



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

**A LEVEL (NEW)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1
A700U10-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 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

SUMMER 2017 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.
- The mark-scheme offers two sources of marking guidance and support for each Section:
 - **'Notes' on the material which may be offered 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 the candidate's response, annotate using details 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 AO and then add each AO mark together to give a total mark for each question or part question.
- Explain your mark with an assessment of the quality of the response 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 decisions made 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, 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 assessment 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 Competition Programmes

- 1. Drawing on your knowledge of the different language levels, analyse the spoken language of these texts as examples of television competition programmes.**

[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 involve judges using evaluative language to assess performances, speaking directly to the performers themselves. The turn-taking is orderly in both with little, overlapping, mostly cooperative approaches and clearly marked turn-transition points. Prosodic features are used distinctively to engage with the contestants and emphasise their judgements. The mean length of utterance differs a little, with the judges in Text A appearing a little briefer and more succinct in their comments than those in Text B. While the presenter in Text A acts as an approved topic manager and also directly addresses the audience, in Text B the judges themselves have to decide when to yield their turn.

The difference in the language used to assess the performances is clear with consistently positive language used by the four judges in Text A. The only occasion where a significant face-threatening act is suggested (in Craig's comment about Jay's previous lack of personality), the point is countered both by Tess' uncooperative overlap and Craig's subsequent praise. The different styles of the other judges is clearly marked with Bruno's hyperbolic praise contrasting with Len's possibly more measured response. There are several examples of field-specific lexis in assessing the technical aspects of the dance, (e.g. *the shaping*) again with Jay's brilliance being strongly praised.

In contrast, the three judges in Text B are much less effusive in their praise, pointing to a series of weaknesses in the performance. Possibly because of the age of the contestant, however, all of them seek to mitigate their criticisms with a lot of face work while also indicating their unease in their use of fillers and hedges. All three also refer to themselves using self-references to identify more fully with the singer herself. Niamh interacts more with the judges, both paralinguistically through laughing at their jokes and through frequent back channelling. The exchange is highly cooperative as a result, culminating in Niamh's politeness features and face work with Paloma Faith.

Notes

The following notes address features of interest which may be explored. This is not a checklist. Look for and credit valid interpretations/approaches.

Text A: *Strictly Come Dancing*

Evaluative adjectives: *strong, consistent, powerful* (both repeated twice), *aggressive, clean, great* (Len); *bigger, better* (alliterative comparatives) (Bruno); *sensitive* (Darcey); *powerful, amazing* (Tess)

Verbs: positive connotations e.g. *loved* (Len), *loved* (repeated three times with prosodic stress on final one Craig); *dance* (non-standard use of simple present by Tess)

Adverbs: *so* (intensifier with prosodic stress in adjective phrase *so consistent*), *now* (acting as a discourse marker), *brilliantly* (manner—evaluative)

Abstract nouns: *power, artistry* (Bruno), *drive, passion* (Craig), *confidence, strength* (Darcey)

Noun phrases: *the most consistent of all the couples* (Len), *another triumph* (Bruno with determiner *another* suggesting previous success), *a very sensitive man within* (Darcey), *an amazing final performance* (Tess), *one last time* (Tess)

Deixis: *this* (proximal pronoun), *that* (distal pronoun), *that* *dance floor* (determiner with prosodic stress—typical of the genre)

Intertextual references: *goodness gracious great balls of fire* (Bruno referencing the excitement of a rock and roll song—idiomatic)

Face threatening act: *you had absolutely no personality whatsoever* (Craig, emphasising criticism through use of adverbs *absolutely* – intensifier – and *whatsoever*) before his subsequent face work; *a couple of hiccups* (Len, using noun phrase to mitigate the force of his slightly critical comments about some previous dances)

Overlapping: *course he did* (Tess' elliptical clause as she seeks to defend Jay)

Patterning: asyndetic *you have a drive you have a passion you dance brilliantly* (tripling)

Pronouns: *let's* (elision of first person plural object form to engage the audience); direct address e.g. *I tell you* (Bruno), *off you go* (Tess to the couple – role of presenter)

Adverbial: *from week one* (stressing quality from the start), *along the way* (informal use)

Prepositional phrases: *for me* and *from Len* (emphasising Len's own opinion – giving it more weight with use of proper noun in identifying himself); *with power and artistry* (Bruno), *in the shaping* (Darcey), *in my book* (Darcey)

Address to audience: *your Strictly Champions* (possessive determiner in noun phrase, engaging the audience); *is he your number one?* (possessive determiner in interrogative) shift of reference from audience to contestants as Tess turns (*your work is done*)

