



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2025

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

About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

EDUQAS GCE A LEVEL ENGLISH LANGUAGE
COMPONENT 1: LANGUAGE CONCEPTS AND ISSUES
SUMMER 2025 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 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: Arguments in Reality Television Programmes

In your response to the question that follows, 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 arguments in reality television programmes. You should compare the attitudes of the speakers and their interactions.**

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 use of prosodic stress to foreground the arguments in Text A and the turn-taking structure with competition for the floor in Text B
- insightful discussion of points of comparison that explore language use e.g. the way in which both Edwina in Text A and Anna in Text B seek to provoke the other speakers
- well-chosen textual references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. the ways in which language reveals the identities of the different speakers, exploring, for instance, the change in Kendra's discourse during the transcript or the contrasting discourses of Jordan and Anna
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading engaging with how meaning is constructed in the arguments e.g. the way in which Melanie seeks to use face-saving strategies in Text A and how Anna uses prosodic features to mock Jordan's previous speeches in Text B
- 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: *I'm a Celebrity... Get Me Out of Here*

Nouns and noun phrases: Kendra's use of the abstract noun *faith* and the noun phrases *my decision* ... *my life* in her first turn to highlight the importance of self-belief and individual decision-making; Edwina's emphasis on the repeated noun phrase *a mother* to imply that Kendra has other responsibilities that she is failing to acknowledge; her dismissive use of the noun phrases *the problem* and *that philosophy* to challenge Kendra's views; her patronising use of the vocative *young lady* which provokes Kendra's anger; Kendra's use of the noun phrase *the heart of it* to point to the emotional impact of her view which she believes Edwina has misunderstood

Verbs and verb phrases: Kendra's use of the verb *own* to emphasise her sense that individual responsibility for your decisions is crucial; Edwina's use of the imperative clause *count me out* to indicate her opposition to Kendra's statement and her (almost school-teacherly) use of the imperative clause *don't you wag your finger at me* to provoke the argument further (despite the fact that she has pointed her finger first); Melanie's use of the verb phrase *would agree* where the modal verb *would* suggests that Edwina has simply misunderstood Kendra's point; Kendra's repeated use of imperatives when she reveals her anger towards Edwina: *shut up* ... *get out* ... *shut up* ... *take* ... *go back* ...; her use of *belong* to suggest that Edwina is not welcome in the conversation; her emotive use of *damage* to underline the personally threatening quality of Edwina's attack on her; Edwina's use of *dominate* to suggest that Kendra is the one who is being overly aggressive; her use of the negated imperative *don't try* to re-assert her authority

Adjectives: Kendra's tripling of superlative adjectives (*healthiest ... happiest ... best*), implying the importance of being positive in life; her use of *proud* to underline further the positivity of her outlook; Edwina's repetition of *sorry* as a form of pseudo-negative politeness prior to stating her view forcefully; her deliberately provocative use of *wrong* in the noun phrase *the wrong decision* (where she changes her argument to suggest that Kendra should not have appeared on the show); Kendra's contrasting use of adjectives *heartful* and *young* (referring to herself) and *heartless* and *grown-up* (referring to Edwina) to emphasise the difference between them; her subsequent change from *heartless* to *devilish* in the noun phrase *your devilish ass* to heighten her moral condemnation of Edwina

Adverbs and adverb phrases: Kendra's use of the adverbs of frequency *never* and *ever* (with prosodic stress for emphasis) to highlight her strength of feeling; Edwina's repeated use of the adverb of frequency *sometimes* to challenge Kendra's statement; Melanie's use of the sentence adverb *really* to suggest that there is a common ground between the speakers

Pronouns: Kendra's use of the generic second person pronoun *you* in the clauses *you live in your moment* and *you believe* to emphasise the value of self-belief to everyone; her contrastingly specific use of the second person pronoun *you* to confront Edwina (with the paralinguistic feature of pointing at her) before she broadens the point by using the indefinite pronoun *anybody*; her use of the first person plural pronoun *we* to emphasise the support of Melanie (and others) and to isolate Edwina

Determiner: Kendra's pointed use of the possessive determiner *our* in the repeated noun phrase *our conversation* to imply that Edwina is interfering in private discussion in which she is unwelcome

Conjunction: Edwina's fronting of the conjunction *but* in the clause *but you can't say* to provoke the argument, a desire reinforced by her sitting up

Prepositions and prepositional phrases: Kendra's use of the prepositional phrase *in your moment* to suggest the importance of individual choice; Melanie's emphatic stress on and elongation of the preposition *for* implying that Edwina has misunderstood Kendra's viewpoint (although the prepositional phrase *for other people* is unaltered from Kendra and Edwina's previous turns)

