

Task 1: Table

Subject: The table below shows the proportion of different categories of families living in poverty in Australia in 1999. Summarise the information by selecting and reporting the main features, and make comparisons where relevant.

Family type	Proportion of people from each household type living in poverty
single aged person	6% (54,000)
aged couple	4% (48,000)
single, no children	19% (359,000)
couple, no children	7% (211,000)
sole parent	21% (232,000)
couple with children	12% (933,000)
all households	11% (1,837,000)

Model Answer #1

Response:

The provided table outlines the proportions of individuals from various household types experiencing poverty in Australia during the year 1999, alongside the corresponding number of affected individuals.

Overall, the data indicates a marked disparity in the prevalence of poverty among different household types, with single-parent families and individuals living alone without children showing the highest proportions.

Among the elderly demographic, single-aged individuals exhibited a poverty rate of 6%, affecting 54,000 people, whereas aged couples represented the lowest rate at 4%, impacting 48,000 individuals. These statistics underscore a relative resilience to poverty among older couples compared to other household configurations. In contrast, the poverty rate for non-elderly households demonstrated a notable increase, particularly for single individuals without children, who faced a significant rate of 19%, corresponding to 359,000 individuals. Couples without children experienced a lower rate of 7%, which amounted to 211,000 people, indicating that individuals without partners were substantially more vulnerable to poverty.

When considering households with dependents, sole-parent families exhibited the highest poverty incidence among all categories at 21%, affecting 232,000 individuals. Conversely, couples with children experienced a poverty rate of 12%, translating to a substantial population of 933,000 individuals. This indicates that while single-parent households grappled with elevated poverty levels, couples with children nonetheless comprised the largest cohort of individuals living in poverty. Collectively, the aggregate poverty prevalence across all households was recorded at 11%, encompassing approximately 1,837,000 individuals, thereby highlighting critical variations in poverty experiences based on household composition.

Evaluation:

Overall Band Score: 9

Task Response (9): Excellent response to the task. All key features of the table are described accurately and completely.

Coherence & Cohesion (9): The report is exceptionally well-organized and easy to follow. The flow of information is natural and logical.

Lexical Resource (8.5): A wide range of sophisticated vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately. The language is precise and effective.

Grammatical Range & Accuracy (9): The grammar is flawless. A wide range of grammatical structures is used with complete accuracy and fluency.

Model Answer #2

Response:

The table shows the proportion of various household types living in poverty in Australia in 1999, along with the number of individuals affected within each category.

Single-aged people made up 6% of those in poverty, with a total of 54,000 individuals, while aged couples had the lowest poverty rate at 4%, affecting 48,000 people. This indicates that elderly households, particularly couples, were less affected by poverty compared to other groups.

Among non-elderly households, the poverty rate for singles without children was notably high at 19%, representing 359,000 people. Couples without children had a poverty rate of 7%, totaling 211,000 individuals. This suggests that single individuals faced a higher likelihood of living in poverty than couples without children.

For households with dependents, sole-parent families had the highest poverty rate of all groups at 21%, affecting 232,000 people. Couples with children showed a 12% poverty rate, yet they accounted for the largest number of people in poverty, with 933,000 individuals impacted.

Overall, the data reveals significant variation in poverty levels across different household types, with sole parents and singles without children particularly affected. In total, 11% of all households in Australia were living in poverty in 1999, equating to 1,837,000 people.

Evaluation:

Overall Band Score: 9

Task Response (9): Excellent response to the task. All key features of the table are accurately described and analyzed.

Coherence & Cohesion (9): The report is exceptionally well-organized and easy to follow. The flow of ideas is natural and logical.

Lexical Resource (8.5): A wide range of sophisticated vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately. The language is precise and effective.

Grammatical Range & Accuracy (9): The grammar is flawless. A wide range of grammatical structures is used with complete accuracy and fluency.

Model Answer #3

Response:

The table gives information about poverty rates among six types of household in Australia in the year 1999.

