



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2023

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

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2023 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.

EDUQAS GCE A LEVEL ENGLISH LANGUAGE
COMPONENT 1: LANGUAGE CONCEPTS AND ISSUES
SUMMER 2023 MARK SCHEME

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 stationery 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 an 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 for an answer. 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.

SECTION A: ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE

AO1	AO2	AO4
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

General Notes

In making judgements, look carefully at 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: Radio Phone-ins

In your response to the question that follows, you must:

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

1. **Analyse the participants' use of spoken language in these phone-ins. You should compare the attitudes of the speakers and their interactions. [60]**

This question tests the candidate's ability to analyse language using appropriate terminology, and to explore meaningful connections across texts that demonstrate an understanding of how language is used through critical selection of relevant concepts and issues.

Overview

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- clear understanding of spoken language concepts evident e.g. the turn-taking structure with the contrast between the lengthy turns of the two presenters in Text A and the much greater competition for the floor in Text B
- insightful discussion of points of comparison that explore language use e.g. the emotionally supportive nature of discourse in Text A and the face-threatening elements of Text B
- well-chosen textual references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. the ways in which language reveals the differing roles of the speakers
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading engaging with how meaning is constructed to drive on the argument e.g. the way in which the language reveals the different relationships between the callers and the experts
- assured evaluation providing details on implications, consistently and purposefully tied to the meaning of the text
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the transcripts in light of the question set.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- focus on irrelevant general features of spoken language, e.g. broad statements about genre
- a lack of focus on what is being asked by the question e.g. limited close analysis of the transcripts
- descriptions of some relevant spoken language concepts without linking to the question/texts
- arguments that are implicit and difficult to follow
- only a limited number of points that are appropriately and accurately supported with textual references
- some demonstration of some linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- lack of engagement with the detail of the texts and providing, instead, a somewhat superficial view of the transcripts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance largely on describing and/or summarising content
- a limited number of comparative points across the texts, mostly rudimentary but some of which may be sensible.

Notes

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

Text A: The Surgery

Nouns and noun phrases: the plural abstract nouns *drama* and *difficulties* suggesting Lara's unwillingness to reveal more personal details; her use of the slightly vague extended noun phrase *post exams pre-results* /kaɪndə/ *stress and worry* to identify the sort of problem she has, reinforced by the noun phrase *loss of confidence*; Katie's use of the vague noun phrase *these experiences* to make traumatic events seem more positive and less damaging; her use of the abstract nouns *resilience* and *strength* to praise Lara and contrasting the noun phrases *a fulfilling life* and *the hard times* to emphasise hope for the future

Proper nouns and vocatives: Kate's formulaic use of the vocative *Hannah* to indicate the identity of the next speaker to the radio audience; her use of *Lara* as a vocative at the start of her final turn to help to personalise the advice; Hannah's use of the proper noun *Netflix*, suggesting a shared understanding of ways in which young people might relax

Verbs: Lara's repetition of the verb *felt* to foreground the significance of her emotional response to her exams; her use of present continuous forms in the clauses *I'm looking back*, *I'm getting* and *I'm thinking* to highlight the immediate and ongoing nature of her worries; Hannah's face work to support Lara in the verb *admire*; her extensive use of imperatives to advise her to relax and value herself: *try ... do ... have ... binge ... chill ... stay ... take ... be ... recognise*; further (fewer) imperatives providing specific advice on seeing teachers: *talk ... see*; her use of informal verbs such as *binge* and the phrasal verb *chill out* to converge with Lara's discourse as a young person; her use of modal verb *might*, suggesting that Lara could be worrying unnecessarily; Katie's use of the dynamic verb *struggled* to recognise Lara's problems

Adjectives and adjective phrases: Lara's use of *worried* to show her feelings; Hannah's use of *amazing* to offer support to Lara and the adjective phrase *really lovely* to encourage her to worry less; the repeated use of the comparative adjective *better* by both Hannah and Katie to offer hope to Lara; Katie's use of the comparative adjective *stronger* at the end to suggest the potentially positive outcome of Lara's personal difficulties for her future life

