

AS and A Level English Language



EXEMPLAR RESPONSES

A level Paper 2 – Child Language

Contents

About this exemplar pack	1
Question for A level Paper 2.....	2
Mark scheme for A level Paper 2	3
EXEMPLAR A	4
Exemplar A: Marker's Comments	5
EXEMPLAR B	6
Exemplar B: Marker's Comments	7
EXEMPLAR C	8
Exemplar C: Marker's Comments	10
EXEMPLAR D	11
Exemplar D: Marker's Comments	13
EXEMPLAR E	14
Exemplar E: Marker's Comments	16
EXEMPLAR F	18
Exemplar F: Marker's Comments	21
EXEMPLAR G	22
Exemplar G: Marker's Comments	24

About this exemplar pack

This pack has been produced to support English Language teachers delivering the new GCE English Language specification (first assessment summer 2017).

The pack contains exemplar student responses to GCE A level English Language paper 2 - Child Language. It shows real student responses to the question taken from the sample assessment materials, which are presented with the students' own grammar and spelling.

For schools delivering a co-taught AS and A level course, the Child Language topic should be covered in the first year. For schools teaching a linear 2 year A level only, the course content can be taught in any order. Please see the example [course planners](#) for more support on delivering the course content.

The A level Child Language question addresses 3 Assessment Objectives: AO1, AO2 and AO3.

Students must:	
AO1	Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression
AO2	Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use
AO3	Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning
AO4	Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods
AO5	Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English to communicate in different ways <i>Note: This Assessment Objective must be targeted with at least one of AO2, AO3 or AO4, either in the same task or in two or more linked tasks.</i>

Following each question you will find the mark scheme for the band that the student has achieved, with accompanying examiner comments on how the marks have been awarded, and any ways in which the response might have been improved.

Question for A level Paper 2

Read Text A in the source booklet before answering Question 1 in the space provided.

- 1** Analyse how Thomas and his parents use language to interact with each other and the role this could have in shaping language development.

In your response you should consider any relevant language frameworks, levels and theories as appropriate.

For Text A, please see pages 55-57 of the [Sample Assessment Materials](#).

Mark scheme for A level Paper 2

		AO1 = bullet points 1	AO2 = bullet point 2
Level	Mark	Descriptor (AO1 and AO2)	
	0	No rewardable material	
Level 1	1–6	Descriptive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of methods is largely unassimilated. Recalls limited range of terminology and makes frequent errors and technical lapses. Knowledge of concepts and issues is limited. Uses a descriptive approach or paraphrases with little evidence of applying understanding to the data. 	
Level 2	7–12	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recalls methods of analysis that show general understanding. Organises and expresses ideas with some clarity, though has lapses in use of terminology. Summarises basic concepts and issues. Applies some of this understanding when discussing data. 	
Level 3	13–18	Clear relevant application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applies relevant methods of analysis to data with clear examples. Ideas are structured logically and expressed with few lapses in clarity and transitioning. Clear use of terminology. Clear understanding and application of relevant concepts and issues to data. 	
Level 4	19–24	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applies controlled discussion of methods supported with use of discriminating examples. Controls the structure of response with effective transitions, carefully chosen language and use of terminology. Discriminating selection and application of a range of concept and issues to the data. 	
Level 5	25–30	Critical and evaluative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents critical application of language analysis with sustained examples. Uses sophisticated structure and expression with appropriate register and style, including use of appropriate terminology. Evaluative application of a wide range of concepts and issues. 	

Level	Mark	Descriptor (AO3)
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1–3	Descriptive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lists contextual factors and language features. Makes limited links between these and the construction of meaning in the data.
Level 2	4–6	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes construction of meaning in the data. Uses examples of contextual factors or language features to support this.
Level 3	7–9	Clear relevant application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains construction of meaning in data by making relevant links to contextual factors and language features.
Level 4	10–12	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes inferences about the construction of meaning in data by examining relevant links to contextual factors and language features.
Level 5	13–15	Critical evaluative approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critically examines relevant links to contextual factors and language features. Evaluates construction of meaning in data.

