



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2019**

**A LEVEL  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1  
A700U10-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

## COMPONENT 1: LANGUAGE CONCEPTS AND ISSUES

### MARK SCHEME SUMMER 2019

#### COMPONENT 1: Language Concepts and Issues

##### General Advice

Examiners are asked to read and digest thoroughly all the information set out in the document *Instructions for Examiners* sent as part of the stationary pack. It is essential for the smooth running of the examination that these instructions are adhered to by **all**.

Particular attention should be paid to the following instructions regarding marking:

- Make sure that you are familiar with the assessment objectives (**AOs**) that are relevant to the questions that you are marking, and the respective **weighting** of each AO. The advice on weighting appears in the Assessment Grids at the end.
- Familiarise yourself with the questions, and each part of the marking guidelines.
- Be positive in your approach: look for details to reward in the candidate's response rather than faults to penalise.
- As you read each candidate's response, annotate using wording from the assessment criteria as appropriate. Tick points you reward and indicate inaccuracy or irrelevance where it appears.
- Explain your mark with summative comments at the end of each answer. Your comments should indicate both the positive and negative points as appropriate.
- Use your professional judgement, in the light of standards set at the marking conference, to fine-tune the mark you give.
- It is important that the **full range of marks** is used. Full marks should not be reserved for perfection. Similarly, there is a need to use the marks at the lower end of the scale.
- No allowance can be given for incomplete answers other than what candidates actually achieve.
- Consistency in marking is of the highest importance. If you have to adjust after the initial sample of scripts has been returned to you, it is particularly important that you make the adjustment without losing your consistency.
- Please do not use personal abbreviations or comments, as they can be misleading or puzzling to a second reader. You may, however, find the following symbols useful

E	expression
I	irrelevance
e.g. ?	lack of example
X	wrong
(✓)	possible
?	doubtful
R	repetition

## General Instructions - Applying the Mark Scheme

Where banded levels of response are given, it is presumed that candidates attaining Band 2 and above will have achieved the criteria listed in the previous band(s).

Examiners must firstly decide the band for each tested AO that most closely describes the quality of the work being marked. Having determined the appropriate band, fine-tuning of the mark within a band will be made on the basis of a 'best fit' procedure, weaknesses in some areas being compensated for by strengths in others.

- Where the candidate's work convincingly meets the statement, the highest mark should be awarded.
- Where the candidate's work adequately meets the statement, the most appropriate mark in the middle range should be awarded.
- Where the candidate's work just meets the statement, the lowest mark should be awarded.

Examiners should use the full range of marks available to them and award full marks in any band for work that meets that descriptor. The marks on either side of the middle mark(s) for 'adequately met' should be used where the standard is lower or higher than 'adequate' but not the highest or lowest mark in the band. Marking should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising failure or omissions. The awarding of marks must be directly related to the marking criteria.

This mark scheme instructs examiners to look for and reward valid alternatives where indicative content is suggested. Indicative content outlines some areas of the text candidates may explore in their responses. **This is not a checklist for expected content in an answer, or set out as a 'model answer'**, as responses must be marked in the banded levels of response provided for each question. Where a candidate provides a response that contains aspects or approaches not included in the indicative content, examiners should use their professional judgement as English specialists to determine the validity of the statement/interpretation in light of the task and reward as directed by the banded levels of response.

Candidates are free to choose any approach that can be supported by evidence, and they should be rewarded for all valid interpretations of the texts. Candidates can (and will most likely) discuss features of the texts other than those mentioned in the mark scheme.

## COMPONENT 1: LANGUAGE CONCEPTS AND ISSUES

### SECTION A: ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE

AO1	AO2	AO4
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

#### General Notes

In making judgements, look carefully at the separate sheet with the marking grid, and at the Overview and Notes which follow. We may expect candidates to select some of the suggested approaches, but it is equally possible that they will select entirely different approaches. Look for and reward valid, well-supported ideas which demonstrate independent thinking.

#### Section A: Interviews with Politicians

In your response, you must:

- draw on your knowledge of the different language levels
- consider concepts and issues relevant to the study of spoken language
- explore connections between the transcripts.