Determiners: *one powerful Paso* (more emphatic than *a powerful Paso*), *no personality* (emphasised by prosodic stress)

Interjections: *oh* (Tess's sense of excitement), *OK* (Len mitigating the effect of his minor criticism), /əʊleɪ/ (Bruno's praise, emphasising the Spanish roots of the Paso Doble – mirrored by Tess), *ah* (followed by two second pause, showing Darcy savouring her pleasure with the dance)

Vocatives: familiarity- first names used by Tess (*Len, Bruno* etc.) – sometimes used as turn-yielding cues by Tess

Conversational features: **elision** e.g. *let's, you've, I've, there's, it's*; **ellipsis** e.g. *this Ø powerful aggressive but clean, Ø course he did*; **non-standard forms** e.g. *your arm movements is* (Bruno's non-standard use of singular form of the verb)

Paralinguistic features: Darcey shaking her head at Craig's score – underlined by her use of the adjective *worthy*; Tess holding Jay's hand to suggest support; Bruno standing up to make his speech more dramatic; Darcy holding her finger up to emphasise clause *you're number one*.

Text B: *The Voice*

Opening token: *hello* (interjection followed by interrogative)—phatic, direct engagement emphasising the fact that the performer is unknown to the judges (unlike Text A)

Common nouns: *voice, song, guitar* (linked to competition)

Abstract nouns: *performance, nerves, capabilities, skills* (linked to competition)

Adjectives: *shaky, exposed* (Boy George—critical of performance); *very beautiful* (Ricky—adjective phrase, but undermined by abstract noun *doubts*); *marvellous, wonderful* (Ricky—linked to girl rather than performance)

Adverbs: Boy George e.g. *really* (repeated, idiosyncratic), *unfortunately* (rejection), *definitely* (emphatic, giving some hope)

Pronouns: first person singular *I* (self-references in oral narratives); second person singular *you* (direct engagement with Niamh); *it didn't feel ...* (Ricky—third person, making criticism less personal)

Distinctive lexical choices: e.g. *howled* (Boy George—self-criticism, aligning himself with Niamh); *zing* (Paloma—impetus to get beyond failure, aligning herself with Niamh)

Noun phrases: positive assessment with emphasis on performer e.g. *a really pretty voice, a good Irish girl/a beautiful Irish girl* (Boy George); stresses of competition environment e.g. *a weird situation* (Paloma), *a nerve thing* (Ricky); negative judgement e.g. *(didn't feel like) a safe pair of hands* (Ricky); hope for the future e.g. *something to build on* (Boy George), *a great start* (Ricky)

Verb phrases: Boy George e.g. *exposed, wobble, didn't nail ...* (negative evaluation), *listen* (imperative, functioning as discourse marker); Ricky e.g. *was willing* (past progressive, implicit support), *did ... enjoy* (periphrastic 'do' for emphasis, before implied 'but'), *keep* (imperative, quoted clause); Paloma e.g. *will do (it)* (modal of certainty, encouragement)

Idiomatic language: *nail it, something to build on, safe pair of hands,*

Deixis (typical of visual medium): demonstrative determiner e.g. *that* story (justifying apparent digression); demonstrative pronouns e.g. *I wasn't doing this* (proximal, exophoric reference to stage underpinned by gesture i.e. supportive—suggesting Niamh's achievement in taking part), *just do that* (distal, referencing format of programme)

Repetition: *keep it together keep it together* (Ricky—imperative clauses, stressing Ricky's anxiety on Niamh's behalf); references to competition format e.g. *turn, turned, turning*

Politeness features: *thank you, thank you very much* (Niamh—remains courteous throughout); closing tokens e.g. *I wish you all the luck in the world, well done*

Informal pronunciation (conversational style): building relationship with Niamh and suggesting equal footing between competitor and expert judges e.g. elision /*jənəʊ*/, *didn't, it's, I've, wasn't, you're*; glottal stop /*twenʔi*/ (Boy George—cardinal number); labiodental fricative replacing dental fricative /*sʌmfɪŋ*/ (Paloma—indefinite pronoun)

Hedges: repeated (typical of informal style) e.g. *kind of like* (Paloma/Ricky); *sort of* (Ricky)

Standard non-fluency features: unintentional repetition e.g. *it's it's* (Boy George); false starts e.g. *it's (.) I know (.) listen* (Boy George); fillers e.g. *like* (Paloma), *yeah* (Boy George), /*ʒ*/ (Ricky); hesitation e.g. *th.throat* (Boy George)

