

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 7

ESOL National 5 Writing: Work

The candidate was awarded **9 marks**. While the layout and grammar are flawed, the task is achieved with a reasonably wide range of grammar and vocabulary.

There is a degree of drift from the ‘training’ focus of the question into things in general that the company should do. Writing is generally coherent and cohesive. Style and layout is inappropriate for the intended reader because it is in the form of a letter rather than a report. There is evidence of structure/paragraphing.

Range of vocabulary/idiom is reasonably wide (‘feedback’, ‘hazards’, ‘instructions’, ‘helpful’, ‘injuries’, ‘the public’, ‘suppliers’, ‘online sales’).

Spelling errors are frequent (‘heared’, ‘custumer’, ‘equiped’, ‘dreases’, ‘wich’, ‘our’ for ‘or’ and ‘rise’ for ‘raise’ but these do not impede communication.

The range of grammar is reasonably wide, with past simple ‘wanted’, correct use of ‘would’, passive ‘be trained and equiped [sic]’, relative clauses with ‘which’, and structures with ‘in order to’ and ‘in case of’. Grammar is mostly accurate although errors include ‘interested on’; ‘image towards the public’; ‘dress towards’).

Punctuation is generally accurate