#### 1. Analyse the spoken language of these texts as examples of interviews with politicians. [60]

#### Overview

Both texts have a similar question-and-answer format but the difference in the relationships between the speakers is very marked. While Eddie Mair's approach as an interviewer is overtly hostile and adversarial, Sean Hannity is entirely supportive of Trump and does not challenge his ideas in any way. As a consequence, the overlaps and latch-ons by Mair clearly indicate competition to hold the floor and his unwillingness to allow Johnson to speak at length. In contrast, the turn-taking in the second interview is co-operative and the one overlap indicates Hannity's desire to emphasise how effective Trump's policies will be. Where Mair uses face-threatening acts, culminating in the noun phrase *a nasty bit of work* to describe Johnson, Hannity and Trump both praise each other with their mutual face work, most obviously in their discussion about ratings at the end.

The differing contexts for the interviews are interesting. Most candidates may be able to note the contrasting approaches of the two interviews with Mair's desire to subject Johnson to sustained scrutiny. In addition, the role of the live audience of supporters in the Trump interview is significant, with both speakers using them to bolster support for the policies discussed. There is also a contrast in the focus of the interviews. Where Mair returns to issues of integrity and honesty in Johnson's past, Hannity allows Trump to focus on the future success of his healthcare policies.

The register of the speakers is slightly different with Johnson's distinctive idiolect apparent in his combination of many non-fluency features with high register lexis such as the verb *ascribed* and the adjective *lamentable*. Trump's discourse is much more straightforward with colloquial lexis such as the present participle *rocking*, although he too demonstrates a range of non-fluency features. Mair appears to diverge from Johnson's language by being less formal at points such as in the clause *I don't blame you*.

Characteristics of a successful response to Question 1 may include:

- clear understanding of spoken language concepts and resulting issues
- insightful discussion of points of contrast that explore the language use
- well-chosen, concise textual references to support the points made
- productive explorations of the issues stemming from pertinent spoken language concepts
- intelligent conclusions drawn on similarities / differences
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading engaging with how meaning is constructed to drive on the argument
- assured evaluation
- a range of terminology, which is used consistently and purposefully
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis in light of the question set.

Characteristics of a less successful response to Question 1 may include:

- focus on irrelevant general features of spoken language
- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on close analysis of the transcripts
- the arguments put forward may be implicit and difficult to follow
- some overview of appropriate points of similarity/difference
- description of some relevant spoken language concepts, but not directly related to the question and/or texts
- inconsistent use of appropriate textual references (about half the points made are supported), or overly long quotations
- some linguistic knowledge demonstrated, but not always accurate
- lack of engagement with the texts resulting in a rather superficial discussion
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a largely descriptive approach, with a summary of content rather than analysis
- some points addressing basic links across the extracts.

## Notes

The following notes address features of interest which may be explored, but it is important to reward all valid discussion.

### Text A: *Eddie Mair and Boris Johnson*

**Proper nouns:** used as vocatives formally by Mair (*Boris Johnson*, rejecting the more popularly used *Boris*) and in a more familiar fashion by Johnson (*Eddie*), possibly seeking to re-establish a closer relationship after the face threatening act

**Verbs:** elevated lexis used by Johnson to assert his authority (*ascribed, propose, dispute*) and to minimise the seriousness of his past behaviour (*sandpapered*) in contrast to Mair (*lie in you did lie to him*)

**Phrasal verbs:** central to Mair's direct accusations (*made up/make up* – used four times in the form of a verb and once as a compound adjective)

**Modal auxiliary verbs:** Johnson's use of *could* and *would* which slightly mitigate the force of his denial of the charges

**Adjectives:** used by Johnson to make his actions seem simply a social slip (*embarrassing, sorry*) and by Mair to underline Johnson's moral failings as a person (*nasty*)

**Adverbs:** used by Johnson to underplay his faults (adverb of manner: *mildly*), to suggest the repetitive nature of the questions (adverb of frequency: *again*) and to mitigate his denials in order to appear more reasonable (adverb of degree: *wholly* in the adjective phrase *wholly fair*); used by Mair to challenge Johnson's account (*factually*)

**Pronouns:** Johnson's use of indefinite pronouns *something* and *somebody* to distance himself from the details of the incident

