texts demonstrating an <u>adequate command</u> of vocabulary with an <u>adequate level</u> of grammatical accuracy; show <u>some ability</u> to adapt their writing to suit the intended audience and purpose; express their ideas and organize their work <u>appropriately</u> .	Coherence and Cohesion: B1+ Fluency: B1+ General Linguistic Range: B1+ Grammatical Accuracy: B1+ Overall Oral Comprehension: B1+ Overall Oral Interaction: B1+ Overall Oral Production: B1 Overall Reading Comprehension: B1 Overall Written Production: B1 Overall Written Interaction: B1+ Reports and Essays: B1+ Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: B1/B2 Vocabulary Control: B1 Vocabulary Range: B1 Identifying cues and inferring: B1	B1+/B1
3	Students speak <u>hesitantly and at times unclearly</u> ; use a <u>simple range</u> of language <u>correctly at times</u> ; handle ideas with <u>some difficulty with fairly limited interaction</u> ; demonstrate <u>some understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>difficulties</u> with questions of <u>average difficulty</u> ; write texts demonstrating a <u>basic command</u> of vocabulary and <u>some awareness</u> of grammatical structure; produce an <u>identifiable</u> text type; make <u>some attempt</u> at expressing their ideas and organizing their work.	Coherence and Cohesion: B1 Fluency: B1 General Linguistic Range: B1 Grammatical Accuracy: B1 Overall Oral Comprehension: B1 Overall Oral Interaction: A2+/ B1 Overall Oral Production: A2 Overall Reading Comprehension: A2+ Overall Written Production: A2 Overall Written Interaction: B1 Reports and Essays: B1 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: B1 Vocabulary Control: B1 Vocabulary Range: A2+ Identifying cues and inferring: A2+	A2+/B1
2	Students speak <u>hesitantly and generally unclearly</u> ; use a <u>limited range</u> of	Coherence and Cohesion: A2+ Fluency: A2+	A2

Group 2 (Language Acquisition) Grade Descriptors – Language B HL			
IB Grade	IB Grade Descriptor	Most Relevant CEFR Scales / Descriptors	Overall Likely CEFR Level
	language <u>often incorrectly</u> ; handle ideas with <u>difficulty and with restricted interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>fairly limited understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>difficulties</u> with <u>some easy questions</u> ; write texts demonstrating a <u>fairly limited command</u> of vocabulary and <u>little awareness</u> of grammatical structure; produce an <u>identifiable</u> text type with <u>limited success</u> ; make <u>some attempt</u> at <u>basic organization</u> ; content is <u>rarely convincing</u> .	General Linguistic Range: A2+ Grammatical Accuracy: A2 Overall Oral Comprehension: A2 Overall Oral Interaction: A2 Overall Oral Production: A2 Overall Reading Comprehension: A2 Overall Written Production: A2 Overall Written Interaction: A2 Reports and Essays: A2 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: A2+ Vocabulary Control: A2 Vocabulary Range: A2 Identifying cues and inferring: A2	
1	Students speak <u>hesitantly and unclearly</u> ; use a <u>very limited range</u> of language <u>mostly incorrectly</u> ; handle ideas with <u>great difficulty and with very restricted interaction</u> ; demonstrate a <u>limited understanding</u> of the meaning and purpose of written texts; have <u>difficulties</u> even with <u>easiest questions</u> ; write texts demonstrating a <u>limited command</u> of vocabulary and <u>little awareness</u> of grammatical structure; produce a <u>barely identifiable</u> text type; <u>lack organization</u> to an extent that content is <u>unconvincing</u> .	Coherence and Cohesion: A2 Fluency: A2 General Linguistic Range: A1/A2 Grammatical Accuracy: A1 Overall Oral Comprehension: A1 Overall Oral Interaction: A1 Overall Oral Production: A1 Overall Reading Comprehension: A1 Overall Written Production: A1 Overall Written Interaction: A1 Reports and Essays: A2 Sociolinguistic Appropriateness: A1/A2 Vocabulary Control: A2 Vocabulary Range: A2 Identifying cues and inferring: A1	A1