

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for the candidates within this pack has achieved the following marks for this element of course assessment

Candidate 1

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because.....

The candidate provides a good introduction which indicates a balanced argument. The candidate mentions other countries and uses terminology like "*this suggests*" which is good inferential type language. He/she makes line references rather than quoting, but this is appropriate.

On the first page, "*an increase in this*" is clumsily expressed and there is also some misreading of the text. The first page is somewhat repetitive.

The line references on page1 are incorrect as these are not lines 25-30 but lines 21-25. This has a negative impact on the candidate's argument. The conclusion is poorly worded.

Overall, the candidate starts promisingly with some inferencing, but the incorrect line references and weak conclusion detract from the overall impression.

Candidate 2

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because.....

The candidate states the overall purpose immediately and uses language such as “... *invites the reader*”. Despite the candidate’s assertion, it is not certain that the title is necessarily a rhetorical question.

The candidate’s conclusion could have been more rounded. Phrases such as “..*adds authenticity*” demonstrate an analytical approach. There is too much focus on food and menus towards the end. The candidate refers to a food statistic and attempts to make sense of it by stating that it “*shows the necessity for children’s menus to be re-evaluated*”.

The candidate misses the irony that fast food restaurants have good facilities for children yet their menus are unhealthy. There is an attempt at analysis with some focus on the word “*aburridos*” to indicate that chicken nuggets are perhaps a thing of the past.

Overall, the candidate provides a good analysis throughout.

Candidate 3

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because.....

The candidate makes reference to the restaurant's website to back up his/her initial statement.

The candidate does not provide quotes to back up arguments and there is no development of ideas. "*Biased towards children not being allowed*" is clumsily expressed and "*They provide*", referring to the writer, is another example of poor expression. The candidate does provide data from the survey but does not expand on this. He/she refers to the "*first hand*" knowledge of Armando Romero, but again does not develop this idea. The candidate fails to mention food or facilities for children.

Overall, there is no depth and the conclusion is weak.

Candidate 4

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because.....

In paragraph 1 the candidate's introduction includes the insightful comment "*change their mindset*". He/she also refers to the "*anecdote*" at the start of the passage and says this makes the story more relatable and personal. On page 2 to 3 "*families bluntly refused*" is well expressed. The candidate refers to listing on lines 14 to 15, highlighting the number of places where children are not allowed. He/she alludes to opinions from professionals and makes mention of humour being used and the impact of this on the reader.

The candidate highlights the statistics in the passage and mentions that they "*..help support the author's claims more and make them seem more credible and researched*". He/she also mentions the use of the simile from line 53 and how this relates to making the atmosphere more welcoming for children. The candidate refers to professional opinion giving the impression of a more researched article. He/she once more focuses on the reader's reaction. The reference to the "*nicho de mercado*" is well argued. On page 3, the candidate uses the word "*emphasise*" instead of "empathise". It is not clear if the question that is quoted on page 5 is in fact rhetorical.

The response is sophisticated and insightful throughout and there is good use of critical terminology. This is a reflective and comprehensive answer and appropriate inferences are made. The conclusion is very well worded and rounded.

Candidate 5

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because.....

The candidate makes relevant points in the introduction.

There is a spelling error (“*two*”) in the opening lines and it is not clear if “*stigma*” is an appropriate word in this same sentence. The candidate does use some critical terminology - “*wants the reader to engage in the topic*” and refers to the question “*¿Estamos viviendo un auge de la niñofobia?*” There is an awkward use of the word “*distinction*” at the top of page 2.

The candidate provides good focus on the intelligent marketing strategy of the fast food industry and substantiates this with a quote. The candidate does not quite develop what Armando Romero is trying to argue and the phrase “*on the other hand*” does not appear to make much sense.

The conclusion is reasonable; referring back to the introduction by saying the writer provides balanced arguments. The candidate misses the irony that fast food restaurants have good facilities for children yet their menus are unhealthy. The candidate does demonstrate some inferencing skills but tends to supply information for the most part.

Candidate 6

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because.....

The candidate mentions “*alleged*” phobia in the introduction. He/she refers to an (almost) anecdotal example and there is an attempt to analyse the word “*contempt*”. The candidate develops this idea with reference to lines 5 to 7 to highlight struggles faced by parents. He/she makes the point that the writer provides a balance to the argument and explains this. There is an insightful inference that “*niñofobia*” is more isolated as opposed to being a nationwide societal issue. Generally speaking, the candidate attempts to draw inferences which are appropriate. In places, he/she demonstrates an accurate and sophisticated reading of the text. There is no mention of fast food restaurants, statistics or low quality food.

This is a long answer. The candidate provides quotes translated into English and the question in the title is not necessarily rhetorical. He/she repeats a point at the start of paragraph 2 on page 2. There is a misspelling of “*commotion*” at the top of page 4 and “*accommodate*” later on the same page (repeated on page 5).

The conclusion could have been more rounded.