**Determiners:** contrasting use of possessive determiners with Johnson's *our* (*viewers*) suggesting a joint responsibility for the programme while Mair's use of *your* (*party leader*) being clearly accusatory

**Interjection:** *OK* used by both speakers to suggest some level of co-operation

**Noun phrases:** used by Mair to challenge directly (*the made-up quote, a barefaced lie*) and to identify the moral focus of the questions (*your integrity*) and by Johnson to be less specific and downplay the accusations (*the whole thing, long and lamentable story, that matter*)

**Prepositional phrases:** Johnson's use of *with great respect* to keep the discourse more formal

**Parallel phrasing:** Mair's use of the three present participles (*making up... lying ... wanting...*) to emphasise the extent of Johnson's alleged dishonesty

**Tag question:** challenging tag question in Mair's face threatening act (*you're a nasty piece of work aren't you?*) possibly surprisingly aggressive in the context

**Topic management:** attempts by Johnson to challenge Mair's role as topic manager in lines 5 and 29

**Non-fluency features:** frequent use of them by Johnson: fillers (*er*), unintentional repetition (*these were these were these were*), adverb *well* used many times at the start of turns to slow the pace down; less marked in Mair's speech reflecting pre-planned nature of his questions with incomplete utterance on line 28 followed by the discourse marker *well* suggesting his desire to be confrontational

**Prosodic features:** stress on verb *sacked* by Mair to emphasise the embarrassing outcome for Johnson, while Johnson in turn stresses the demonstrative pronoun *that* to minimise its importance; accelerated speed of Johnson's turn on line 24 suggesting his anxiety to move away from the issue

## Text B: Sean Hannity and Donald Trump

**Nouns and noun phrases:** Trump's use of noun phrases to aggrandise his policies (*the largest tax cut for people in our history* on line 15) with the use of the plural concrete noun *people* here (and on line 8) to underline its popular appeal; other uses of the noun *people* where more specific terms could have been used (e.g. *economists* in line 7 or *politicians* on line 19) again makes the discussion less technical; Hannity's reference to the plural concrete noun *truckers* to stress Trump's appeal to working class America

**Verbs:** informal use of present participles by Trump (*beating, rocking*) to make himself sound more ordinary (in contrast to Johnson)

**Modal verbs and verb phrases:** varied use of modal verbs: *will* in verb phrases to indicate confidence in the effectiveness of the policies (Trump: *will cover* on line 6 and *will be* on line 13; Hannity: *will benefit* on line 9, mirrored by Trump on line 13); *would* in verb phrase *would have done* (lines 4 and 13) to indicate that the bill has been delayed by forces beyond his control

**Adjectives:** Trump's continual use of positive evaluative adjectives to emphasise the value of his prospective policies (*great, incredible, fantastic*) in contrast to Hannity's use of the adjectives *frustrating* and *disappointing* to express sympathy for Trump and criticise those in his party who have challenged him

**Adverbs:** Trump's use of *actually* to emphasise his confidence in the bill passing; Hannity's use of *even* to suggest his exasperation at those who did not vote with Trump

**Personal pronouns:** Trump's use of the inclusive collective pronoun *we* to suggest all will benefit but also his repeated use of the second person pronoun *you* to address the audience directly; his use of the first person singular *I* (*I would have done it*) in turn emphasises his personal responsibility for the policies in contrast to the third person plural *they* (*I thought they were going to put this through*) which suggests that the failure to get the policy through lies elsewhere

**Comment clauses:** Trump's use of embedded comment clauses to make his discourse more personal: *I'd love* (line 6) and *I have to say this* (line 16)

**Exclamative utterance:** *what a nice sound that is* (line 29) used by Trump to establish his support for the media and to emphasise the relaxed nature of the interview, closer to a friendly discussion than an interrogation



**Face work:** Trump's use of the prepositional phrase *in honour of his ratings* and the interrogative addressed directly to the audience (*did you see how good his ratings are?*) to praise Hannity; mirrored by the use of the comparative adjective *higher* in Hannity's response *they'll be higher tonight*

**Overlapping:** two examples of overlaps which, like the two latch-ons, are clearly co-operative, emphasising the closeness of the relationship between the two

