GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

AUTUMN 2020

A LEVEL
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1
A700U10-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2020 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 AUTUMN 2020

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 (**AO**s) that are relevant to the questions that you are marking, and the respective **weighting** of each AO. The advice of 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 Grid/Notes/Overview 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 level 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 that penalising failure or missions. The awarding of marks must be directly related to the marking criteria, and all responses must be marked according to the banded levels provided for each question.

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 that demonstrate independent thinking.

Section A: Television Quiz Shows

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 television quiz shows.**   **[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 building up of tension by both hosts as they seek to dramatise the exchange in both transcripts
- insightful discussion of points of contrast that explore language use e.g. the contrasting responses to the climax of the exchange with the differing responses of both contestants and hosts
- well-chosen textual references that support the points made concisely and precisely
- intelligent conclusions e.g. the way in which both hosts use face work to appear encouraging rather than adversarial
- intelligent interpretation of texts through close reading engaging with how meaning is constructed to drive on the argument e.g. the use of verbs such as *steamrollered* and *play* to intensify the competitive elements of the shows
- 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:
- a focus on irrelevant general features of spoken language e.g. broad statements about turn-taking
- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on 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 linguistic knowledge, but not always 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 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: *Pointless*

Proper nouns: used as vocatives (*Ivor* and *Lindsay*) to build the relationship between Armstrong and the couple

Verbs: used to make the competition seem more intense (the verb *steamrollered* used in the active voice on l. 7 and the passive voice in l. 8) with the phrasal verb *fought off* (l. 1) using the language of conflict for the same purpose; use of present progressive aspect (repetition of *is riding* on l. 21 and ll. 30/31) to underline the ongoing drama

Adjectives: attributive adjective (*some <u>great</u> answering* on l. 6) and predicative adjective (*that's <u>fantastic</u>* on l. 42) emphasising Armstrong's support for the contestants and his pleasure at their success

Adverbs: adverbs of time *now* (used three times, twice with emphatic stress) and *still* (repeated on ll. 40-41) when the clock is counting to emphasise the mounting excitement; adverb of degree *ju:::st* (l. 14) to make the answer seem tantalisingly near which is reinforced by the pronoun *all* in the clause *all you have* (l. 10) and *all you need* (l. 13)

Pronouns: sense of audience's engagement in the quiz with the use of elided first-person plural pronouns in the imperative clauses (*let'<u>s</u> put* on l. 17 and *let'<u>s</u> find out* on l. 34) and the inclusive use of the pronoun *we* on l. 30

Determiners: the possessive determiner *our* (ll. 2-3) used to describe both trophy and jackpot, making the programme appear more personal, allowing the presenters to identify with the audience

Interjection: sense of Armstrong's excitement emphasised through *who:::ah* (l. 29) and *ooh* (l. 34)

Adverb phrase: the repeated adverb phrase *fantastically well* showing Armstrong's desire to support the contestants

Prepositional phrases: emphasis on the prize money (*with twenty thousand two hundred and fifty pounds* on ll. 11-12) with emphatic stress on cardinal number thousand stressing its relatively large amount

Discourse markers: Armstrong's interjection to draw attention to the move to the next section of the quiz (*well* on l. 1, *OK* on ll. 12 and 29 and *right* on l. 34)

Deixis: frequent use of deictic expressions, often with emphatic stress, such as the demonstrative pronoun *that* (ll. 11 and 24) and demonstrative determiner *this* (l. 32)

Overlapping: use of interrogative on l. 26, an indication of Armstrong's desire to create further tension but mostly co-operative and structured turn-taking

Prosodic features: some informal pronunciation by both Armstrong and Lindsay *(/djə/* and */dʌnəʊ/)* possibly to make the exchange seem more like an ordinary conversation; emphatic stress on the adverb *ever* (l. 30) to underline the large amount of money at stake.