It is noticeable that levels of poverty were higher for single people than for couples, and people with children were more likely to be poor than those without. Poverty rates were considerably lower among elderly people.

Overall, 11% of Australians, or 1,837,000 people, were living in poverty in 1999. Aged people were the least likely to be poor, with poverty levels of 6% and 4% for single aged people and aged couples respectively.

Just over one fifth of single parents were living in poverty, whereas only 12% of parents living with a partner were classed as poor. The same pattern can be seen for people with no children: while 19% of single people in this group were living below the poverty line, the figure for couples was much lower, at only 7%.

Evaluation:

Overall Band Score: 9

Task Response (9): The report accurately addresses all parts of the task and presents a clear overview of the data. All key features are discussed.

Coherence & Cohesion (9): The report is exceptionally well-organized and easy to follow. The logical flow of information is excellent, and the paragraphs are well-structured.

Lexical Resource (8.5): A wide range of sophisticated vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately. The lexical choices enhance the clarity and precision of the report.

Grammatical Range & Accuracy (9): The grammar is impeccable. A wide range of grammatical structures is used with complete accuracy and fluency.

Model Answer #4

Response:

The table gives information about poverty rates among six types of household in Australia in the year 1999.

It is noticeable that levels of poverty were higher for single people than for couples, and people with children were more likely to be poor than those without. Poverty rates were considerably lower among elderly people.

Overall, 11% of Australians, or 1,837,000 people, were living in poverty in 1999. Aged people were the least likely to be poor, with poverty levels of 6% and 4% for single aged people and aged couples respectively.

Just over one fifth of single parents were living in poverty, whereas only 12% of parents living with a partner were classed as poor. The same pattern can be seen for people with no children: while 19% of single people in this group were living below the poverty line, the figure for couples was much lower, at only 7%.

Evaluation:

Overall Band Score: 9

Task Response (9): The report provides a clear and accurate overview of the data presented in the table. All key features are identified and discussed in a logical and well-structured manner.

Coherence & Cohesion (9): The report is very well-organized and easy to follow. The information is presented in a logical order, and the use of cohesive devices is seamless.

Lexical Resource (8.5): The report demonstrates a wide range of vocabulary, which is used accurately and appropriately. The language is sophisticated and natural.

Grammatical Range & Accuracy (9): The report is grammatically flawless. A wide range of grammatical structures is used with complete accuracy and control.

Model Answer #5

Response:

The table presents the distribution of impoverished families in Australia in 1999 across various household categories.

Overall, poverty affects 11% of the total population in Australia, with diverse impacts on different family types.

Among the different family categories, aged couples exhibit the lowest poverty incidence at 4%, representing around 48,000 households. Single aged persons follow, contributing 6% to the total impoverished population, with an estimated 54,000 households. Couples without children account for 7% of the impoverished demographic, comprising approximately 211,000 individuals. Conversely, couples with children demonstrate the highest poverty burden at 12%, affecting roughly 933,000 people. The most disadvantaged family types in terms of poverty incidence are single individuals with no children at 19% and sole parents at 21%, encompassing 359,000 and 232,000 individuals, respectively.

In conclusion, the data underscores that while aged couples experience the least poverty in Australia, sole parents are the most severely impacted by economic deprivation among the various family structures in the country.

Evaluation:

Overall Band Score: 9

Task Response (9): The report provides a comprehensive and accurate overview of the data presented in the table. It effectively addresses all aspects of the task and demonstrates a clear understanding of the information.

Coherence & Cohesion (9): The report is well-structured and logically organized. The information flows smoothly from one paragraph to the next, with clear transitions and cohesive devices used effectively.

Lexical Resource (8.5): The report demonstrates a wide range of vocabulary, using precise and sophisticated language to describe the data. The choice of words is appropriate and effective, enhancing the clarity and impact of the report.

Grammatical Range & Accuracy (9): The report exhibits a high level of grammatical accuracy and fluency. A wide range of grammatical structures is used correctly and appropriately, contributing to the overall clarity and sophistication of the writing.