Monitoring features: *you know, /jənəʊ/* (Boy George—cooperative interaction)

Back channelling: *yeah, course* (Niamh—cooperative affirmation)

Syntax (informal style): elliptical (e.g. *I'll tell Ø why I didn't turn*); minor utterances e.g. *of course, of course* (Niamh, has lower footing—affirmation); many long loosely coordinated utterances (particularly in judges' oral narratives e.g. ll. 39-46); frequent use of informal quoting clauses (e.g. *saying, going, went*) and comment clauses (e.g. *I know, I mean*)

Prosodic features: stress on *really* (Boy George—intensifier/degree adverb), *this* (Boy George—demonstrative determiner) and *will* (Paloma—modal auxiliary) to underline praise and mitigate criticism; intonation (rising on interjection *hello* and adverb *well* to indicate friendliness); tempo (Boy George and Paloma speeding up while developing side sequences involving anecdotes of their own experiences)

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 - 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 (e.g. genre: television competition) - Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. social status, prestige forms) - 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 (e.g. genre: television competition) - Some intelligent discussion of issues (e.g. social status, prestige forms) - 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 (e.g. genre: television competition) - Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. social status, gender) - 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 (e.g. genre: television competition) - Basic discussion of issues (e.g. social status) - 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 (e.g. genre: television competition) - Limited discussion of issues (e.g. social status) - 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 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, manipulative language, accent and dialect) 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.

The following notes address features of interest which may be explored. This is not a checklist. Look for and credit other valid interpretations/approaches.

EITHER

Child Language Acquisition: communication from two years to three and a half

2. Read the following extract from *Varieties of English* by Dennis Freeborn. Danny, a child aged 30 months (2½ years), is having a conversation his mother in which they discuss visiting a relative in Watchett. [60]

Danny: I don't want to go to Watchett
Mum: no (.) cos he's not there any more (.) they've moved
Danny: I (.) we don't want to go and see them
Mum: don't you? but you'd like to go and see them in Liverpool wouldn't you?
Danny: no I don't want (.) I want to go (.) when get bigger want to go on my own a a Watchett
Mum: do you? you want to go on your own?
Danny: not a bi. not a (.) when get bigger
Mum: when you get bigger yes (.) you'll be able to do lots of things when you get bigger (.) you'll perhaps be able to ride on an aeroplane
Danny: it's on (1.0) like on television
Mum: mm (1.0) it showed some children in the aeroplane on the television didn't it?

Chapter 6 'Learning to Talk' (Palgrave 1993)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which children's language develops between the age of 2 years (24 months) and 3½ years (42 months). [60]

As the question asks candidates to explore the features of children's language between 2 and 3½, it is likely that the analysis of Danny's language here will be the starting point for many answers. Having focused on the elements omitted in his speech (characteristic of telegraphic talk) as well as the more advanced features (such as his use of negated dummy auxiliary verbs), candidates may well move on to account for the ways in which language usually changes during these crucial eighteen months. Discussion may address issues of lexis, grammar and phonology.

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- the way in which function words such as determiners, conjunctions and prepositions (as well as auxiliary verbs) are commonly omitted at the start of the age range
- the gradual acquisition of inflectional endings for plurality and possession with nouns, and aspect and tense with verbs
- the child's awareness of irregular forms but also the tendency to over-regularise ("she goed"), with some discussion about why that is significant
- other features of grammatical development such as more confident use of pronouns or more complex forms of negation or subject-verb inversion in the construction of questions
- the rapid development of vocabulary during this period
- some account of phonological features characteristic of this age (such as the tendency to use labiodentals rather than dentals or the increasing competence in handling consonant clusters)
- the role that caretaker speech plays in the development of children's language skills through this period with children able to initiate talk, engage in effective turn-taking and manage topics more effectively
- the contrast between different theoretical models (such as Behaviourist and Nativist) with some identification of their strengths and weaknesses.

OR

Language and Power: language used to manipulate

3. Read the following extract from *The Stuff of Thought* by Steven Pinker.

Many disagreements in human affairs turn not on differences in data or logic but in how a problem is framed. We see this when adversaries talk "past each other" or when understanding something requires a "paradigm shift". I mentioned some examples, like invading Iraq versus liberating Iraq, ending a pregnancy versus killing an unborn child, and redistributing wealth versus confiscating earnings. Each controversy hinges on a choice between metaphors.