EXEMPLAR A

Thomas shows features of spontaneous language such as repetition and micropauses as he tries to ensure he uses the correct words and pronunciation. An example of this is when Thomas is responding to a question asked by his father, 'erm (.) I said (.) I (.) am /am/ (.) am /em/ feeling /fiwɪŋ/ well.'

Throughout the transcript Thomas' father is always asking him questions, following Halliday's theory as he motivates Thomas to speak coherently. For example when the father asks Thomas 'What happens in that one', encouraging Thomas to recap and retell the story that they read together.

By encouraging Thomas to retell the story of 'The Tiger who Came To Tea', Thomas' father is proving and reinforcing that spoken language can be put into words and vice versa, making the concept of reading and writing understood by Thomas. When Thomas' father asks "do you want to read' and then 'what book are we going to read next?', he is reinforcing positive feelings towards reading. Had he forced Thomas to read a book he didn't want to read Thomas would have been reluctant to want to read at all.

Thomas' father asks Thomas 'so (.) how are you today?' and Thomas responds 'mm brilliant'. However we know that Thomas has been off of nursery due to a minor illness. Thomas' father is encouraging Thomas to express his feelings and put them into words.

When Thomas makes a mistake, neither his mother or his father correct his grammar. This means that Thomas does not realise the mistake he has made so can not use the correct form in the future. An example of a mistake made by Thomas is when he says 'the tiger that camed through the door'. Here his father responds 'do you think fathers come through the door like that' with no correction at all. The same thing happens with Thomas' pronunciation of certain words. For example when Thomas pronounces 'ready' as 'wedi' no one tries to tell him how to actually pronounce it using Standard British English.

Exemplar A: Marker's Comments

This A level script is a bottom level 2 response and is characterised by being general and covering a very narrow range of features. The student recalls only a limited number of linguistic terms and applies only the most basic of concepts and issues to the data. They are able to give some textual support and they organise their ideas with some accuracy but it tends to be descriptive and limited in scope.

The initial section is certainly valid but it is quite observational and not linked to development and so shows only the most general of understanding. Halliday's functional theories are usually applied to the child and so this may indicate some insecurity with concepts. There is a hint of a reference to child directed speech that can be credited as demonstrating general understanding but it is too vague and limited to move from the Level 1/2 border. The discussion of literacy is quite interesting but is not the focus of the question and is again showing evidence of a descriptive approach. The final paragraph shows some problems. The student appears to be critical of the father's role and implies this is affecting the child's development. Although the correction is not explicit, the father does model the correct form for Thomas.

Mark: 7/30 + 4/15 = 11/45

AO1 and AO2

Level 2	7–12	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recalls methods of analysis that show general understanding. Organises and expresses ideas with some clarity, though has lapses in use of terminology. Summarises basic concepts and issues. Applies some of this understanding when discussing data.
----------------	------	---

AO3

Level 2	4–6	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes construction of meaning in the data. Uses examples of contextual factors or language features to support this.
----------------	-----	---

EXEMPLAR B

What is particularly interesting about the text is that there are two particularly influential more knowledgeable others (MKOs) present, lending to Vygotsky's theory about how important MKOs are in child language development. The father in particular uses many interrogatives, perhaps to test Thomas and stimulate him to think about what he is doing. It is a multi-party and interactional conversation, with Thomas as the centre of attention. Both the mother and father as MKOs use repetition of what the child has said as a way to perhaps aid the child's language skills, for instance, Thomas pronounces the word 'microwaved' as /malwelv/, to which the father says the original words as is the standard form.

In terms of discourse, the MKOs control the conversation by using interrogatives, to which the child replies: F: why have you opened the door? C: so people can go inside. Mid-way through the conversation, there is a 14 second pause, after which the Father initiates a new topic of the book and whether Thomas wants to read it or not. There are no topic loops in particular, perhaps due to the MKOs trying to create material for the recording due to the observer's paradox.

