

Examiner comments and final marks (Audio 2)

Part 1 Interview

Grammar: The candidate uses a range of simple structures with errors, particularly in subject-verb agreement (*I really loves, he always bring,*), superlatives (*most sweetest*) and confusion of 'it's' with 'is', but these errors do not impede understanding so the candidate can be given the top mark in Level 3. The candidate occasionally attempts more complex structures (*... lots of people er including student loves to eat junk food which is really unhealthy for them er especially in Europe ...*).

Vocabulary: The candidate uses a sufficient range of vocabulary appropriately to discuss a variety of ideas (*taste, especially, selecting, junk food, overweight, unhealthy phenomenon*).

Development: The candidate responds relevantly and exemplifies their responses to all three questions. However, the candidate doesn't develop the responses sufficiently to achieve the next level.

Pronunciation: This is mostly clear inaccuracies do not impede communication. Intonation is sometimes used for emphasis (*strawberry, people, junk food, Europe*).

Part 2 Short talk

Grammar: The candidate mainly uses simple structures with quite a lot of errors in the use of singular or plural (*these two option is ... , multi store or convenience store*), verb structure (*which is can be er released, it's really hard to walking or cycling, ... take metro or subway comes to school*). There is effective use of discourse markers (*taking this as an example, in my opinion*) and attempts at complex structures (*So, in my opinion I prefer the not using plastic point because, as I mentioned before, it's more easier for me to do ...*), though these aren't generally accurate (*...using the plastic which is can be er released so which will not cause...*). Overall, the inaccuracies limit this to a mark in the top of Level 3.

Vocabulary: The candidate uses a range of vocabulary mostly appropriately (*heavy pollution, convenience store, as I mentioned before*). There are some inaccuracies (*produce, reduce, released, more easier*) which means the meaning conveyed is inaccurate and unclear. However, there is lack of repetition so the candidate is between 5 and 6 in Level 3.

Development: Although the candidate starts by saying that both options are easy for them, the candidate goes on to compare the two effectively giving the advantages of not using plastic, the difficulties for the candidate to walk or cycle to school and suggesting an alternative option of taking the metro or subway. The candidate fulfils the criteria for Level 4 and is between 7 and 8.

Pronunciation: The pronunciation is mostly clear and inaccuracies in pronunciation do not impede communication. The candidate sometimes uses intonation effectively to stress points (*can be ... , we must take the bus...*) so fulfils the criteria for Level 4.

Part 3 Discussion

The examiner has chosen to only use two out of the four questions. However, there is sufficient evidence to mark the candidate's responses.

Grammar: The candidate uses mainly simple structures with quite a lot of inaccuracies in the use of singular and plural (*every people, governments, the most people*), confusion of 'it' and 'it's', verb tenses (*I have just discussed this topic ...last night*). Although the level of inaccuracy does impede understanding, there is some ambition in attempting more complex structures (*I disagree about this opinion, cause take Shanghai to Beijing as an example ... use of who, which, because*) so the candidate can be awarded the top mark of Level 3.

Vocabulary: The candidate uses a sufficient range to discuss simple ideas (*nowadays, especially, pay attention, roommate, to waste our time, quantity, spend it, useful*).

Development: For the first question the candidate gives a relevant response and it is an attempt at a complex idea. However, it is not developed further (i.e. the idea that the older generation do not care about the environment because they don't use their phones sufficiently to be informed by the government.) The response to the second question is more developed with the candidate providing an example for the idea discussed with the candidate's friend, but the inaccuracy of language makes the second part of the response

quite difficult to follow (... *I think it's a really er it's a way to waste our time and maybe we can like reduce the quantity of air travelling but do not spend it for all of them and sometimes it's really useful for us to travel.*).

Pronunciation: The pronunciation is mostly clear and inaccuracies in pronunciation do not impede communication. The candidate sometimes uses intonation effectively to stress points (... almost every people ...) or to minimise the point (*reduce the pollution*) so fulfils the criteria for Level 4.

Mark awarded for Grammar = 6 out of 10

Mark awarded for Vocabulary = 6 out of 10

Mark awarded for Development = 7 out of 10

Mark awarded for Pronunciation = 7 out of 10