



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2018

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

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2018 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 (NEW)

SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME

COMPONENT 1: Language Concepts and Issues

General Advice

Examiners are asked to read and digest thoroughly all the information set out in the document *Instructions for Examiners* sent as part of the 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.
- The mark scheme offers two sources of marking guidance and support for each Section:
 - **'Notes' on the material which may be explored in candidate responses**
 - **Assessment Grid, offering band descriptors and weightings for each assessment objective.**
- 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.
- Decide which band **best fits** the performance of the candidate **for each assessment objective** in response to the question set. Give a mark for each relevant assessment objective and then add each AO mark together to give a total mark for each question or part question.
- 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

The following guidelines contain an overview, notes, suggestions about possible approaches candidates may use in their response, and an assessment grid.

The mark scheme, should not be regarded as a checklist.

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 parts of the texts other than those mentioned in the mark scheme.

COMPONENT 1: LANGUAGE CONCEPTS AND ISSUES

SECTION A: ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE

AO1	AO2	AO4
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

General Notes

In making judgements, look carefully at the 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: Television Documentaries about War

- Drawing on your knowledge of the different language levels, analyse the spoken language of these texts as examples of television documentaries about war. [60]**

In your response, you must also:

- explore connections between the transcripts
- consider concepts and issues relevant to the study of spoken language.

Overview

Both texts follow the same structure with an initial pre-credit sequence in which the conflict is introduced before the focus shifts to the build up of the respective wars. However, the tone of the two transcripts is markedly different. Text A uses a formal, elegiac and mournful style to suggest the horror of war with the narrative emphasising the brutality of the Nazi attack. The transcript is consciously poetic at points such as the inverted syntax of the opening clause: *down this road on a summer day in 1944 (1) the soldiers came*. The use of the asyndetic list of prepositional phrases (*in Poland (.) in Russia (.) in Burma (.) in China*) at the end of the first section also points to the global reach of the conflict while the slow delivery, frequent downward intonation and quite lengthy pauses emphasise the devastating effects of war across the world.

In contrast, Peter and Dan Snow's language in Text B points more to the excitement of the war and particularly the skill with which the British soldiers fought. The commentary is clearly supportive of the British war effort, presenting it as heroic and noble. The overwhelming power of the Argentinian forces is contrasted with the plucky response of the British, most notably in the form of the Governor. While Text A does use language that denigrates the Nazis, there is no real sense of heroism in the account beyond its reference to the village's *martyrdom*.

Both extracts are obviously scripted with no non-fluency features characteristic of spontaneous speech. However, the fact that Text A has an anonymous voiceover makes it appear more objective while the account provided by the two Snows, some of which is delivered straight to camera and uses first person narration, suggests a more personal involvement in the narrative. The register of Text A is also more formal than it is in Text B, possibly reflecting the respective periods in which the documentaries were made. Both texts make use of the visual images to authenticate the script, with consistent use of deictic expressions (*this road*, *these islands*) to stress the precise location of the events.

Notes

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

Text A: *The World at War*

Noun: mostly concrete at first (*road, men, garages, barns, women, children, church, people*) in describing the event but also collective (*community*) to emphasise the villagers' unity and then abstract (*martyrdom*) to present the villagers as victims

Personal pronouns: third person plural pronoun *they* used to refer to the soldiers (*when they had gone*), the villagers (*they heard the firing*) and also the authorities post war (*they never rebuilt Oradour*)

Adjectives: *huge blind excitement* (indicating criticism of the Nazis); *vulgar little corporal* (reflecting the German Establishment's view of Hitler)

Adverbs of manner: *take office legally, mysteriously gutted by fire* (again stressing the deceitful and violent nature of the Nazis, reflected also in the dynamic verb *seized* and the use of the determiner *all* in the noun phrase *all civil liberties*)

Tense of verbs: shift to present tense (*its ruins are a memorial*) to indicate the present significance but also in account of the Nazis' rise (*fills, think, the time for thinking is over*); present perfect (*have come to power*) and modal auxiliary to indicate future (*will be the new beginning*) dramatising the attitudes of the German public at the time

Past participles: *tortured, embittered, demoralised* (triadic structure to point to the condition of Germany)

Noun phrases: *thousand upon thousand of other martyrdoms* (to convey the symbolic significance of the deaths)

