

**Student:** Hidden

**Date:** Hidden

**Task:** 2

**Prompt:** *Some people think that governments should spend more money on public transportation to reduce traffic congestion and pollution. Others believe the money should be used to improve road infrastructure. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.*

## **Overview**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Band Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<i>Task Response</i>	5.0	Addresses the general topic but does not properly “discuss both views”; the essay is heavily one-sided and contains serious logical flaws that weaken the argument and limit the score.
<i>Coherence and Cohesion</i>	6.0	Has a clear overall structure and basic paragraphing, but internal logic is faulty; some cohesive devices are used inappropriately to connect ideas that actually contradict each other.
<i>Lexical Resource</i>	6.0	Uses adequate vocabulary to discuss the topic, but key phrases are repeated and attempts at more complex or precise expression are limited; needs more variety and precision in paraphrasing key ideas.
<i>Grammatical Range &amp; Accuracy</i>	6.0	Grammar is generally accurate with a mix of simple and some complex sentences, but sentence patterns are quite limited; needs a wider range of complex structures to reach a higher band.
<b>Overall</b>	5.5	Overall performance sits in the Band 5–6 range; the main limiting factor is Task Response (failure to fully address both views and weak logic), despite acceptable cohesion, vocabulary, and grammar.

---

## **Criteria Breakdown: Task Response**

Estimated Band - 5.0

Overall Comment: You engage with the general topic of transport spending and clearly express your preference for improving road infrastructure. However, you do not fulfil the full requirements of the task. The prompt asks you to “discuss both views and give your own opinion,” but your essay focuses almost entirely on the benefits of improving roads and gives only a token, dismissive reference to public transport. In addition, several of your key arguments are based on serious logical fallacies, which significantly weakens your response.

### Strengths:

- You present a clear opinion in favour of improving road infrastructure.
- You attempt to relate your points to the issues of congestion and pollution.
- You provide more than one supporting reason for your preferred side (e.g., faster traffic, supposed pollution reduction).

### Areas for Improvement:

- Discuss both views properly. You must devote substantial space—ideally a full body paragraph—to explaining the advantages of investing in public transportation (e.g., moving large numbers of people efficiently, reducing car ownership, providing mobility for non-drivers, cutting total emissions).
- Avoid dismissing the opposing view too quickly. Phrases like “only effective solution” signal to the examiner that you are not going to give the other view fair consideration, which directly lowers your TR score.
- Eliminate logical fallacies:
  - False cause: The claim that “if roads are improved, cars will move faster, so they will pollute less” ignores the reality that better roads encourage more driving, which can increase total emissions.
  - Hasty generalization: Saying that because adding lanes reduced traffic “in some places,” it will work “everywhere” is an over-generalization without evidence.
- Support claims with realistic, balanced reasoning. When you make a claim (e.g., better roads reduce pollution), think carefully: Is this always true? Under what conditions? Are there situations where the opposite happens? Showing awareness of complexity is characteristic of higher bands.

- Follow the instruction pattern explicitly. For this type of question, a strong structure is:
  - Paragraph 1: Introduce the topic and mention both views + your opinion.
  - Paragraph 2: Discuss View 1 (e.g., public transport).
  - Paragraph 3: Discuss View 2 (e.g., roads).
  - Paragraph 4: Conclusion: restate both views and clearly explain which you think is better and why.

---

## **Criteria Breakdown: Coherence and Cohesion**

Estimated Band - 6.0

### Overall Comment:

Your essay is organized in a clear and simple way: an introduction, body paragraphs that support your chosen view, and a conclusion. Paragraphing is logical and makes the essay easy to follow on the surface. However, the internal logical connections between some sentences are weak or incorrect, which damages the quality of your cohesion.

### Strengths:

- Clear overall progression: Introduction → arguments for roads → conclusion.
- Basic cohesive devices (e.g., “also,” “therefore,” “while”) are used to link sentences and ideas.
- Paragraphs are separated in a way that broadly matches different points in your argument.