In terms of grammar, Thomas makes two noticeable 'virtuous errors'. One being a transition in the same turn or utterance between using a first person plural pronoun 'we' to the third person singular pronoun 'him', simultaneously omitting the standard form 'to be'. This demonstrates that perhaps Thomas does not have a full understanding of the standard forms of anaphoric referencing. Similarly, Thomas uses the -ed participle to refer to the past tense with irregular verb 'to come', stating it as 'camed'.

Thomas's use of phonology is very interesting, as there are some phonemes that have not reached full development. For instance, Thomas consistently pronounces the standard /θ/ sound as a /d/, and shows some inconsistency with the phone /l/, once pronouncing the word 'lots' as /rɒts/ and then shortly after as /wɒts/. Also in the word 'ready' a /w/ sound is used instead of the standard /r/, perhaps indicating a speech impediment. More convincingly, however, is the theory that some phonemes develop later than others, in particular the /r/ sound.

Exemplar B: Marker's Comments

This script illustrates a response at the border between Level 2 and 3. It is short and illustrates the difficulty students will have in achieving higher bands with responses that are limited in length.

The script starts with a reference to Vygotsky and the MKO which shows some understanding of concepts underpinning child language development and in so doing illustrates characteristics of top level 2. Additionally, the student is clearly responding to the demands of the question as the focus is on the interaction of the family. The use of 'interrogatives' shows the ability to use basic linguistic terminology and there is some implicit understanding of child directed speech but the subsequent paragraph fails to develop these ideas and instead merely describes a section of the transcript which is characteristic of lower level 2 responses. In the final section, more implicit knowledge of theories is seen with the mention of 'virtuous errors' but both examples lack explanation. The student's final section is on phonology but they merely reproduce the information from the transcription and there is little attempt to describe variation from adult forms or to discuss reasons for the differences meaning that awarding for AO3 is limited.

Mark: 11/30 + 6/15 = 17/45

AO1 and AO2

Level 2	7–12	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recalls methods of analysis that show general understanding. Organises and expresses ideas with some clarity, though has lapses in use of terminology.• Summarises basic concepts and issues. Applies some of this understanding when discussing data.
----------------	------	--

AO3

Level 2	4–6	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describes construction of meaning in the data. Uses examples of contextual factors or language features to support this.
----------------	-----	---

EXEMPLAR C

The conversation takes place at home as Thomas is too ill to go to nursery and so his parents may have taken time away from work or other projects to be with him. Thomas will likely feel more relaxed to converse as he is in a familiar environment. The father uses an interrogative to engage Thomas "How are you today?" This may function to gain information from his son, or it may have a phatic function as it allows for polite conversation. In doing this Thomas gives a standard response with the declarative statement "mm brilliant". This shows how the father is sculpting Thomas' language as an adjacency pair is created, therefore showing how his language is reinforced, supporting Skinner's theory of development. The mother and father also show that they are both involved in encouraging Thomas' language development as the mother uses the same technique of using interrogatives to encourage a response. Also the parents use turn taking effectively by supporting each other's speech to Thomas e.g. "Why have you opened the door", "so people can go inside", "that's a good idea isn't it?". This shows how all three members of the family cooperate to converse, i.e. supporting Goffman's theory of footing as all three family members have equal footing. Contextually this links to the conversation taking place at the family home, therefore there are no outside influences affecting the equilibrium.

Thomas also demonstrates how he uses imitation in his language in order to communicate, "yeah," "yeah". In this he imitates his father showing he agrees with him about opening the bus door being a good idea, an interrogative proposed by the mother, show more family communication. By doing this Thomas is demonstrating how he understands cognitively what is a 'good idea', supporting Piaget's claims.

