

TEST 3, WRITING TASK 2

This is an answer written by a candidate who achieved a **Band 7.0** score.

Today high levels of sugar are contained in many sources of food, especially in manufactured food. And, of course, eating so much sugar is not good for our health: it can cause just a simple cavy, for example, but also worse problems, like the increasing level of sugar in blood. Some people suggest that sugary products should be more expensive, so people would buy less of them.

According to me, I think that this solution is not the best one as sugary products include some types of food that we eat everyday, such as bread or pasta. This foods, particularly the first one, are really important in our diet, so make them more expensive will influence not only our lifestyle, but also some people wouldn't be able anymore to buy the most important food for them. Just think for example to poor people, who can maybe afford a few loads of bread per day: what would they eat if we increased bread price?

I think that the best solution for this problem would be informing people about what they eat, because sometimes we don't even know that. They have already done something to inform people about the characteristics of food, of course, and lebel's are one of the most important thing, as they tell you all the ingredients of a particular food. Yet, not many people spend some of their time reading lebel's, or, if they do it, they probably don't know the biggest part of the substances named in the list, as well not everybody knows that there is a specific order of the ingredients in the list. So something we could do is organizing some "talks" to inform people not only about the function of lebel's, but especially about the big amount of sugar we eat everyday. I think as well that this talks should be organised also in schools, because also children must be aware of what they eat; besides, children can tell what they have learned by these "conferences" at their parents, so the whole family would eat better.

To sum it up, I think that it is not necessary to increase the prices of sugary food and that all we need is information, that will lead people to eat less sugary food and, as a consequence, live better with less problems.

Here is the examiner's comment:

This is a good response to the question. It does not agree with the statement and presents a different solution to the problem.

There are four paragraphs, made up of an introduction, a conclusion and two further paragraphs explaining why the candidate disagrees with the statement and then giving an alternative solution. Ideas are logically organised, with a range of linking devices to make the response easier to read [*Yet | as well | I think as well that | as a consequence*], but there are some errors [*This / these | also*].

There are 386 words in this response, well over the expected 250 words. In this case, the increased wordcount results in a good range of vocabulary with some flexibility and collocation [*informing people about what they eat | aware of what they eat*] despite some remaining errors [*cavy / cavity | lebel's / labels*].

The response uses a variety of structures [*what would they eat if we increased bread price?*] despite some errors [*by these "conferences" / at these "conferences" | less problems / fewer problems*].