Text B: *Who Wants to be a Millionaire?*

Nouns and noun phrases: *the highest amount* (l. 8) with the superlative adjective *highest* indicates what the contestants have achieved so far while *one million pounds* (l. 9) points to what is now at stake

Verbs: the repeated use of transitive verb *play* rather than *answer* by both host and contestants makes the competition more exciting; the use of *is* in the repeated clause *it is it is* indicates the Llewelyn-Bowens' confidence that they have the right answer

Modal verbs: Tarrant's use of *will* (l. 9) builds up the drama before asking the question while his use of *would* (l. 11) points to the tremendous cost of getting it wrong

Adverbs: the repeated use of the adverb *ever* (l. 5 and l. 8) again underscores how rarely this situation has occurred while the fronting of the adverb *here* in the clause *here it comes* makes it more dramatic

Personal pronouns: the third person plural pronoun *they* (used twice on l. 1 rather than *you*) contrasts with the first person plural pronoun *we* (l. 2 and l. 4), aligning the audience with Tarrant and distinguishes the viewers from the Llewelyn-Bowens to make them appear more isolated

Interjections: Jackie's *oh God* (l. 16) reveals her tension while her repetition of this (l. 39) and Laurence's *oh no* (l. 38) indicate their despair at having got the question wrong

Verb phrase: Tarrant's use of *can walk* points to the ease with which the Llewelyn-Bowens can leave without jeopardising what they have earned so far

Adjectives phrases: Tarrant uses the adjective phrase *so exciting* (l. 17) to underline the tension while Jackie's use of *so sorry* indicates her sense of guilt, with the intensifier *so* emphasising her distress; his sense of the unique nature of the moment is apparent in his use of the adjective phrases *quite extraordinary* and *very special*

Imperative clauses: Tarrant's use of the formulaic clause before the advert break *don't go away* addresses the television audience to create tension while his unmitigated directive to the Llewelyn-Bowens *give me your final answer* appears surprisingly direct, possibly suggesting his unease about the (wrong) answer they are about to give

Embedded clause: Tarrant's insertion of the clause *I love this* (l. 17) makes him seem personally excited by the unfolding action with the embedding of it within the clause *this is so exciting* pointing to its spontaneity

Deixis: Tarrant highlights the possible rewards by referring to *that cheque there* with the demonstrative determiner *that* and the adverb of place *there* making the prize money already earned appear real, intensifying the danger of potentially losing it

Overlapping: the overlapping of the repeated interjection *no* (ll. 13-14) indicates the closeness of host and contestant with Jackie's use of the formal vocative *Mr Tarrant* seeming playful in this context; the overlapping on l. 34 and l. 36 points rather to Jackie's distress at getting the wrong answer

Prosodic features: the informal pronunciation of */wʌnə/* (l. 21) marks Tarrant's attempt to appear more ordinary, possibly identifying himself with the audience; the emphatic stress on the adjective *huge* emphasises what they could lose by attempting an answer; the verb *lost* (l. 33) is the pivotal moment in the exchange and the clause *you've just lost* is delayed for eight seconds to make the revelation more shocking.

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

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 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 conflicting attitudes to the use of Standard English in prescriptivist and descriptivist positions
- well-chosen references, including possibly either the research of specific linguists, which support the points made concisely and precisely e.g. the assumptions behind Chomsky's critique of Skinner's theories on CLA
- 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 significance of biological and environmental factors in children's learning
- productive explorations of the implications of context factors e.g. the way power relations are established within a family by speakers' language
- consistent and purposeful reference to the contextual factors and how meaning is created e.g. the way in which Non-Standard forms can assert covert prestige
- 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 a political interview.

Characteristics of a less successful response may include:
- losing sight of what is being asked by the question e.g. lack of focus on close analysis
- some relevant linguistic concepts without linking to the question
- arguments that are implicit and difficult to follow
- only a limited number of points that are appropriately and accurately supported with references
- 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 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: nature and nurture

2. Read the following extract from *Child Language Acquisition* by Caroline Rowland.

Animals find it difficult to learn human languages even with extensive training. Children find it easy. Why is this? What do children possess that allows them to acquire language? This question is central to the nature-nurture debate, the debate over the relative contributions of genes and the environment to development. On one level, the answer is very simple: both nature and nurture contribute to language acquisition. However, questions about how they interact throughout a child's development are still hotly debated.