Adverbs and adverb phrases: Lara's phatic use of *basically* as she starts her turn; her use of the intensifier *very* in the adverb phrase *very seriously* to underline the gravity of her relative's illness; Hannah's use of *actually* in the clause *actually getting through your exams* which emphasises the idea that sitting them was an achievement; her repeated use of the intensifier *really* in the clauses *I really think* and *really take it easy* and the sentence adverb *really* in the clause *so really I've got everything crossed* to highlight the genuine nature of her concern; her prosodic stress on the adverbs of time *now* and *tonight* and the adverb phrase *right now* to highlight that Lara only has an evening to get through before getting her results; her repetition of the adverb *still* in the clauses *you're still here you're still doing your thing* to acknowledge Lara's resilience, despite the vagueness of the noun phrase *your thing*; Katie's repetition of the adverb *perhaps*, possibly indicating some implicit unease about her suggestion that Lara's personal difficulties can be seen as a positive experience

Pronouns: frequent use of second person singular form *you* to address Lara directly with use of first person *I* by Hannah and Katie in clauses such as *I've got everything crossed for you* to convey their personal involvement and concern; Hannah's self-correction when she moves from first person plural *we* to second person singular *you*, recognising that this is Lara's problem; Katie's slightly surprising shift to the first person near the end in the clauses *I've struggled* and *I'm stronger*, possibly seeking to suggest greater empathy for Lara's situation while arguing that exam performance is less important

Determiners: frequent use of second person possessive determiner *your* in the noun phrases *your Maths and English...your exam grades...your exams* to stress the importance of the exams to Lara, making the advice seem more personal; Katie's prosodic stress on the indefinite determiner *any* in the interrogative *is that any help?* to indicate some potential doubt about the effectiveness of the advice

Interjections: the informality of Lara's use of *yep* at the start in contrast to her repetition of the more formal form *yes* at the end, where the pauses possibly indicate some uncertainty about the value of the advice; Hannah's use of *yes* followed by the adverb *absolutely* to affirm how familiar and recognisable Lara's problems are

Comment clauses: repeated use of comment clauses by all speakers such as Lara's *I mean* and *I guess* (possibly suggesting some conversational uncertainty) and Hannah's *I mean* and *to be honest* (possibly emphasising the emotional authenticity of her response)

Parallel phrasing: repeated use of parallel phrasing with Hannah's imperative clauses encouraging Lara to be less stressed *have a bath (.) binge on Netflix (.) chill out*; Katie's tripling in the clauses *make you better at your job make you better at your relationships and make you better when working with other people*, with its surprising emphasis on the potential value of personal trauma for Lara's subsequent working life

Fillers and non-fluency features: Lara's frequent use of fillers at the start, revealing her nerves as she starts the call; both Lara and Hannah's use of /jənəʊ/ as either fillers or monitoring features to underline the connection with the other

Turn-taking and mean length of utterance: the clear transition relevance places mean that there are no overlaps and the exchange is entirely cooperative with the length of the turns of both Hannah and Kate indicating their power in the exchange in contrast to the brevity of Lara's response at the end

Prosodic features: Hannah's emphatic stress on the indefinite pronoun *nothing* to help Lara worry less; both Hannah and Katie accelerate their speech at the start of their turns (possibly to avoid losing the interest of the audience); Katie's raised intonation on each of her three uses of the comparative adjective *better* seek to emphasise the promised sense of improvement in Lara's future work and life.