Thomas' father asks him to elaborate when he says he'll change "that" as 'that' is a vague noun and the father wants to encourage him to use more context independent language i.e. so more than just Thomas understands what Thomas means. This is successful as Thomas correctly identifies the steering wheel. This again supports Skinner's theory of reinforcement as Thomas is changing his language based on his conversation partners' reactions. Thomas' father also uses his name to directly target him with an interrogative, "Thomas, do you want to read?" This allows Thomas to understand that questions can be directed to one person and if another name/title is used then the question may not concern him e.g. if the mother ask the father a question. This allows Thomas to understand social discourse and improve his understanding of functioning within group conversations, linking to Grice's maxims of relevance as he understands that a question that is not relevant to him may not target him. Thomas' understanding of the 'rules' of conversation defined by Grice is demonstrated throughout the text as he shows relevance in his answers and generally does not give too much or too little information, but when he does his parents ask him to elaborate, showing how he is learning and they are shaping his language.

At some points there is overlap in two people's speech during the conversation, which is common and applies to people of all activities. Thomas demonstrates that he understands the rules of turn-taking however, as after

he interrupts his father there is a three second interval in which he waits to ensure his father has finished thus showing an understanding of the pragmatics involved with turn-taking. This also demonstrates how Thomas is protecting his 'face' as he does not want to be seen as rude and therefore is protecting his negative face by being polite.

Thomas' parents demonstrate that they are using examples of situations which Thomas will be more familiar with in order to improve his understanding, also suggests he is younger and may not cognitively understand some concepts, supporting Piaget's theory of cognitive understanding. For example Thomas plays with a bus and his father asks if he will put children on it, suggesting that Thomas would be familiar with a bus with children on it either from real life or through fictional resources like Television shows or books.

Thomas' father also uses recasting in order to improve the quality and to standardise Thomas' language e.g. Thomas uses the non standard past tense verb "camed" and his father recasts this as "come" showing how he is shaping his son's language use.

Contextually the language is generally more relaxed and Thomas is given the confidence to speak his opinions and to narrate his playing to his parents, who show interest in order to encourage their son to continue to use language effectively. Also they are not critical of Thomas' language use of opinions e.g. when he talks of microwaved beef his father says "that's interesting" which does not negatively challenge his son's opinion.

These interactions may shape Thomas' language use as they allow him to gain confidence concerning speaking to other people. They also allow him to experience conversing in a group and to practice pragmatic influences over conversation such as turn taking, implied meanings and understanding the function of language.

Exemplar C: Marker's Comments

This student's writing style and consistent application of concepts places the response at the level 3/4 borderline for AO1 and 2 and some slight underdevelopment of some language features such as phonology and grammar limits the response to top of level for AO3.

The student shows a clear focus on the importance of context in the opening section and understands that being 'in a familiar environment' can affect a child's language and the comment about interrogatives shows that the student is able to consider a number of potential explanations for the relevance of a language features. Effective terminology is applied in this section and the examples are integrated into some effective analysis considering the role of the mother and father. However, despite a strong focus on concepts, the students focus on the use of questions does become a little repetitive and feels over stretched. At this stage, the response would have perhaps benefitted from some specific focus on child directed speech. The comment on 'comed' further illustrates this student's ability to apply concepts critically as there are references to 'recasting', and 'shaping language use' but it would have been beneficial to have speculated on why Thomas has used this form.

Mark: 18/30 + 9/15 = 27/45

AO1 and AO2

Level 3	13–18	Clear relevant application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies relevant methods of analysis to data with clear examples. Ideas are structured logically and expressed with few lapses in clarity and transitioning. Clear use of terminology. • Clear understanding and application of relevant concepts and issues to data.
----------------	-------	--

AO3

Level 3	7–9	Clear relevant application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains construction of meaning in data by making relevant links to contextual factors and language features.
----------------	-----	--

EXEMPLAR D

Throughout the transcript, Thomas and his parents pragmatically employ a diversification of linguistic devices in order to interact with one another. For example, the use of adjacency pairs, child directed speech and recasting all develop the level of interaction between these family members.