'Introduction' (Routledge, 2014)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the role that both nature and nurture play in children's acquisition of language.   **[60]**

Responses may explore some of the following points:
- the argument between the Nativist approach associated with Chomsky and the Behaviourist approach of Skinner, possibly referencing Chomsky's review of Skinner's *Verbal Behaviour* (1958)
- details about Nativist ideas with the focus on the biological, such as the importance of over-regularisation in Chomsky's critique of Skinner
- the contrast between other approaches such as the Cognitive one (Piaget and the Interactionist approaches [such as Vygotsky or Bruner's views], the second of which places more emphasis on the importance of the environment)
- the nature of Child Directed Speech (CDS) and arguments about its role in children's development (possibly quoting areas such as some speakers in Papua New Guinea where it does not play a role)
- the significance of case studies such as such as Genie or Jim, the son of deaf parents (research by Bard and Sachs) which highlight the significance of interaction
- 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, irrespective of input
- a (brief) account of the stages of development, noting the significance of the set order in which children acquire language for a more biological account of the process
- the acquisition of other grammatical features (such as Bellugi's work on pronouns or negation), again pointing to the child's ability to acquire language, despite different environmental factors
- specific examples of child language that are relevant to the debate about nature and nurture.

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

Standard and Non-Standard English: attitudes to correct English

3.   Read the following extract from *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar* by Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum.

What we're saying is that when there is a conflict between the proposed rule of grammar and the stable usage of millions of experienced speakers who say what they mean and mean what they say, it's got to be the proposed rule that is wrong and not the usage. Grammar rules must ultimately be based on facts about how people speak and write. If they don't have that basis, they have no basis at all. The rules are supposed to reflect the language the way it is, and the people who know it and use it are the final authority on that.

Chapter 1, 'Introduction' (Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the different attitudes to 'correct' English.   [60]

Responses may explore some of the following points:
- the distinction between prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches
- the social implications of 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 the notion of "correctness" in the eighteenth century and the role of texts such as Fowler's *Modern English Usage* in defining standard forms
- specific examples of debated grammatical features (such as the split infinitive)
- the role of code-switching 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 by possessive determiners
- some exploration of the features of particular regional dialects (and the attitudes towards them)
- recent developments in dialects in Britain, including some discussion of dialect levelling
- the significance of language change in explaining dialectal variation with the process of regularisation sometimes apparent in Standard English 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 such as the standardisation of irregular verbs – e.g. "he gone"
- the significance of electronic English in shaping the spoken discourse of many young people.

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

Or,

Language and Power: negotiating power and status

4.   Read the following extract from Francesca Pridham's *The Language of Conversation*.

MUM: Matt what are you doing?
MATT: the computer
MUM: could you turn the music down then please (1) [music is turned down] thanks Matt do you want to make me a cup of coffee? (2)
MATT: in a minute (1)
MUM: in a minute when Matt? (5) it's been a minute now {*Matt sighs*} pardon?
MATT: no (1)
MUM: are you going to do your bedroom?
MATT: no (2)
MUM: Matt you could do your bedroom couldn't you because you're halfway through it (.) you nearly finished
MATT: later
MUM: later when Matt?
MATT: go away

Unit 4, 'Negotiation and Interaction' (Routledge, 2001)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which participants exert and respond to power in spoken interactions.   **[60]**

Responses may explore some of the following points:
*   some discussion of the difference between status (the social role) and power (dominance within the exchange) in exploring how speakers negotiate their relationship within the discourse
*   identification of characteristic features through which speakers seek to assert control (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 or discussions between friends or partners
*   the nature of interviews in which conflict occurs such as political interviews or chat/talk shows and how the speakers vie for positions of power
*   the nature of classroom discourse and exchanges between teachers and students, especially where there is some dispute over authority
*   the relationships between users in electronic media, again exploring how conflict is handled
*   the nature of legal discourse, including the way in which barristers interrogate witnesses
*   some (brief) reference to theorists (e.g. Norman Fairclough's notion of synthetic personalisation or Deborah Tannen's concept of genderlects or Sinclair and Coulthard's classroom discourse analysis).

This is not a checklist. Look for and reward 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 us 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 credit-worthy		

A700U10-1 EDUQAS GCE A Level English Language - Component 1 MS A20/DM