**Non-fluency features:** several examples of incomplete utterances from Trump (line 3: *this is take*) with occasional fillers (*er* on lines 3 and 34) but generally quite fluent and confident (possibly in contrast to Johnson); self-correction on line 17 when he replaces the adjective *great* with *good*, fearing that he is over-praising his political opponents

**Prosodic features:** Trump's use of accelerated delivery in lines 3-4 indicating his enthusiasm and confidence in getting the bill passed; rise in intonation on line 17 to mark his self-correction; emphatic stress on modal verb *would*, adjective *fantastic* and verb *imagine* to emphasise his confidence in the policies; Hannity's stress on the adjective *frustrating* to indicate his sympathy with Trump.

**This is not a checklist. Reward other valid interpretations where they are based on the language of the text, display relevant knowledge, and use appropriate analytical methods.**

**Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section A Question 1**

<b>BAND</b>	<b>AO1</b> <b>Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression</b>  <b>20 marks</b>	<b>AO2</b> <b>Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use</b>  <b>20 marks</b>	<b>AO4</b> <b>Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods</b>  <b>20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sophisticated methods of analysis</li> <li>• Confident use of a wide range of terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of texts</li> <li>• Coherent, academic style</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed critical understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of issues</li> <li>• Confident and concise selection of textual support</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insightful connections established between texts</li> <li>• Sophisticated overview</li> <li>• Effective use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective methods of analysis</li> <li>• Secure use of a range of terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>• Thorough discussion of texts</li> <li>• Expression generally accurate and clear</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Some intelligent discussion of issues</li> <li>• Consistent selection of apt textual support</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purposeful connections established between texts</li> <li>• Detailed overview</li> <li>• Relevant use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible methods of analysis</li> <li>• Generally sound use of terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>• Competent discussion of texts</li> <li>• Mostly accurate expression with some lapses</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Sensible discussion of issues</li> <li>• Generally appropriate selection of textual support</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible connections established between texts</li> <li>• Competent overview</li> <li>• Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic methods of analysis</li> <li>• Using some terminology with some accuracy (including spoken)</li> <li>• Uneven discussion of texts</li> <li>• Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Basic discussion of issues</li> <li>• Some points supported by textual references</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes some basic connections between texts</li> <li>• Rather a broad overview</li> <li>• Some valid use of linguistic knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited methods of analysis</li> <li>• Some grasp of basic terminology (including spoken)</li> <li>• Undeveloped discussion of texts</li> <li>• Errors in expression and lapses in clarity</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few simple points made about concepts</li> <li>• Limited discussion of issues</li> <li>• Little use of textual support</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited connections between texts</li> <li>• Vague overview</li> <li>• Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<b>0 marks: Response not credit worthy</b>		

## SECTION B: LANGUAGE ISSUES

AO1	AO2	AO3
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

### Overview

Each question focuses on a specific kind of language use (e.g. the language of medicine, child language, standard and non-standard language) and responses should analyse and evaluate the ways in which contextual factors affect linguistic choices in each case. Examining the data given or selecting relevant points from the extracts will provide a starting point for most responses, but there should also be evidence of wider reading (e.g. references to theorists), awareness of the social implications of language use (e.g. attitudes to non-standard forms), and linguistic knowledge (e.g. appropriately used terminology). Responses should be logically organised with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Characteristics of a successful response to Question 2 / 3 / 4 may include:

- clear understanding of concepts and resulting issues
- well-informed analysis
- critical engagement with key concepts and issues
- well-chosen, concise textual references to support the points made
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. discussing findings in the light of the question
- purposeful discussion of relevant issues
- well-developed knowledge
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the set topic and other sources, making effective use of the examples and possibly bringing in a wide range of sources.

Characteristics of a less successful response to Question 2 / 3 / 4 may include:

- losing sight of what is being asked by the question
- description of some relevant linguistic concepts and issues, but not directly related to the question
- reference to some relevant linguistic concepts (e.g. genre, audience, purpose) and issues (e.g. individual opinions, relationships, gender), but with few links to the question/data
- inconsistent use of appropriate textual references, or overly long quotations
- evidence of some linguistic knowledge although it is not always accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- lack of engagement with detail, instead providing a rather superficial view of the data
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance on describing or summarising content.