The transcript seems to be set out in an interrogative-declarative format due to the child directed speech from the mother and father. The adjacency pairs set out due to this question/answer format create higher levels of interaction between parent and child. The interrogative 'how are you?' followed by the declarative 'brilliant' represents the polysyllabic lexis being used by Thomas, however, the omitted plosive /b/ from the first syllable represents a virtuous error within his pronunciation.

The child's repetition of 'no' in response to a interrogative with the affricate pronunciation /tʃ/ somewhat depicts that the child is distracted due to the situation in which the conversation is taking place. The fact that Thomas is playing with his toy represents why his answers throughout the discourse of the transcript seem to be somewhat short. However, the clear consistent use of interrogatives on the behalf of both the mother and father depicts the use of Child Directed Speech as a way of attempting to engage Thomas into an interactive situation. The consistent use of the first person singular personal pronoun 'you' in a majority of the parents' interrogatives pragmatically depicts that they are making a conscious, deliberate attempt to make the conversation centric to Thomas in order to engage his interaction. This attempt does somewhat engage Thomas, yet the contextual situation remains distracting, evident through his response 'no', pronounced with the short vowel schwa /ə/ which depicts dialect in Thomas' tone.

The consistent use of fillers such as 'er and erm' on Thomas' behalf represents a cognitive attempt to work out the hypothetical situations his parents are presenting him with, however, fillers are also a phonological display of the solution or state of thinking. This consistent use of fillers could however simply be a reinforcement of Thomas' distraction or the failed linguistic devices employed in an attempt to engage him to interact.

The fact that Thomas uses a irregular verb ending in 'camed' depicts a cognitive understanding of the spoken past tense, while also depicting a conscious effort of standardised grammar. However, the father notices the virtuous error and recasts Thomas' speech by echoing his statement and pragmatically correcting the verb ending by saying 'come' which is present tense, this subliminal correction throughout the interaction is a form of positive reinforcement and, over time, will allow Thomas to pick up on standard speech.

Thomas' declarative 'I are staying' represents a virtuous error in distinguishing the difference between plural and singular verb tenses. Throughout the extract Thomas seems to employ declaratives as his pivotal form of interaction, while his father and mother employ interrogatives in the form of a hypothetical situation in order to form their interaction, which is not so much an attempt to

themselves interact with Thomas, but an attempt to get him to interact with them.

The fact that the transcript includes interruptions within the speech represents an engagement and readiness to interact, mostly from Thomas in the conversation centric to him.

To conclude, the most abundant linguistic devices to form interaction would be child directed speech in the form of interrogatives from the parents, and declaratives from Thomas, which, in a way, prompt more interrogatives from the parents. However, the subtle pronoun use in order to engage the child, along with the semantic field of play and hypothetical situations are more subtle, pragmatic and effective devices that are employed.

Exemplar D: Marker's Comments

This script shows a student who has a discriminating and controlled approach to the data, with accurate application of linguistic terminology and use of appropriate examples. There is clear evidence of understanding and there are a number of relevant links to context and language features.

In the first section the student mentions child directed speech and uses 'adjacency pair' showing that they understand the focus of the question. Although the student does not explain what child directed speech is they are able to demonstrate a secure understanding and there are relevant links to language features. The student introduces some brief analysis of other features in their selected example with a brief discussion of phonology. As well as demonstrating their understanding of language features it also allows them to demonstrate further their knowledge of linguistic terminology. Unlike responses in lower mark bands, this student considers the context of the conversation with the observation that 'the child is distracted'. Although the subsequent discussion of pronouns shows further controlled application of understanding to the data there are some basic errors in terminology here but once again the consideration of context is relevant and consistently applied. Further illustration of this student's discriminating approach is found in the section on the use of 'comed'. Terminology such as 'irregular verb', 'virtuous error', and references to 'subliminal correction' show not only accurate application of linguistic terminology but also secure understanding of concepts underpinning child language development.

