

These thirty original worked situations practise specific email moves, discussion reasoning and sentence structures. Read the situation, write your own wording, then compare the example and its explanation. The examples are not a universal template or an official score guide. Their fictional details must not replace facts supplied by a real task.

1. Emails: connect a specific situation to a practical request

I Identify a room booking before explaining the problem.

I booked Cedar Room for Thursday from three to four. The calendar now shows another event in that slot.

The room, day and time make the request searchable. Replace these fictional details with the task's facts; do not invent a booking confirmation.

I Explain why a requested room feature matters.

We need a screen to check the slides during our rehearsal. A quiet room without a screen would not let us practise that part.

Connect the feature to the activity. "We need a good room" leaves the reader guessing what would solve the problem.

I Offer an acceptable alternative without abandoning the main request.

If Cedar Room is unavailable, another quiet room with a screen at the same time would work for us.

The if-clause supplies a condition. Keep the essential needs and make any flexibility explicit.

I Request an extension with a bounded proposal.

Could I submit the report on Monday instead of Friday? I can send the completed introduction and methods sections today.

A proposed date and completed work help the recipient decide. A polite request is not a claim that approval has already been granted.

I Describe an equipment fault using observable information.

The battery indicator falls to empty after about ten minutes, even after charging according to the instructions.

Observed behaviour is more useful than "It is terrible." Do not diagnose a component failure you have not checked.

I Offer a workable return arrangement.

I can bring the camera and charger to the desk tomorrow between noon and two. Please tell me whether that time is suitable.

Include the relevant accessories and a realistic window. The second sentence leaves the recipient able to confirm or suggest another time.

I Correct a notice without spreading an unverified second version.

The notice says west gate, while the planning email says east gate. Could you confirm the meeting point before we send a correction?

Name the conflicting details and request verification. Do not choose one source solely because it is more convenient.

I Ask about missing group work without assigning a motive.

The two comparison paragraphs are not in the folder yet. Is there a research or access problem we can help with?

Describe what is missing, then ask about the difficulty. "You do not care" turns an observation into an unsupported personal judgment.

I End with an action the recipient can understand.

Could you confirm by this evening whether a draft tomorrow is realistic? If not, we can discuss the task split at our meeting.

The response deadline supports a next decision. Avoid threatening a consequence not authorised by the task or your group.

| Choose a closing that fits the relationship.

Formal: Thank you for considering my request. Kind regards, Wei. Familiar teammate: Thanks for checking this with us. Jia.

Tone depends on the recipient and purpose. Formal wording does not require exaggerated praise, and friendly wording should still be clear and respectful.

2. Academic discussion: add reasoning to the actual conversation

| State a position on whether weekly support should be compulsory.

I would require one introductory session but make later workshops optional. This would give everyone a starting point without assuming identical needs.

A qualified position can be clear. Explain the dividing condition rather than saying that both sides are right and stopping there.

| Engage with a classmate's reason rather than only their name.

Ana is right that students may need help before deadlines accumulate. An early session could show them how to map the term's assignments.

The second sentence develops Ana's prevention reason. "I agree with Ana" alone does not show that you understood or evaluated it.

| Disagree with a universal repair claim fairly.

Repair can be sensible for a one-off fault, but repeated breakdowns may justify replacement. Reliability records would help distinguish those cases.

The contrast identifies when the claim may fail. It does not assert that every old machine is unreliable or that buying new always saves money.

| Use a concrete example to explain knowledge transfer.

A lecturer could start with the campus bus route, then compare a route serving a different travel pattern. The second example tests whether students can apply the idea beyond the familiar case.

The example does analytical work. A list of unrelated places would not explain why a wider example matters.

| Distinguish a proposed benefit from a measured result.

A shared booking page could make availability clearer, but a trial would be needed to check whether conflicts actually fall.

Could signals a possibility; would be needed states the evidence requirement. Do not invent a successful trial to make your proposal sound stronger.

| Add a missing consideration to a discussion.

Sara's update argument is useful, but Ben raises discovery: students may notice a board without looking for an event online. A brief printed notice could direct them to the current details.

The contribution identifies a separate function and explains a combined option. It does more than repeat each classmate's conclusion.

| Respond to a resource objection.

A trial still requires staff time. Limiting it to one equipment category and recording the workload would help the college judge whether expansion is feasible.

Acknowledge the cost before answering it. A narrow scope is a proposal for evaluation, not proof that the cost will be small.

| Keep a sample boundary when discussing a survey.

Twenty of thirty surveyed current users expressed interest. That suggests demand within this group, but non-users' needs remain unknown.

The words surveyed and current carry the scope. Removing them would make the count appear to describe the whole campus.

| Avoid an unsupported cause-and-effect jump.

The later group understood more notice details, but it contained different people. The result supports further testing rather than proving that the new layout caused the difference.

A later or larger result alone does not isolate a cause. Explain the design limit rather than merely adding "maybe" to a strong claim.

I Close a contribution with the consequence of your reasoning.

For these reasons, I would retain a short printed announcement while using one online page for full details. This preserves discovery and makes updates easier to coordinate.

The ending follows the two functions discussed. It should not introduce an unrelated new reason or claim that your preferred option is already approved.

3. Build a sentence: connect grammar with meaning

I Make an embedded question after “Could you explain”.

Could you explain why the workshop was cancelled?

The embedded clause uses subject before verb: the workshop was. Avoid “why was the workshop cancelled” inside this polite request; that order belongs to a direct question.

I Report a yes/no question using whether.

The coordinator asked whether the room was available.

Whether introduces the reported yes/no question. There is no question inversion inside the statement. The example reports past availability rather than guaranteeing present availability.

I Link a reason with because.

We chose the smaller room because it was quieter.

Both clauses contain a subject and finite verb. The because-clause explains the choice; it does not express a contrast.

I Link a contrast with although.

Although the room was small, it had enough seats for our group.

Do not insert but after this although-clause. Keep the contrast between limited size and sufficient seating.

I Make a conditional plan without claiming the condition is fulfilled.

If the organiser confirms the time, we will update the notice.

The if-clause uses present simple and the main clause expresses a future action. Confirmation is a condition, not a stated completed event.

I Identify a person with a defining relative clause.

The student who prepared the chart will explain the results.

Who links the person to the identifying action. The sentence does not mean that every student prepared the chart.

I Describe a thing with a defining relative clause.

The file that contains the revised schedule is in the shared folder.

The clause identifies which file. Avoid duplicating the object with “that it contains”; that already connects the file to contains.

I Use a passive when the affected object is the focus.

The equipment was checked before the rehearsal began.

Was checked is the past passive. The sentence does not identify the checker; add “by the technician” only when the task supplies that detail.

I Compare two objects using the correct adjective form.

The new notice is clearer than the first version.

Use clearer, not “more clearer.” This is a sentence-form example, not evidence that a particular real notice performed better.

I Join a purpose clause to an action.

We saved a copy so that everyone could review the same version.

So that introduces the intended purpose. The sentence does not establish that every person actually reviewed the copy; intention and measured outcome differ.