The following notes address features of interest which may be explored, but it is important to reward all valid discussion.

*Either, Language and Situation: variation and audience*

**2. Read the following extract from *Sociolinguistics* by Peter Stockwell.**

*A senior doctor is discussing a patient's condition with a senior nurse, the patient herself and a junior doctor*

*Senior doctor talking to senior nurse out of the patient's hearing:*

We'll stop Mrs P's A (drug's pharmaceutical name) – it's done bugger all to help her and just made her more vulnerable to infection.

*Senior doctor moving to the patient's bedside and addressing her:*

Well it is TB – as long as you take the tablets to fight the infection there will be no problem – we are going to stop your breathing tablets as it's just not helping.

*Senior doctor moving away from the bedside and talking to the junior doctor:*

Unfortunately her emphysema masked the underlying tuberculosis – I've actually seen at PM widespread miliary infection that was not picked up on by either CT scan or PA view on x-ray.

Section C, 'Exploration' (Routledge, 2002)

**Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which speakers vary their use of language depending on audience. [60]**

As the extract focuses on variations in discourse within a hospital, an analysis of how the doctor changes her/his language depending on whom s/he is addressing is likely to be the starting point. Candidates should also comment on a range of other speech situations in which the language is used differently according to the audience. Specific examples should be given with the focus on spoken word and not written text.

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- the use of language in the classroom, both by the teacher and the student/pupil, contrasting their discourse and possibly referencing Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model
- variation in the candidate's own idiolect, noting specific examples of talking to friends as opposed to family members, for instance
- the discourse of domestic situations, noting how the presence of particular people (e.g. a grandparent at Christmas) alters the use of language
- variation in the language of the media, depending on the context (e.g. comparing the discourse of Radio 1 with that of Radio 4)
- the language of other professional situations such as legal discourse in a courtroom as opposed to discussions between lawyers in the office
- accounts of accommodation theory and examples of convergence and divergence (possibly referencing Howard Giles' research)
- reference to research on gender with specific focus on how men and women might vary their language depending on the situation (e.g. Tannen's ideas of Rapport and Report Talk)
- use of more formal registers in certain situations such as job interviews in contrast to the language used by employer and employee in a normal work situation.

**This is not a checklist. Look for and reward other valid interpretations/approaches.**

Or, **Child Language Acquisition: up to 24 months**

**3. Read the following extract from Matthew Saxton's *Child Language*.**

[We should] try to get a sense of the magnitude of the task facing the newborn child. The first thing to note is that the child is battling on several fronts at once. Language has different components, or levels, each of which must be tackled: phonology, vocabulary, morphology and syntax. Or we might reduce our list to just two factors: meaning and sound. The study of child language acquisition could be reduced to working out how meaning and sound are connected.

Chapter 1, 'Prelude: Landmarks in the Landscape of Child Language'  
(Sage, 2010)

**Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which children acquire language up to the age of 24 months. [60]**

As the extract discusses the nature of the challenge facing the newborn child, it is likely that some sense of the range of this challenge will be the starting point for the discussion. Candidates will move onto a discussion of the process by which language is acquired in the first 24 months, possibly focusing on the four elements mentioned (phonology, vocabulary, morphology and syntax).

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- research about the influence on language recognition in the womb (Mehler's work)
- some account of the pre-speech stages (cooing, babbling) and their significance for the child's ability to acquire language
- the holophrastic stage and the development of vocabulary (possibly referencing Nelson or Fenson's research), including over-extension and under-extension
- the two-word stage and the initial development of grammatical/syntactical awareness with specific examples of different grammatical forms used such as the formation of questions or negation
- specific focus on phonological development, including phonemic expansion and features such as deletion, substitution, reduplication and metathesis
- the initial part of Brown's research on the order in which inflectional forms are acquired, providing some morphological analysis
- the role of Child Directed Speech and interaction with caregivers in the acquisition of language in the first two years
- reference to Aitchison's three-part process (labelling, packaging, networking) or Halliday or Dore's work
- some account of the theories of acquisition (although should be tied directly to the first two years).