Mark: 22/30 + 12/15 = 34/45

A01 and A02

Level 4	19–24	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies controlled discussion of methods supported with use of discriminating examples. Controls the structure of response with effective transitions, carefully chosen language and use of terminology. • Discriminating selection and application of a range of concept and issues to the data.
----------------	-------	---

A03

Level 4	10–12	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes inferences about the construction of meaning in data by examining relevant links to contextual factors and language features.
----------------	-------	--

EXEMPLAR E

Within the transcript we observe Thomas playing in the family home, after being away from nursery due to being ill. At aged four, we would expect Thomas to be firmly within the post-telegraphic stage – meaning he should have an ability to form a range of sentences and use conjunctions and polysyllabic lexical items. Within the transcript it seems that Thomas is in a safe domestic environment in which his language can develop.

Lexically, there are many interesting observations to be made about Thomas' use of language to interact with his parents. Immediately we see Thomas' father ask Thomas a tag question 'how are you today?' – this is a form of CDS (Child Directed Speech) which allows for Thomas to gain an understanding of conversational pragmatics such as turn-taking and adjacency pairs, and Bruner and Vygotsky's social interactionist theory would argue that interactions such as this are crucial to children's language development. However, it is interesting to note that Thomas responds to this with the adjective 'brilliant'. Although, this to an extent shows that the child is quite developed in his language use due to the polysyllabic nature of the word. However, due to the context of the conversation in which Thomas is off nursery sick, it is interesting that he responds positively. This could suggest that the lexis 'brilliant' is a formulated response, or alternatively could suggest that Thomas does not understand the question fully or does not have a lexical grasp of the meaning of 'brilliant', which would refute Vygotsky and Piaget's Cognitive Theory which states that language comes with understanding and that children cannot linguistically articulate concepts they don't understand. Furthermore, Thomas' seemingly inappropriate response to the question could be due to preoccupation.

Another interesting lexical observation is that Thomas uses colloquial forms such as 'yeah'. It is interesting to observe that Thomas uses this lexical item after his father – which behaviourists theorists would label as imitation and the colloquial term is used in the correct context.

In terms of morphology, it is interesting to observe that Thomas shows an awareness of the past tense, especially with regard to the 'ed' morpheme, shown through his use of lexical items such as 'started', suggesting that he is within the post-telegraphic stage. However, this is not completely secure, shown through his over extension of came to 'camed'. This supports the theories found by Berko's 'Wug test', which looked at how children over-extended plural rules e.g. dog-dogs, sheep-sheeps. It seems from Thomas' utterance that the same can be applied to the rules for past tense suffixes. It is however, interesting to note that Thomas has correctly substituted o with a in order to make 'come' in to past tense 'came'. A behaviour theorist would argue that in order for Thomas' language to securely develop he needs positive and negative reinforcement from his parents – however, Thomas' parents do not appear to reinforce Thomas with regard to his language use and Thomas' language seems to be securely developing – perhaps refuting behaviourist theory.

The refuting of behaviourist theory is also highlighted phonologically through Thomas' language use, whereby he corrects himself on words he initially pronounces incorrectly for example 'yust', which he immediately corrects to 'just', refuting behaviourist ideas and supporting Chomsky's Nativist theory, that children have an innate ability to learn language, and will do so when they are ready. Furthermore, Thomas seems to find some phonemes difficult to produce, perhaps due to lack of biological development or a minor speech impediment, such as s lisp. However, he copes effectively with this using substitution and deletion, for example substituting the 'r' phoneme with the easier 'w' in the lexis 'ready' which he pronounces 'reddy'. His ability to do this means the quality of his communication is not hindered.

It is also interesting to note the elided form of 'because' that Thomas uses, 'koz'. This is likely to be because of influence by caregivers and other language users, as this is a common pronunciation of the lexis within people's sociolect, perhaps as a means for ease of articulation. Social Interactionist theorists would argue that this clearly displays how external influences affect language.

Thomas also seems to struggle to pronounce more specialist lexis that he would not use regularly, for example 'microwave', in which he drops the unstressed syllable, again as a means of ease of articulation – which does not hinder his communication. The fact that Thomas is able to retain language that he does not use regularly, offers support to the Nativist theory that we are 'hard-wired' with a LAD (language acquisition device), that can sort language into patterns and retain it.