Text B: 606

Nouns and noun phrases: Savage's initial use of the emotive noun phrase *a complete and utter lie* and his repeated use of the concrete noun *liar* to dispute David's claim about the purchase of the trainers; his repeated face-threatening use of the noun phrase *people like you* to personalise his attack on the caller, reinforced by his use of the noun *liar* as a vocative; David's use of the noun phrase *this kid* to underline Savage's supposed lack of concern for others which Savage emphasises further by re-formulating it as *a little boy* to make it seem more outrageous (and, therefore, less plausible); Chapman's careful use of the noun phrase *the trainer route* to avoid further conflict, underlining his role as a peacemaker in the discussion, also seen in his framing of the noun phrase *most of your points* at the end

Proper nouns and vocatives: Savage's growing exasperation and irritation with the caller's accusation, revealed through his use of the vocative *David*, used once in his initial response and in the imperative clause *go on David* where he tries to calm down but used twice on three other occasions; Chapman's more respectful use of the same vocative before the politeness feature *thank you* as he seeks to conclude the discussion more calmly; his use of the vocative *boys* as he seeks to re-assert order to the conversation where his language mimics a parent or a teacher; Savage's fronting of the familiar vocative *Chappers* in response, revealing his closer relationship with him (and possibly his desire to win his approval) in contrast to his later use of *Mark* when he seeks to interrupt

Verbs: Savage's use of the phrasal verb *make...up* to affirm the inaccuracy of the claim which is backed up by his negated imperative *don't say...*; his use of the imperative clause *wait a minute* as he seeks to initiate a topic loop and return the discussion to the caller's allegations; his use of the phrasal verb *wind...up* (and *wound...up*) to imply that the caller has deliberately sought to anger him; David's repeated use of the dynamic verb *saw* to suggest the empirical basis of the alleged purchase of the trainers

Modal verbs: Chapman's measured tone reflected in the modal verb *could* in the paralleled clauses *you could bring in film stars...you could bring in TV stars*, mirrored in the formality of David's reply *I would accept that* (in contrast to Savage's heated discourse); David's later use of the modal verb *would* in the clause *you would say that* and the use of the challenging tag question *wouldn't you* as clear face-threatening acts

Adjectives and adjective phrases: Savage's use of the face-threatening adjective *stupid* as he personalises the disagreement; his repetition of the adjective *untrue* as he persists in disputing the claims; the contrasting tone in Chapman's repetition of the superlative adjective *funniest* which treats the disagreement in a more lighthearted manner

Adverbs: Savage's repetition of the adverb of frequency *never* culminating in the use of the adverb phrase *never ever* to add further emphasis and convey his indignation; Chapman's use of adverbs as discourse markers such as *right* and *alright* as he seeks to control the discussion as the approved topic manager

Determiners: David's use of the predeterminer *all* alongside the possessive determiner *your* in the noun phrase *all your boxes* to imply the callousness of Savage's alleged treatment of the child

Interjections: the repetition of the interjection /wəʊ/ in Savage's first turn, pointing to his unwillingness to accept the charge laid against him from the very start; his repeated use of the interjection *no* to indicate his unwillingness to accept any topic shift or desire to restrain him implied by Chapman's overlapping use of the adverb *well*

Prepositional phrases: David's use of the prepositional phrase *with my own eyes* to assert the authenticity of his accusation; Chapman's use of the prepositional phrase *in all my years* to establish his broadcasting experience in the discussion; Savage's use of the vague prepositional phrase *with modern things* which seeks to broaden his unhappiness with the caller's point into a broader cultural critique; his subsequent use of the prepositional phrase *on my mother and father's life* to assert his truthfulness in denying the accusation

Turn-taking and overlapping: the low mean length of utterance and the consistently uncooperative overlaps, initiated by Savage to express his anger and by Chapman to attempt to reclaim the floor

Prosodic features: Savage's raised volume on the noun *liar* reflects his mounting anger; Chapman's attempt to slow the pace of his speech shows his desire to defuse the growing tension; David's rising intonation on the noun *eyes* indicates his certainty that what he says is true.