Interjections: Edwina's (possibly childish) use of the idiomatic interjection *so there* indicating her desire to assert her position; her subsequent mocking use of both */u:/* and *the hairdryer* (in reference to the anger of her response) to undermine Kendra and (deliberately?) provoke her further

Parallel phrasing: Kendra's use of tripling in *trying to ... trying to ... trying to ...* to emphasise her own commitment to helping others (reflected in the verbs *help* and *inspire*) in contrast to what she sees as Edwina's negative hostility; her repetition of the three questions in her final turn with the proper noun phrases *Queen of England ... Queen of England ... Queen of the jungle*, conveying her resentment at what she sees at Edwina's assumed superiority

Fillers and non-fluency features: Kendra's repetition of */jənəʊ/* as a monitoring feature, stressing her desire to relate to her listeners at the start; her self-correction at the end of her first turn (*like be like have a*) indicating a degree of uncertainty (possibly enabling Edwina's interruption); Kendra's use of backchannel communication (*/jeə/*) revealing her gratitude for Melanie's support

Turn-taking and mean length of utterance: Edwina's overlap with her first turn, indicating her desire to challenge Kendra's attitude and her subsequent overlapping of Melanie's turn *well no*, revealing her desire to continue the argument; Kendra's longer turns at the start and end of the transcript (noting how she holds the floor in both but that her tone has changed markedly)

Prosodic features: Edwina's use of emphatic stress on the determiner, noun and adverb with *other people first* to underline her strength of feeling about her point; her upward intonation on the fronted proper noun ↗*Kendra*, conveying a patronising tone; Kendra's emphatic stress on the second and first person pronouns *you* and *me*, implying that she sees the argument in very personal terms.

Text B: Love Island

Nouns and noun phrases: Anna's use of the noun phrase *all the romantic spots* while mimicking Jordan's voice, stressing her belief in the faux sincerity of his previous language; her use of the vocatives *babes* and *babe*, ironically endearing terms used mockingly here; her repetition of the noun phrase *a joke* as a face-threatening act to convey her contempt for Jordan's behaviour

Verbs: Jordan's informal use of *grab* at the start, mitigated by the politeness feature *please*, as he seeks to assert his power; his use of *apologise* and the modal verb *should* as an acknowledgement of his regret for his actions the previous night; the informal use of *pulled* to indicate initiating a private conversation (reflecting the distinctive discourse of the programme); Anna's emotive use of *lied* in her response to Jordan's more measured language, highlighting his deceit; her use of *take* in the infinitive clause *to take a girl*, making Jordan's behavior appear more casual and uncaring; Jordan's use of the colloquial phrasal verb *blew off*, indicating how he took Anna's response to be disproportionately intemperate; his initial use of the informal *squash* to discuss the end of their relationship, possibly making it seem less important; his use of the present progressive in the idiomatic clause *I'm just closing the book* to imply again the straightforward simplicity of the conversation from his viewpoint in contrast to Anna's anger; his more formal use of *vocalise* towards the end, suggesting that he is trying to present a more mature face

Adjectives: Anna's repetition of *disrespectful* to challenge Jordan about his behaviour; Jordan's use of *rash* in response to indicate his criticism of Anna's reaction on the previous night; Anna's mocking use of *hilarious* to challenge Jordan's face at the end

Adverbs: Jordan's use of two adverbs as the discourse markers *so first* at the start of the conversation, indicating his initial desire to act as the topic manager; his emphatic stress on the adverb *just* to indicate his frustration at being interrupted by Anna; Anna's use of *actually* at the end which is essentially phatic, revealing her level of anger

Pronouns: Anna's mocking adoption of Jordan's voice using first person to mimic the romantic language that he used previously (*I'm so happy I found you here*); her use of the first person plural *we* in the clause *we'll get on to that later*, asserting her authority as topic manager; her accusatory use of the second person pronoun in the repeated clause *did you think*

Interjections: Anna's repetition of *no* (with accelerated tempo), indicating her growing irritation at Jordan's partial apology; Jordan's use of *OK* in his final turn to acknowledge that Anna has unequivocally not accepted his apology

Prepositional phrases: Anna's use of *for the past three weeks* to emphasise what she sees to be the extent of Jordan's deceitfulness; her use of *in front of my eyes* to suggest his callousness and disregard for her feelings; her use of *in a minute* to underline her control of the topic management

Parallel phrasing: Anna's use of tripling in her first turn *you shouldn't ... you shouldn't ... you shouldn't* culminating in the face threatening clause *you shouldn't have lied to me*

Filler: Jordan's uncertainty and (possible) nervousness conveyed by his filler /ɜ:m/ following a three-second pause in his opening turn