It is interesting to observe the use of Thomas' parents' language and behaviour, and how this influences Thomas' language use. Both parents use elements of CDS, such as tag questions, highlighted to Thomas through their use of a rising intonation. It is interesting that the father uses open questions. Thomas father also uses recasting as a means to encourage Thomas' language use, for example 'What did he do? Did he eat everything in the house?'

The father also asks Thomas 'do you want to read?'. This could, contextually, be an activity that Thomas and his parents partake in, on a regular basis. Social interactionist theory argues that parents who partake in social interaction with their children, aid their language development.

Exemplar E: Marker's Comments

This is a band 5 response and was awarded 38/45. Considering the time allowed, the student produces a full response and shows a sustained application of selected language features and considers the effect of context. Examples are effectively and accurately integrated into the response and a wide range of theories are supported and refuted by the student in the course of the analysis. The terminology is generally accurate and the writing style is sophisticated and accessible.

The student uses the opening paragraph to identify the expected development stage of the child ('post telegraphic') mentions a few language features and briefly comments on the broad context of the conversation. Although significant marks cannot be awarded for general introductions such as this, it would seem this student has knowledge of developmental theories and some of the issues that may affect child language development.

In the subsequent paragraph, the student further demonstrates knowledge of theory by writing about two relevant theories with links to interaction. Although there is a slight error with the application of 'tag question', the student shows critical application of concepts and issues and uses an appropriate register and integrated examples. The discussion of 'brilliant' is interesting and informative and shows a student who is willing to use the knowledge gained on the course to speculate about why a child may use particular forms.

This student's ability to link language features critically to a range of theories is continued in the analysis of colloquialism and behaviorism. The writer's sustained critical application continues with a detailed discussion of past tense inflections which also illustrates skillful integration of a different theorist (Berko) while maintaining a sophisticated and accessible writing style.

The student shows confidence with theories by choosing to refute and support different theories when discussing phonology. It is a shame that the writer chooses not to use the IPA to illustrate the discussion but the writer shows an understanding of common patterns of substitution and deletion of phonemes.

The student uses the last part of the response to consider the role of the parent and shows knowledge of some of the core features of child directed speech and social interaction.

Mark: 25/30 + 13/15 = 38/45

A01 and A02

Level 5	25–30	<p>Critical and evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents critical application of language analysis with sustained examples. Uses sophisticated structure and expression with appropriate register and style, including use of appropriate terminology. • Evaluative application of a wide range of concepts and issues.
---------	-------	--

AO3

Level 5	13–15	Critical evaluative approach <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Critically examines relevant links to contextual factors and language features. Evaluates construction of meaning in data.
----------------	-------	--

EXEMPLAR F

Text A is a conversation in the spoken mode between Thomas, aged 4 years old, and his mother and father. Because of the conversations context of production, namely in the family home, the formality of the conversation will be fairly low, as Thomas should feel very comfortable and not as though he is being tested. The case is similar with the context of reception, as Thomas is being spoken to by people he trusts and knows the most, he will be fairly comfortable and will have fairly colloquial language.

Firstly looking at discourse to explain Thomas' language development, it is clear that Thomas has a good grasp of conversational skills. Text A, lines 1-2 show Thomas and his father discussing how Thomas is feeling that day: "T: mm brilliant". Because Thomas recognises when to reply he has a good grasp of turn taking. This is modelled by his parents, who do not interrupt either Thomas or each other, and give Thomas space to provide his own contributions. Ferguson's baby talk register (BTR) explains that from a very young age, carers and parents try to teach babies turn taking to allow them to have a conversation and interact with people, despite not being able to standardly speak. At the age of 4, it is not surprising that Thomas has this skill, as going by the average age for children to acquire things, this would be with a child at the age of 2-2.5 years. Equally, because Thomas feels comfortable with the context of production, he is not shy and is happy to reply to his father and have a conversation.

