

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each section of this course assessment component.

Section 2 Discursive Writing

Candidate A

The candidate was awarded **16 marks**.

Content

The essay reads reasonably well and most of the content is comprehensible. It is largely relevant to the original essay title but deals somewhat superficially with the subject matter; greater depth of thought would have been welcome here, as the views given are often poorly developed. The ideas expressed by the candidate also lack depth and sophistication and are presented somewhat clumsily at times.

Accuracy

The meaning is unclear in a few places due to poor control of the language structure. There are frequent verb errors throughout (many of which are quite serious at this level) and there are also many other grammatical inaccuracies of various types.

Language resource

The level of language used is fairly limited and not particularly varied, with some constructions and expressions being repeated several times. The overall structure of the essay could also be much clearer – there is inadequate paragraphing.

Candidate B

The candidate was awarded **32 marks**.

Content

The essay is fully relevant to the chosen title and reads very fluently and naturally. There is evidence of a mature and thoughtful approach to the subject matter which is dealt with in a sophisticated and stylish manner. However, the essay is far too brief – it is 103 words short of the lower recommended length of 250 words – and the reader is left with the impression that the ideas and content could have been developed much further.

Accuracy

The candidate states at the beginning of the essay that she is originally from Italy and is most probably a native speaker. The language used is entirely accurate, with no errors of grammar or vocabulary.

Language resource

The range of structures and level of vocabulary used are both of a very high standard and ideas and opinions are expressed clearly and effectively.

The essay has been awarded a mark of 32, but had the candidate been able to develop her ideas and arguments more fully she might have attained a higher mark.

Candidate C

The candidate was awarded **40 marks**.

Content

The essay is well structured and the content is totally relevant to the title. The essay reads very naturally and it is evident that the response has been well thought-out and expressed using a wide range of vocabulary and idioms.

Accuracy

There is a high degree of grammatical and vocabulary accuracy throughout; the few mistakes that do occur are of a trivial nature and do not hinder comprehension in the slightest.

Language resource

A wide range of higher-level constructions is used both very accurately and effectively at all times. The candidate is clearly very confident in his use of language and demonstrates a pleasing degree of flair in the way that he puts his points across, with the views that he expresses showing both sophistication and a degree of maturity wholly appropriate to this level.

There is much to commend in this essay and it has therefore been awarded a mark of 40.

Candidate D

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

Content

The essay attempts to address the subject matter (albeit at a very basic level) but there is a failure for the most part to communicate effectively. Length is an issue here – the essay is 163 words long (87 words short of the minimum length of 250 words) and so the candidate is unable to fully address the topic and develop her ideas.

Accuracy

From the very beginning it becomes apparent that the candidate's command of language is not sufficiently well-developed to achieve the task at a sufficiently high standard. There are major errors in verbs, constructions and vocabulary, many of which are serious at this level, for example the use of the infinitive instead of the appropriate part of the verb. We are left with the impression that the language used is more incorrect than correct.

Language resource

It is obvious that the candidate lacks a thorough knowledge of the language. The structures used are very basic as some of the language used would most certainly be unintelligible to a native speaker. There is also a great deal of unnecessary repetition.