

## Candidate 5

**The candidate fully achieves the task with good support for each point in the rubric resulting in a very positive impact in the reader. This piece of writing deserves to be in the top band.**

### **Mark awarded: 14**

The candidate has captured the style and format of an evaluative report and this is wholly effective (apart from the use of + on some occasions).

There is an optimal range of vocabulary related to the task e.g. *followers, launch, platforms potential client* etc. There are only occasional errors in spelling which do not impede.

The candidate uses an optimal range of grammar structures but occasional errors and the use of overly long sentences prevent this candidate from achieving full marks.

Punctuation is generally adequate and appropriate.

## Candidate 6

**This answer falls well short of Higher standard in terms of range and accuracy.**

**Mark awarded: 4.**

The writing is mainly irrelevant to the task as it is about improving the profile of the company overall, not on how social media could be used to market it. As a result of this, the range of used is not appropriate and it limited overall.

The range of language available to the candidate has made it difficult to match the style and tone of a formal evaluative report e.g. use of *stuff* (para 4)

Layout is appropriate. There is clear evidence of paragraphing and in general punctuation is adequate, although there are some overly long sentences e.g. para 2.

Grammatical structures contain frequent errors and this, alongside the mainly irrelevant writing leads to a clear fail at Higher level.

Examples of errors:

Para 1 – *so you also reaching*

Para 3 – *if we treat the customers nice and friendly would increase...*

Para 4- *would take the attention of people...*

## Candidate 7

**The candidate attempts to fulfil the task and does provide support for each point made however, problems with punctuation, grammar and spelling means it is not quite up to the Higher standard It is a narrow fail.**

### **Mark awarded: 7**

The candidate attempts to meet the style and layout of a formal evaluative report but is let down by the ending: *Your favourite employee.*

Coherence is weak in places, mainly due to the one sentence paragraphs and this must reduce the overall mark awarded.

The vocabulary used is sufficiently wide e.g. *boost, specialises, scrolls, swiping* but there are frequent errors in spelling e.g. *recognition, intrests* . On the whole these errors do not interfere with intelligibility.

A sufficiently wide range of grammatical structures are used and the meaning is conveyed despite frequent errors. Again, errors do not impeded understanding but are too frequent and at times basic to allow a higher mark to be awarded e.g. use of *an* instead of *a* , *it would also gives*.