

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

Everyday Life

The candidate was awarded **14 marks**.

Overall, this reads like a realistic review, even if more in the form of a blog posting, for which the candidate should be given credit. Vocabulary is appropriate to the task, with some more advanced items included. Spelling, punctuation and layout are good. Although clearly in the top band in terms of level of writing, the task is not entirely fulfilled leading to a deduction of 1 mark.

Content and organisation

The task is achieved although would have been improved if the candidate had focussed on the one attraction of the Eiffel tower rather than expanding the review to the whole trip to Paris and offering advice on visiting Paris rather than the Eiffel Tower. The candidate refers all the bullet points at different stages, giving an opinion on each and including some useful advice. The fact that the writing does not fully address the task should not detract from the overall quality of the writing.

The analysis of each aspect is detailed and comes across as realistic. The writing is coherent and cohesive with a positive impact on the reader. Paragraphs are consistent and layout is appropriate.

Vocabulary and spelling

Vocabulary is wide ranging eg *myriad, frightful, claustrophobic*. With the exception of “*defanitely*” for *definitely* in the final paragraph, there are no spelling errors.

Grammar and punctuation

Grammar shows some advanced touches eg *all who appreciate, urge you to consider, unless you have a family*. It is accurate throughout with only a few minor slips.

The use of punctuation is accurate throughout.