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

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

SECTION B: LANGUAGE ISSUES

AO1	AO2	AO3
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

Overview

Responses in this section, regardless of which option is chosen, test the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate the ways in which contextual factors affect linguistic choices, to demonstrate evidence of wider reading and an awareness of the social implications of language use, and to use linguistic knowledge appropriately. Responses should be logically organised with clear topic sentences and a developing argument.

Notes

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

Characteristics of a successful response may include:

- clear understanding of concepts and resulting issues
- well-informed analysis
- effective use of the prompt material at the start before effectively moving on to the candidate's own material
- critical engagement with key concepts and issues e.g. the way in which language can be used to challenge others
- well-chosen references, including possibly either the research of specific linguists, which support the points made concisely and precisely e.g. Chomsky's critique of Skinner's theories on how children acquire language
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures e.g. the nature of code-switching in different contexts
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. the relative merits of prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches
- productive explorations of the implications of contextual factors e.g. the way in which audience alters speakers' use of language
- consistently and purposefully reference the contextual factors and how meaning is created e.g. the way in which authority can be challenged by particular lexical choices
- tightly focused, meaningful analysis of the set topics, making effective use of examples and possibly bringing in a wide range of sources e.g. exploration of how power and status are negotiated in the classroom.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:

- loss of focus on what is being asked by the question e.g. broader analysis not directly relevant to the question
- description of some relevant linguistic concepts without linking them to the question
- the investigation of concepts tending to be implicit and difficult to follow
- a limited number of points which are appropriately and accurately supported with references
- demonstration of some rather limited linguistic knowledge although it may not always be accurate
- some overview of appropriate but general contextual factors such as audience and/or purpose
- a lack of engagement with a somewhat superficial overview of issues/concepts
- a limited number of points developed through the response
- a reliance largely on describing and/or summarising content.

Child Language Acquisition

2. Read the following data. [Source: NF Blake and Jean Moorhead's *Introduction to English Language* (Macmillan, 1993)]

Mark: Play. Play. Play, Mummy. Mummy, come on.
 Mother: All right.
 Mark: Helen play, please? (pause) Helen still gone sleep, Mummy?
 Mother: No. She's up there talking, isn't she?
 Mark: Yes. (playing with his toys) Top of the coach. Broken.
 Mother: Who broke the coach?
 Mark: Mark did.
 Mother: How?
 Mark: Out.
 Mother: How did you break it?
 Mark: Dunno (pause) Mummy mend it.
 Mother: I can't, darling. Look the wheels have gone as well.
 Mark: Oh I want Daddy taked it to work (pause) mend it.
 Mother: Daddy did?
 Mark: Daddy take it away, take it to work. Mend it.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate some of the ways in which children acquire language between eighteen months and four years of age. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- a (relatively) detailed account of the language used by Mark in the stimulus material
- an account of the stages of development, tracking the two-word stage, the telegraphic stage and the post-telegraphic stage
- specific examples of lexical, grammatical and phonological development in these stages
- the contrasting theoretical arguments about how language is acquired, exploring, for instance, Chomsky's Nativist critique of Skinner's Behaviourist model
- the contrast between other theorists such as the Cognitive model (Piaget) and the Interactionist model (Vygotsky or Bruner)
- the role of Child Directed Speech (CDS) in enabling the child's development
- the significance of case studies such as Genie or Jim, the son of deaf parents (research by Bard and Sachs), in revealing the process whereby children acquire language
- research such as Berko Gleason's "Wug Test" or Brown's work on the order in which inflections are learned and their implications for the way in which children acquire the patterns of language
- specific examples of child language that are relevant to this age group.

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

Language and Power: challenging others

3. Read the following data. [Source: Martin Montgomery's *An Introduction to Language and Society* (Routledge 2008)]

The teacher has just given instructions concerning the completion of a written task, telling the class that underlining should be done in black.

Pupil: What colour do we use to underline, miss?

(laughter from pupils)

Teacher: That is a stupid question. I've only just this minute said.

Pupil: I know, miss.

