

## Candidate 4 - Work

The candidate was awarded **7 marks**. While the message is generally clear and there is a reasonable range of vocabulary and grammar, there are frequent grammatical errors, and the message becomes hard to follow at one point.

The task is achieved with support for points made. Writing is generally coherent and cohesive. Style is too informal for the intended reader ('I've', 'don't', 'doesn't', 'it's') and general layout is inappropriate the candidate has produced a letter rather than a report. There is evidence of structure/paragraphing.

The range of vocabulary/idiom is reasonably wide ('feedback'; 'dangerous situations'; 'spilt' (albeit the wrong spelling is used); 'newborn baby'; 'ridiculous'). There are a few spelling errors ('split' for 'spilt'; 'campany' and 'hills' -- the last of which seems to be a spelling error, seriously impeding communication).

There is a reasonable range of grammar with relative clause used ('ideas which'), present perfect ('I've saw [sic]); past simple 'I wanted', past continuous ('she was holding'), passive ('doors was blocked' [sic]) and subordination with 'when', 'that' and 'but'.

There are frequent errors in grammar, relating to articles, singular-plural agreement, missing 'to' from infinitives, inconsistent use of narrative tenses, incorrect formation of present perfect, lack of necessary future tense, and a double negative ('none . . . don't').

Surprisingly, punctuation is generally accurate, although there is a missing apostrophe at the end of 'others'.