**This is not a checklist. Look for and reward other valid interpretations/approaches.**

Or, **Standard and Non-Standard English: status of standard/non-standard forms**

**4. Read the following extract from *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction* by Linda Thomas and Shan Wareing.**

Of the many dialects of English, the dialect known as Standard English has a special status. Standard English is the dialect of institutions such as government and the law; it is the dialect of literacy and education; it is the dialect taught as 'English' to foreign learners; and it is the dialect of the higher social classes. [It] achieved prominence historically, not on linguistic grounds, but on grounds of power and influence.

Chapter 10, 'The Standard English Debate' (Psychology Press, 1999)

**Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which some people see standard forms of language as having a higher status than non-standard forms.** [60]

As the extract specifically identifies Standard English as a dialect, some definition of the nature of a prestige form is likely to be the starting point. Candidates will move onto a discussion of the range of attitudes towards standard forms and its relationship with social power, exploring specific examples to support their argument.

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- some brief historical context on the emergence of standard forms and the process of standardisation
- the distinction between prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches (possibly referencing writers such as Crystal and Johns who argue for different sides)
- the frequent difference between attitudes to lexical variation (e.g. Scottish use of the adjective "wee") and the more heavily stigmatized grammatical variation (e.g. regularising of verbs such as "they was")
- specific examples of particular regional dialects as opposed to standard forms and the debate about their relative status
- some consideration of particular contexts (with examples) where standard forms are especially valued (the idea of its "gatekeeping" function)
- the significance of language change in explaining dialectal variation with Standard English sometimes regularising forms ("you" as a second person pronoun for both singular and plural as opposed to "thou", "thee" and "ye") and sometimes rejecting regularisation (such as some dialects' standardising of irregular verbs – e.g. "I seen")
- recent developments in dialects in Britain, including some discussion of dialect levelling
- the significance of ethnicity in accent and dialect studies with an account of the influence of AAVE on the spoken discourse of many young people.

**This is not a checklist. Look for and reward other valid interpretations/approaches.**

**Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section B Questions 2-4**

<b>BAND</b>	<b>AO1</b> <b>Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression</b>  <b>20 marks</b>	<b>AO2</b> <b>Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language us</b>  <b>20 marks</b>	<b>AO3</b> <b>Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning</b>  <b>20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sophisticated methods of analysis</li> <li>• Confident use of a wide range of terminology</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of topic</li> <li>• Coherent, academic style</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed critical understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of issues</li> <li>• Confident and concise selection of supporting examples</li> </ul>	<b>17-20 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confident analysis and evaluation of a range of contextual factors</li> <li>• Productive discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Perceptive evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective methods of analysis</li> <li>• Secure use of a range of terminology</li> <li>• Thorough discussion of topic</li> <li>• Expression generally accurate and clear</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Some intelligent discussion of issues</li> <li>• Consistent selection of apt supporting examples</li> </ul>	<b>13-16 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of contextual factors</li> <li>• Some insightful discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Purposeful evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible methods of analysis</li> <li>• Generally sound use of terminology</li> <li>• Competent discussion of topic</li> <li>• Mostly accurate expression with some lapses</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Sensible discussion of issues</li> <li>• Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples</li> </ul>	<b>9-12 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible analysis and evaluation of contextual factors</li> <li>• Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Relevant evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic methods of analysis</li> <li>• Using some terminology with some accuracy</li> <li>• Uneven discussion of topic</li> <li>• Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of concepts</li> <li>• Basic discussion of issues</li> <li>• Some points supported by examples</li> </ul>	<b>5-8 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some valid analysis of contextual factors</li> <li>• Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning</li> <li>• Inconsistent evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited methods of analysis</li> <li>• Some grasp of basic terminology</li> <li>• Undeveloped discussion of topic</li> <li>• Errors in expression and lapses in clarity</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few simple points made about concepts</li> <li>• Limited discussion of issues</li> <li>• Few examples cited</li> </ul>	<b>1-4 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some basic awareness of context</li> <li>• Little sense of how meaning is constructed</li> <li>• Limited evaluation of effectiveness of communication</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<b>0 marks:</b> Response not credit worthy		