(laughter from pupils)

Teacher: What is your name?

Pupil: Ian Smith.

Teacher: Well, you're not a very polite boy, are you?

Pupil: No, miss.

Teacher: In fact, you seem a very rude, very stupid kind of boy.

Pupil: I am, miss.

(laughter from pupils)

Teacher: I see.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which one speaker might seek to challenge the authority of another. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- a (relatively) detailed analysis of the stimulus material, exploring how the pupil uses language to challenge the teacher's authority
- identification of characteristic features through which speakers seek to challenge authority in spoken language (e.g. use of vocatives or face threatening acts)
- detailed exploration of particular domestic situations (possibly drawn from the candidate's own experience) such as family arguments between children and parents
- the language of political debate where one speaker uses face-threatening acts to challenge another (e.g. members of the public confronting politicians)
- the nature of classroom discourse and exchanges between teachers and students, especially where the student or pupil refuses to be subservient
- the nature of legal discourse, especially where a witness diverges from the expected discourse of the court
- police interviews where the suspect challenges the police
- some (brief) reference to theorists (e.g. Norman Fairclough's notion of synthetic personalisation; Deborah Tannen's concept of genderlects; Sinclair and Coulthard's classroom discourse analysis; Giles' Accommodation Theory).

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

Standard and Non-Standard English: prescriptivism and descriptivism

4. Read the following extract. [Source: John Myhill's "Re-thinking Prescriptivism" from *Language Alive in the Classroom* ed Rebecca S. Wheeler (Praeger, 1999)]

In the English speaking world, the forms that are declared to be prescriptively "correct" and those declared to be "incorrect" are based on a single simple principle: the variation used by those in power is considered to be correct while the form used by those with less power is considered incorrect. Consider the following pairs of sentences, having the same meaning, which correspond to African American Vernacular English (or Black Vernacular English) and Standard English:

AAVE: He say he hungry now.

SE: He says he's hungry now.

AAVE: He be at Mary house every afternoon.

SE: He's at Mary's house every afternoon.

AAVE: I ain't tell him nothing.

SE: I did not tell him anything.

As William Labov argues neither form is superior to the other as both follow clear and consistent grammatical rules.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate prescriptivist and descriptivist views of language, noting which you find more persuasive. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- a (relatively) precise account of the differences between the AAVE and SE forms in the stimulus material
- the distinction between prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches
- the social implications of using non-standard forms, exploring different positions put forward by writers such as Crystal or Rosen as opposed to Johns
- specific examples of forms in non-standard dialects such as MLE and the arguments that surround its use
- some historical perspective on the emergence of a prescriptivist notion of "correctness" in the eighteenth century and the role of texts such as Fowler's *Modern English Usage* in defining standard forms
- the emergence of specific grammatical features being considered "wrong" such as terminal prepositions or split infinitives or fronted conjunctions
- the role of code-switching as understood by descriptivists with some consideration of the effect of contexts (contrasting speech situations where non-standard forms are more acceptable with situations where they are not)
- specific examples of stigmatised grammatical variation (e.g. regularising of verbs such as "she were", non-standard use of prepositions, unmarked adverbs, zero-marked plurals in nouns of measurement, multiple negation, object pronouns used as possessive determiners) and the contrasting attitudes towards them
- some exploration of the features of particular regional dialects and popular prescriptivists' contrasting attitudes towards lexical and grammatical variation
- the significance of language change in explaining dialectal variation with the process of regularisation sometimes apparent in SE (e.g. the use of "you" as a second person pronoun for both singular and plural as opposed to "thou", "thee" and "ye") and sometimes in dialectal forms (e.g. the standardisation of irregular verbs, "he gone")
- the work of particular descriptivist linguists such as Labov or Trudgill and the importance of language use for identity (e.g. Labov's work on language loyalty).

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

Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section B

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

A700U10-1 EDUQAS GCE A Level English Language - Component 1 MS S23/CB