Verb phrases: *were gathered...were taken...were led down...were driven...were shot ... were killed* (passive forms emphasising the helplessness of the people with the past participle *driven* making them seem like cattle)

Prepositional phrases: *with mock solemnity, by revolutionary violence* (indicating a highly critical view of the Nazis)

Adverbial of time: *Germany 1933* (to indicate the shift in the narrative, characteristic of documentary style)

Fronted adverbials: *down this road, on a summer day, in 1944* (three prepositional phrases which postpone the main clause to create tension)

Contrasting adverbials: *only a few hours....for a thousand years* (stressing the speed with which the community has been destroyed)

Asyndetic listing: *in Poland (.) in Russia (.) in Burma (.) in China (.) in a world at war* (list of prepositional phrases that suggests the ever spreading destruction of the global conflict)

Simple utterances: *the soldiers came, nobody lives here now* (ominous quality with lengthy pauses and lack of context in the noun phrase *the soldiers*)

Deictic expressions: to emphasise the specific nature of the atrocity – *this road, this church* (demonstrative determiner), *this is Oradour-sur-Glane* (demonstrative pronoun), *nobody lives here now* (adverb of place followed by adverb of time)
Prosodic features: stress on *power* (abstract noun), *seize* (dynamic verb) and several deictic expressions (first person plural pronoun *we* and demonstrative pronoun *this*)

Text B: Twentieth Century Battlefields (*The Falklands War*)

Nouns and noun phrases: an *invasion* (abstract noun reflecting view of the Argentinians as aggressors) and *the most ambitious military undertaking in British History* (pre- and post-modified noun phrase which glorifies the British action); the *challenges* that faced (abstract noun) underlying the difficulty of the task facing the British compared to *well defended enemy; the story of the battle for the Falklands*, dramatising the event

Verbs and verb phrases: help to establish Argentina's responsibility for the conflict as well as their power (*provoked, seize, force, capture, overwhelmed, rolled* - dynamic verbs) in contrast to British reaction (past tense verb *sent* and present participle *struggling*); sense of threat to the Governor (*trapped* - past participle) while dramatic nature of the events implied by journalistic use of *hit*; direct involvement of Dan Snow implied by *'ll experience* (use of elided modal auxiliary)

Adverbs: *ever* (adverb of time); *spectacularly* (emotive use of the degree adverb); *just sixty nine* (degree adverb stressing the small nature of the British force)

Adjectives: *most improbable* (periphrastic form of the polysyllabic adjective); *uneven; barren and windswept* and *remote* (attributive adjectives) and *isolated hardy* and *undisturbed* (predicative adjectives in a triadic structure) to indicate landscape and location; *tiny* and *defiant* (to emphasise the heroism of the British)

Personal pronouns: *I (look)* (PS) and *'ll experience* (DS) – first person pronouns to foreground their personal involvement in the programme

Adverbials: used to stress the advantages that the Argentinians had over the British: *eight thousand miles from home* (noun phrase) as opposed to *on their own doorstep* (prepositional phrase); *in freezing conditions on exposed hill-tops* (prepositional phrases) point to the British vulnerability with *to their advantage* indicating their skill in overcoming these difficulties; *on the edge of the Antarctic* (prepositional phrase), suggesting the distance from Britain

Simple utterances: used occasionally to add to the sense of drama: *this is the story of the battle for the Falklands; they were the advanced party*

Deictic expressions: all used to make the description of the scene more vivid - *this is the story* or *this may look like* or *these are the Falkland islands* (demonstrative pronouns); *these islands* (demonstrative determiner); *who live here* and *landed here* (adverbs of place);

Prosodic features: stress on *fifteen thousand* (cardinal number); *extraordinary* (adjective); some pauses for dramatic effect but generally tempo is quicker than Text A

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	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use	AO4 Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods
	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 (including spoken) Perceptive discussion of texts Coherent, academic style 	17-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed critical understanding of concepts (e.g. TV documentaries) Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to war; features of bias) 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 (e.g. genre: radio news) Some intelligent discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to war; features of bias) 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 (e.g. TV documentaries) Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to war; features of bias) 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 (e.g. TV documentaries) Basic discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to war) 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 (e.g. TV documentaries) Limited discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes to war) 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 or not attempted		

SECTION B: LANGUAGE ISSUES

AO1	AO2	AO3
20 marks	20 marks	20 marks

Overview

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

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

Either,

2. Read the following extract from *The Meaning Makers* by Gordon Wells in which Gary, an eighteen month old boy, is with his parents in the kitchen and wants to have a biscuit.

