

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this component.

Candidate 2

Writing: Work

Identifier: Methods that could improve the company image.

The candidate was awarded **12 marks** because while this response sits in the 15-13 descriptor for nearly everything, there is noticeably poor spelling.

The writing fully achieves the task, using language flexibly and effectively with well-developed support for each point made. Writing is coherent and cohesive with a very positive impact on the reader. Style and layout are wholly effective in addressing the intended reader. Structure and paragraphing are consistent and coherent.

An optimum range of vocabulary is used 'viability/'registered charity/'strategy's effectiveness/internal operation/reducing expenditures/albeit more effective' but spelling is often noticeably weak, for example, 'prominetly/significat/Envormentalism/bugdet/campains'. All misspelt words, however, are recognisable except the last.

An optimum range of grammatical structures is used 'was compiled from/be made/be suggested, was completed/emphatic did'/with correctly used modals 'could, should, may, will', gerund/infinitives/present continuous/comparative/superlative. Overall punctuation is used correctly aside from a rogue possessive 'it's'.