Chapter 5 'The Metaphor Metaphor' (Penguin 2008)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate the ways in which language is used to manipulate attitudes and behaviour. [60]

As the extract discusses the way in which language frames the nature of political discourse with specific examples, these are likely to be the starting point for many answers. Learners may also explore further the significance of figurative and rhetorical language in manipulative language.

Responses may explore some of the following points:

- the language of political discourse in a variety of contexts (interviews, political speeches, political campaigns or election debates) exploring how language choice seeks to frame the discussion of issues and win popular support (e.g. the use of abstract nouns or first person plural pronouns)
- the way in which language manipulates us in advertising or marketing as it seeks to affect how we respond to products (e.g. the use of imperative verbs or direct address with second person pronouns)
- the effectiveness of the language of charity appeals in encouraging people to donate money (e.g. the use of emotive adjectives or rhetorical features such as hypophora)

- the language of the media in conveying specific attitudes while covering specific issues such as immigration (e.g. use of premodified noun phrases or sensationalist lexis)
- the use of language in family exchanges (such as parent and child) in an attempt to establish authority and alter behaviour (e.g. the use of vocatives or face threatening acts)
- the language used in arguments, possibly with some reflection on research about male and female strategies (e.g. mitigated and aggravated directives)
- the language of education including classroom discourse and exchanges between teachers and students (e.g. use of different types of tag questions or the nature of initiation – response – feedback structures)
- the nature of legal discourse, including the way in which lawyers use language to manipulate the attitudes of a jury (e.g. formal collocations or the use of passive constructions)
- 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)

OR

Standard and Non-standard English: social attitudes towards accent and dialect

4. Read the following extract from *Bad Language* by Peter Trudgill and Lars-Gunnar Andersson.

Social accents are not bad in any linguistic sense. Nor are any individual vowel or consonant pronunciations bad in themselves. It must be clear that, if it is not bad to pronounce *hour* and *our* identically, it cannot be bad to pronounce *hill* and *ill* the same either. The only bad thing about lower-social-class accents is that they symbolise low social status. The majority of people who do not speak with a BBC accent therefore run the risk of being discriminated against by undemocratic individuals and institutions in certain social and occupational situations.

Chapter 7 'Bad Accents?' (Penguin 1992)

Using this extract as a starting point, analyse and evaluate social attitudes towards the use of accent and dialect. [60]

As the extract discusses the nature of class discrimination on the basis of accent, this is likely to be the starting point for many answers. The candidates may also comment on the use of language in a range of contexts and the arbitrary nature of prestige forms in both accent and dialect, challenging prescriptivist approaches to language by commenting on features such as rhoticity.

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 accommodation theory e.g. code switching
- specific experiments undertaken on attitudes to accent such as Peter Trudgill's on the relative attractiveness of British regional accents or Howard Giles' capital punishment experiment on accent and persuasiveness or William Labov's work on language loyalty in Martha's Vineyard
- some discussion of the stereotyping of speakers from different regions with identification of specific phonological features of particular accents (such as glottal stopping or L-vocalisation) and lexical/grammatical features of particular dialects

- the range and nature of accents in the media, including areas such as news reporting, sports commentary and advertising
- attitudes to accent and dialect in education with some awareness of the “gatekeeping” role of Standard English
- the frequent distinction between attitudes to lexical variation (e.g. Scottish use of the adjective “wee”) and the more heavily stigmatised grammatical variation (e.g. regularising of verbs such as “they was”)
- the significance of language change in explaining dialectal variation with Standard English sometimes regularising forms (“you” as a second person pronoun for both singular and plural as opposed to “thou”, “thee” and “ye”) and sometimes rejecting regularisation (such as some dialects’ standardising of irregular verbs – e.g. “I seen”)
- recent developments in accent and dialects in Britain, including some discussion of Estuary English and dialect levelling
- the significance of ethnicity in accent and dialect studies with an account of the influence of AAVE of Black American English on the spoken discourse of many young people.

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

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 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 (e.g. stages of language acquisition, turn-taking, modality) - Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. identity, status, gender) - 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 (e.g. stages of language acquisition, turn-taking, modality) - Some intelligent discussion of issues (e.g. identity, status, gender) - 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 (e.g. stages of language acquisition, turn-taking, modality) - Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. identity, status, gender) - 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 (e.g. stages of language acquisition, turn-taking) - Basic discussion of issues (e.g. status, gender) - 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 (e.g. stages of language acquisition, turn-taking) - Limited discussion of issues (e.g. status, gender) - 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 or not attempted		