Gary: [crying] Look
Father: What do you want?
Mother: Come here
Gary: Look [looking up at the cupboard]
[Father lifts him to the cupboard and Gary removes biscuit jar]
Father: Hey, Joyce, look [to Gary] that what you wants?
Gary: Uh
Father: What d'you want?
Gary: That [takes a handful of biscuits]
Father: All right?
Gary: Uh
[Father lifts him down]
Gary: Hey, Dada, look! [he gives one biscuit to his Mother and one to his Father but holds onto two himself]
Father: That one is for Sandra*, is it?
Gary: Mm [holds on to both biscuits]
Father: How come you got two?
Gary: Ha! [runs off with the two biscuits]

*Gary's older sister

Chapter 1, 'The Children and Their Families', (Multilingual Matters 2009)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the way in which adults use child-directed speech during the period when children are acquiring language. You should consider adults' speech and children's responses. [60]

As the question asks students to explore the interaction between adults and children, it is likely that the analysis of Gary and his parents' language here will be the starting point. Having focused on the repeated use of interrogatives and one tag question by the parents and their willingness to meet Gary's needs, candidates may well move on to account for characteristic features of child-directed speech and its role in the development of children's language, including some exploration of children's responses to adults.

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- the use of diminutives such as *doggy* and reduplication such as *dum-dum* for *dummy* in CDS
- phonological variation on behalf of the adult including features of higher pitch, exaggerated pitch changes, elongated vowels and long pauses between phonemes
- frequent use of concrete nouns (often with the object within sight) and deictic expressions (*that book*) as well as dynamic verbs
- tendency to use proper nouns sometimes instead of pronouns (*Mummy says...*)
- simple grammatical structures with a high proportion of interrogatives to yield the turn and imperatives
- typical topic management by the adult (and, later on, the child) with recurrent topics including members of the family, animals, parts of the body, food, and clothing
- frequent use of recasting by adults of children's speech, possibly with some discussion of its effectiveness at various points of the child's development
- an account of the aims of CDS to engage the child's interest
- the use of theoretical positions about child language acquisition (such as Behaviourist and Nativist) with some identification of how they evaluate the role of child-directed speech
- some discussion about whether the purpose of CDS is actually social (encouraging contact between adult and child) rather than educational (citing evidence that it may make little difference)
- significance of case studies in which contact with adults has been denied to children (e.g. Jeanie)
- exploration of global variations (e.g. places such as parts of Papua New Guinea where CDS is not used)

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

Or,

3. Read the following extract from *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction* by Peter Trudgill.

If you are an English speaker you will be able to estimate the relative social status of the following speakers solely on the basis of the linguistic evidence given here:

Speaker A

I done it yesterday.

He ain't got it.

It was her what said it.

Speaker B

He did it yesterday.

He hasn't got it.

It was her that said it.

There are grammatical differences [here] which give us clues about their social backgrounds. The internal differentiation of human societies is reflected in their languages. Different social groups use different linguistic varieties, and as experienced members of a speech community we have learnt to classify speakers accordingly.

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the relationship between speakers' use of language and social class. [60]

As the extract discusses the nature of class and language, a precise analysis of the grammatical variations cited is likely to be the starting point. The candidates should also comment on the use of language in a range of contexts and the arbitrary nature of prestige forms in both accent and dialect, pointing to the role that language plays in social stratification.

