

Higher ESOL Writing – Every Day Life

Candidate 1

The candidate fully achieves the task. The overall level of language is high and there is a very positive impact on the reader.

Mark awarded: 15

The candidate follows the points laid out in the rubric and the text has a realistic quality with well-chosen examples to support each point. The writing is coherent and cohesive throughout and the style and format are wholly effective for an online review. There are clearly defined paragraphs that flow logically.

The range of vocabulary used is very wide and is used effectively, e.g. *quirky, vibrant* (paragraph 1), *stunning* (paragraph 3). There are only occasional errors in spelling and these do not impede communication at all, e.g. *queing, turists* (paragraph 2).

There is a very wide range of grammatical structures used effectively, with a high level of accuracy. Punctuation is consistent and appropriate.

What distinguished this answer is the natural quality of the writing. E.g., *My personal favourite being ...* (paragraph 1)

.... *balancing out the price....* (paragraph 3)

..a price surely cannot be put on (paragraph 3)

Candidate 2

Although the candidate makes a fair attempt at the task, this answer falls well short of the Higher standard required in terms of grammatical structures and spelling.

Mark awarded: 5

The candidate covers the task adequately, dealing with each point in turn as set out in the rubric but the range of language available to the candidate has made it difficult at times to match the style and tone needed for an online review.

Overall, the message is conveyed but coherence is weak with only a limited range of basic cohesive devices used. Layout is appropriate, with evidence of paragraphing. In general, punctuation is adequate, with consistent use of commas and full stops.

Vocabulary is better than basic e.g. *amazing*, *majestic* (paragraph 1) but spelling errors are frequent and at times impede understanding e.g. *hart*, *exesible*, *armer*, *jewelry* (paragraph 1) *qiuves* (paragraph 3).

The limited range of grammatical structures and the frequent, often basic errors are noticeable throughout and this precludes the award of a higher mark.

Paragraph 1 *is easy exisible, we seen*

Paragraph 2 *There is an easy access, Some of the rooms wasn't, That was a lot of people there*

Paragraph 3 *I would recommend to buy*

Candidate 3

The candidate does not fully achieve the task as a city rather than a tourist attraction is reviewed. Grammar and vocabulary are up to standard but suggest this is a candidate more comfortable with spoken rather than written English. Spelling and punctuation are accurate. This writing is satisfactory but is held back from a higher mark by the factors described.

Mark awarded: 9.

As the candidate does not focus on a tourist attraction, but rather an entire city it is difficult to cover the points on the rubric and provide clear support. This, alongside the lack of paragraphs throughout affects cohesion and coherence. The message is easy to follow, however, and there is a good attempt to match the style of an informal online review. At times though it is too informal with a suggestion that this candidate is more comfortable with speaking than writing e.g. *would of loved* and some overly long sentences for example, *You would assume.....*

A wide range of vocabulary is accurately and effectively used e.g. *incredible, portrays, hospitality, classy*. Occasionally there is a choice of vocabulary that jars with the reader e.g. *financial structure* Spelling is accurate.

There is a satisfactory range of grammatical structures used with a good level of accuracy but it would be nice to see the candidate trying out some more complex structures. When this is attempted, small errors do creep in e.g. *I would give you some advice..*

Punctuation is mainly accurate but there are a few missing capitals e.g. *louvre* and *paris*.

Candidate 4

In ways, this is a competent answer but issues with punctuation and grammar means it is not quite up to the Higher standard.

Mark awarded: 7

The task is not fully achieved as a city rather than an attraction is reviewed, with limited general support for the points made. Although paragraphing is acceptable, the lack of punctuation and long sentences results in cohesion being weak in places.

The range of vocabulary used is suitable to the level e.g. *unique* (paragraph 2) and *bursting with flavour* but there are a number of spelling mistakes e.g. *obvisouly*, *faboluos* and a number of the choices of vocabulary items that jar with the reader e.g. *crucial*, *morale*.

Grammatical structures are limited and contain errors which are sometimes basic e.g. *every restaurant we been in. There were some days that it would rain*