Turn-taking and overlapping: Jordan's overlapping with the interjection /jeə/ as he uses backchannel communication in an attempt to regain the floor; both speakers' use of latch-ons in the middle of the transcript, indicating competition for the floor; Anna's use of the imperative clauses *let me finish* and *wait no* to interrupt Jordan, asserting her status as topic manager; her constant repetition of the interrogative *did you think the book was open?* (which is repeated five times) including overlapping Jordan in an attempt to assert her authority

Prosodic features: Anna's use of a slower tempo when mimicking Jordan's language *my head can't be turned by anyone* to highlight the (deceptively) romantic quality of his previous discourse; her use of the elongated vowel in the adjective phrase *so::: happy* to achieve the same effect; her downward intonation and emphatic stress on the negator *not* in the elliptical clause *apology not accepted* used as a way of managing the topic by finishing the conversation.

This is not a checklist. Look for and credit other valid interpretations/approaches where they are based on the language of the texts, 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 - Sophisticated methods of analysis - Confident use of a wide range of terminology (including spoken) - Perceptive discussion of texts - Coherent, academic style	17-20 marks - Detailed critical understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Confident and concise selection of textual support	17-20 marks - Insightful connections established between texts - Sophisticated overview - Effective use of linguistic knowledge
4	13-16 marks - 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 - Secure understanding of concepts - Some intelligent discussion of issues - Consistent selection of apt textual support	13-16 marks - Purposeful connections established between texts - Detailed overview - Relevant use of linguistic knowledge
3	9-12 marks - Sensible methods of analysis - Generally sound use of terminology (including spoken) - Competent discussion of texts - Mostly accurate expression with some lapses	9-12 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate selection of textual support	9-12 marks - Sensible connections established between texts - Competent overview - Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge
2	5-8 marks - Basic methods of analysis - Using some terminology with some accuracy (including spoken) - Uneven discussion of texts - Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy	5-8 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Basic discussion of issues - Some points supported by textual references	5-8 marks - Makes some basic connections between texts - Rather a broad overview - Some valid use of linguistic knowledge
1	1-4 marks - 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 - A few simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues - Little use of textual support	1-4 marks - Limited connections between texts - Vague overview - Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors
0	0 marks: Response not worthy of credit		

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 persuade or convince 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 theory of language acquisition
- clear appreciation that contextual factors shape the content, language and grammatical structures e.g. the use of non-standard English (NSE) in particular contexts
- intelligent conclusions drawn e.g. the relative importance of Child Directed Speech in language acquisition
- productive explorations of the implications of context factors e.g. the way in which the formality of the speech situation alters speakers' use of NSE
- consistent and purposeful references to the contextual factors and how meaning is created e.g. the way in which language can be used convincingly by politicians
- 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 specific examples of children's interaction with adults.

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.

Standard and Non-standard English: use of and attitudes towards NSE

2. Read the following extract.

Source: James and Lesley Milroy's *Real English: the grammar of English Dialects in the British Isles* (Routledge 2013)

The grammar of speech differs very much from the grammar of written language.

Compare the following pairs of sentences:

1(a) These cats – they're hungry

1(b) These cats are hungry

2(a) In the morning will suit me better

2(b) It will suit me better in the morning

3(a) I looked up and saw this man

3(b) I looked up and saw a man

The first item in each pair is commonly found in informal spoken English but is not associated with any particular regional syntax. Nevertheless, some people believe that spoken language of this form to be "ungrammatical". The truth is that the grammar of spoken English simply has not been fully described.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which non-standard English is used by speakers and how its use is viewed. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- a (relatively) precise account of the differences between the NSE and SE forms in the stimulus material
- other examples of NSE grammatical forms (possibly drawing on a range of different dialects) such as regularising of verbs e.g. she were, non-standard use of prepositions, unmarked adverbs, zero-marked plurals in nouns of measurement, multiple negation, object pronouns used by possessive determiners
- examples of use of NSE in a variety of contexts (e.g. inappropriately in formal speech situations such as job interviews) with some discussion of code-switching
- specific examples of forms in non-standard dialects such as MLE and the arguments that surround its use
- the social implications of using non-standard forms, exploring different positions put forward by writers such as Crystal or Rosen as opposed to Johns
- 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, split infinitives, fronted conjunctions
- some discussion about popular prescriptivist arguments contrasting positive attitudes towards lexical variation and negative attitudes towards grammatical variation
- 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.