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- the distinction between accent and dialect with specific reference to RP and Standard English as prestige forms, noting social attitudes towards both
- the role of RP and the attitudes towards it, possibly exploring accommodation theory and code-switching (reference to Giles' research)
- attitudes to dialect in education with some awareness of the 'gatekeeping' role of Standard English
- recent developments in accent and dialects in Britain, including some discussion of Estuary English (possibly considering the debate between Peter Trudgill and Paul Coggle) and dialect levelling
- reference to specific theorists such as William Labov (exploring his work in New York or on Martha's Vineyard) or Peter Trudgill (in Norwich) or Jenny Cheshire (Reading) or Laura Milroy (Belfast), commenting on the role of class
- assumptions about class and accent/dialect made in particular speech situations – e.g. job interviews, newscasting and the media in general, political speeches
- specific dialectal features (e.g. multiple negation) or accent features (e.g. h-dropping) and attitudes towards these variations
- the significance of language change in explaining dialectal variation with Standard English sometimes regularising forms ('you' as a second person pronoun for both singular and plural as opposed to 'thou', 'thee' and 'ye') and sometimes rejecting regularisation (such as some dialects' standardising of irregular verbs – e.g. 'I seen').

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

Or,

4. Read the following extract from an interview taken from *Interpreting Texts* by Kim Ballard, in which the television presenter Sir Trevor McDonald is interviewing Colonel Derek Robbins who had fought in World War Two.

Trevor MacDonald: but those searing memories never leave you
Derek Robbins: they don't leave you (.) no (.) they don't leave one (1.0) they are (.) grim (.) grim
Trevor MacDonald: so the sixtieth anniversary of D-Day* is in many respects (.) in every respect (.) worth marking worth commemorating
Derek Robbins: I couldn't agree with you more (1.0) it's er (1.0) and all the old soldiers are very grateful (.) to the way (.) the young and the country (.) have taken trouble (1.0) to look after them in in er (.) Normandy and to help them in this anniversary
Trevor MacDonald: and what is also not forgotten (.) Colonel Robbins is that we (.) who are around today are all grateful to you (.) and to your comrades =
Derek Robbins: = well very nice of you (.) of you to say that

* The day in 1944 on which allied forces landed in northern France to fight the occupying German army

Chapter 6, 'Representation', (Routledge 2005)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which language is used by speakers in different speech situations such as interviews. [60]

As the question asks candidates to explore the language used in interviews, an analysis of the high level of co-operation and the consistent face work by MacDonald are likely to be the starting point. Candidates should also explore further the importance of the language used in the specific context as well as in a variety of interviews and any other contexts that they wish to explore.

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- the nature of turn-taking in interviews, usually with the interviewer as the topic manager, but with the interviewee having a higher Mean Length of Utterance
- the range of strategies used by interviewers to elicit responses from the interviewee (e.g. tag questions, or yielding the turn with a declarative rather than an interrogative)
- use (or absence) of politeness markers and vocatives helping to define the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee
- exploration of a range of specific contexts such as political interviews, sports interviews, police interviews or chat/talk show interviews with an assessment of how the context alters the relationship between the speakers
- detailed analysis of specific interviews, again showing variation within genres (e.g. different approaches to chat shows) and between them (e.g. the difference between a particular sports interview and a particular political one)
- contrasting adversarial interviews with face threatening acts where the cooperative principle breaks down (such as Paxman's famous interview of Howard) with more supportive contexts (such as Caitlyn Jenner being interviewed by Ellen Degeneres)
- use of and variation in prosodic features in different interviews
- specific reference to the language of interviews in the candidate's own experience such as job interviews
- consideration of power and status within interviews and how they are asserted or negotiated, possibly referencing Norman Fairclough's work on discourse and power
- reference to the possible role of gender in interviews, commenting on the validity of theorists' work (Lakoff, Tannen, Cameron etc)
- contrasting levels of formality in interviews over time, for instance by analysing political interviews of the 1950s with present day exchanges.
- Exploration of any other speech situation, such as classroom discourse or informal conversation focusing on how the situation affects the speaker's use of language.

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

Assessment Grid: Component 1 Section B-Questions2-4

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 <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 (e.g. theories of language acquisition, turn-taking, modality) • Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. social class, cooperation in spoken exchanges) • 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 (e.g. theories of language acquisition, turn-taking, modality) • Some intelligent discussion of issues (e.g. social class, cooperation in spoken exchanges) • 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 (e.g. theories of language acquisition, turn-taking, modality) • Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. social class, cooperation in spoken exchanges) • 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 (e.g. theories of language acquisition, turn-taking) • Basic discussion of issues (e.g. social class, cooperation in spoken exchanges) • 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 (e.g. theories of language acquisition, turn-taking) • Limited discussion of issues (e.g. social class, cooperation in spoken exchanges) • 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 or not attempted		