### Areas for Improvement:

- Ensure that logical connectors reflect real logic. In the sentence “Also, if roads are better, more people will choose to drive... Therefore, better roads mean fewer emissions overall,” the word “Therefore” is misused. If more people drive, the logical expectation is more emissions, not fewer. This shows a breakdown of logical cohesion.
- Strengthen internal paragraph flow. Within each paragraph, ideas should follow a clear chain: point → explanation → example → result. Avoid jumping directly from one idea to a conclusion that does not logically follow.
- Use cohesive devices to show accurate relationships, not just to move on. Choose words that show cause and effect (“as a result,” “consequently”),

contrast (“however,” “on the other hand”), or addition (“furthermore,” “moreover”) only when those relationships are true.

- Balance both views across paragraphs. For a “discuss both views” question, a well-coherent essay usually gives one main paragraph for each view, rather than two paragraphs on one side and only a brief mention of the other in the conclusion.

---

## **Criteria Breakdown: Lexical Resource**

Estimated Band - 6.0

### Overall Comment:

You have enough vocabulary to write about government spending, roads, and transport, and you can express your key ideas clearly. However, your language is repetitive and sometimes lacks precision. You tend to reuse simple phrases such as “improve roads” or “reduce traffic,” instead of demonstrating the wider range of synonyms and collocations that would be expected in a Band 7 essay.

### Strengths:

- Sufficient vocabulary to address the main aspects of the topic (roads, traffic, pollution, government spending).
- Word choice is generally appropriate and rarely causes confusion.
- Some attempt to use more topic-specific language (e.g., referring to “traffic congestion” and “pollution problems”).

### Areas for Improvement:

- Increase variety and precision. Instead of repeating “improve roads” and “better roads,” use alternatives like “upgrade the road network,” “expand highway capacity,” or “modernise transport infrastructure.”
- Develop a set of synonyms for key nouns and verbs.
  - Traffic congestion: “traffic jams,” “heavy traffic,” “gridlock,” “congested roads.”
  - Reduce pollution: “cut emissions,” “curb air pollution,” “lower carbon output.”
  - Spend money on: “allocate funds to,” “invest in,” “channel public money towards.”

- Avoid very broad or absolute claims unless you can support them: e.g., “only effective solution,” “solve problems at once.” These phrases not only weaken your logic but also sound simplistic.
- Use more specific, formal expressions. Instead of “solve pollution problems,” consider “mitigate environmental damage” or “address air quality concerns.”

---

## **Criteria Breakdown: Grammatical Range & Accuracy**

Estimated Band - 6.0

### Overall Comment:

Your grammar is generally accurate, and you can produce both simple and some complex sentences. There are no frequent serious errors that make your writing hard to understand. However, you rely heavily on straightforward sentence patterns, and you do not yet show the breadth and flexibility of grammatical structures associated with Band 7.

### Strengths:

- Sentences are mostly grammatically correct and easy to understand.
- You use some complex sentences (for example, conditional structures like “if roads are improved...”).
- Basic tenses and agreement are usually well controlled.

### Areas for Improvement:

- Increase sentence variety. Avoid repeating the same Subject–Verb–Object pattern. Incorporate:
  - Complex sentences with multiple clauses,
  - Relative clauses (“roads, which are often congested,...”),
  - Conditionals (“If governments invest in public transport instead...”).
- Use advanced structures occasionally. For higher bands, try:
  - Participle clauses: “Investing heavily in public transportation, governments can significantly reduce congestion.”
  - Inversion for emphasis: “Not only would this ease traffic, but it would also cut emissions.”
- Maintain accuracy while experimenting. When you try more complex forms, check them carefully so that new grammar does not introduce new mistakes.
- Vary sentence length. Mix shorter, direct sentences with longer, more complex ones to create a more natural and sophisticated rhythm in your writing.