Language and Power: convincing others

3. Read the following extract.

Source: The International Churchill Society Website - [The Munich Agreement - International Churchill Society \(winstonchurchill.org\)](http://winstonchurchill.org)

The following is an extract from Winston Churchill's speech in 1938, arguing against signing a treaty with Nazi Germany:

Many people, no doubt, honestly believe that they are only giving away the interests of Czechoslovakia, whereas I fear we shall find that we have deeply compromised, and perhaps fatally endangered, the safety and even the independence of Great Britain and France. Our loyal, brave people should know the truth. They should know that there has been gross neglect and deficiency in our defences; they should know that we have sustained a defeat without a war, the consequences of which will travel far with us along our road; they should know that we have passed an awful milestone in our history, when the whole equilibrium of Europe has been deranged. And do not suppose that this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which language is used by speakers to convince others of their point of view. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- a (relatively) detailed analysis of the stimulus material, exploring how Churchill uses language to convince the audience of the dangers of signing a treaty (focusing on emotive lexis, use of pronouns, parallel phrasing, use of metaphors etc)
- identification of characteristic features through which speakers seek to convince others of their views (e.g. direct address or use of antithesis)
- detailed exploration of other political speeches, noting how language is used to convince
- detailed exploration of particular domestic arguments (possibly drawn from the candidate's own experience) such as family disagreements between children and parents
- detailed exploration of classroom discourse and exchanges between teachers and students, especially one where a speaker is seeking to convince the other
- detailed exploration of legal discourse, especially where a barrister is trying to convince a jury
- detailed exploration of police interviews where the suspect seeks to defend themselves from charges
- some (brief) reference to theorists (e.g. Norman Fairclough's notion of synthetic personalisation; Sinclair and Coulthard's classroom discourse analysis; Giles' Accommodation Theory).

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

Child Language Acquisition: interaction between adults and children

4. Read the following data.

Source: Martin Montgomery's *An Introduction to Language and Society* (Routledge 2008)

Mother: now (.) there's mister Box gone by in his car (.) Wendy's daddy
 Child: Wendy's daddy
 Mother: now love (.) come on (.) are you going to come and play with your cars?
 Child: no (1)
 Mother: who's that going up through there (2) who is it? (3) eh? (4)
 Child: Wendy
 Mother: it's not Wendy (3) look (.) who is it? eh?
 Child: Brenda
 Mother: that's right (*laughs*) come on (.) now are you going to come and play with your cars?
 Child: no
 Mother: wouldn't you like to build a garage?
 Child: NO (3) (*noise of a helicopter*) an aeroplane
 Mother: yes (.) can you see it anywhere James?
 Child: there there =
 Mother: = where? show me
 Child: = there there
 Mother: oh yes (.) it's not an aeroplane is it? (.) you look (.) what is it? (2) it's a helicopter (1) can you see?
 Child: yes

Using this data as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which interaction with adults affects children's capacity to acquire language. [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- a (relatively) detailed account of the language used by both the mother and the child in the stimulus material (e.g. the mother's use of interrogatives, tag questions and imperatives and the child's limited responses)
- an account of features of child directed speech (CDS) and the role it plays in enabling a child's development
- the contrasting theoretical arguments about how language is acquired, exploring, for instance, Chomsky's Nativist critique of Skinner's Behaviourist model, especially in regard to the role of adult input
- the contrast between other theorists such as the Cognitive model (Piaget) and the Interactionist model (Vygotsky or Bruner), where the latter puts more emphasis on the role of adult interaction
- 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 the interaction of adults and children.

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 20 marks	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use 20 marks	AO3 Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning 20 marks
5	17-20 marks - Sophisticated methods of analysis - Confident use of a wide range of terminology - Perceptive discussion of topic - Coherent, academic style	17-20 marks - Detailed critical understanding of concepts - Perceptive discussion of issues - Confident and concise selection of supporting examples	17-20 marks - 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 - Effective methods of analysis - Secure use of a range of terminology - Thorough discussion of topic - Expression generally accurate and clear	13-16 marks - Secure understanding of concepts - Some intelligent discussion of issues - Consistent selection of apt supporting examples	13-16 marks - 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 - Sensible methods of analysis - Generally sound use of terminology - Competent discussion of topic - Mostly accurate expression with some lapses	9-12 marks - Sound understanding of concepts - Sensible discussion of issues - Generally appropriate selection of supporting examples	9-12 marks - 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 - Basic methods of analysis - Using some terminology with some accuracy - Uneven discussion of topic - Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy	5-8 marks - Some understanding of concepts - Basic discussion of issues - Some points supported by examples	5-8 marks - Some valid analysis of contextual factors - Undeveloped discussion of the construction of meaning - Inconsistent evaluation of effectiveness of communication
1	1-4 marks - Limited methods of analysis - Some grasp of basic terminology - Undeveloped discussion of topic - Errors in expression and lapses in clarity	1-4 marks - A few simple points made about concepts - Limited discussion of issues - Few examples cited	1-4 marks - Some basic awareness of context - Little sense of how meaning is constructed - Limited evaluation of effectiveness of communication
0	0 marks: Response not worthy of credit		