Thomas' opportunities to speak, and develop his language skills are encouraged through his parents use of interrogatives, including open, closed and tag questions. Regarding the discourse in text A, Thomas has a habit of using repetition in his speech as line 43 shows: "I would give him roast beef microwaved roast beef". There are many explanations for why Thomas may have uttered this phrase twice; it may be because he felt it was an important concept lexical phrase that answered the question posed to him, it could be because he felt he didn't have his audience's attention when he first said it, or it could be explained as a run-up phonetically. I strongly believe it is an example of a run-up in his phonetical speech, as the first time Thomas attempted to "roast", he could not quite match the standard form.

Thomas is aware of appropriate responses, for example line 8, he responds to his father's open question with "so people can go inside". Thomas understands that an explanation is required and that the lexeme "so" can be used in conversational speech to explain something. Thomas demonstrates the syntactic structure of subject-verb-object (SVO). This is because "people" is his subject, "can go" is Thomas' verb phrase, explaining that his utterance is in the progressive aspect and active voice and "inside" is Thomas' object. Although this is the most simple type of syntactic verb structure, he actually shows he is more advanced for his age. This is because at only 4 years old, he understands that he can create a subject-verb-complement (SVC) sentence structure. With "go inside" being a prepositional phrase complementing his subject "people", because it is explaining where exactly the people can go.

Lexically, although Thomas understands the concept words in a message and can convey them, he struggles with including some lexical words, such as "a". Text A, line 15 depicts this: "that's steering wheel". Although "a" does not carry much meaning in this message, it is still required for standard English. Thomas' father immediately models standard usage of the indefinite article in line 16 "have you got a driver there?" Subsequently Thomas uses determiners before stating concrete nouns: "a tiger" and "the roof", line 39. Thomas' father's immediate modeling of standard syntax may have reminded Thomas of this requirement. This links with the behaviourist theory by Burrhus Skinner, that children imitate their parents' speech idiolects in order to help themselves acquire language.

Thomas' use of lexis shows he is very advanced for his age as he understands the different degrees of certainty and possibility that words can have. Line 43 of text A: "I would". This is an example of a modal auxiliary verb depicting a degree of possibility. It explains that someone or something "would" do something, but then again, they also might not do something. As Thomas has used it in his speech he knows that by saying it, he is not making a promise that he definitely would like something, just that there is a possibility that he may like something. This may be a case of the interactional approach by Jerome Bruner in that Thomas' parents may be positively reinforcing his language decisions and Thomas is used to that and therefore copies the type of words that they use. This is because in line 42: "F: what would you give the tiger to eat", the lexeme "would" is used, and it is used a total of 5 times within the 9 utterances spoken prior to Thomas using the lexeme himself.

Discussing the morphology of Thomas' language development, it is clear that he is standard in his use of morphemes, which would be expected on an average basis for a 4 year old. Text A, line 43 depicts: "microwaved" in use. This shows us that Thomas has the ability to understand the inflectional bound morpheme "-ed" which is commonly used to explain past tense and to converge nouns to verbs. In this case, the noun "microwave" has become a verb in past tense: "microwaved". Jean-Berko Gleason's wug test, explains how children at 3/4 years old test best when dealing with /s/ as a bound morpheme for plurality. "-ed" is one of the very first and most simple bound morphemes that children acquire, along with "-s" marking plurality, therefore it is not surprising, after 2.5 years on from when Thomas would have first acquired bound morphemes, that he is able to fluently and easily, use bound morphemes in his conversational speech.

Focusing on Thomas' phonology, he uses proto words and run-ups, for example text A, line 43: "/wəʊst/". This is an understandable virtuous error (term coined from Chomsky) for Thomas to have made as both the /r/ and /w/ phonemes have the same manner of articulation, but different place of articulation. The place of articulation of /r/ is on the alveolar ridge, whereas /w/ is a bilabial. The fact that Thomas knew he was non standard in his first pronunciation relates to the Fis phenomenon. This was where linguists interviewed a young boy who called his toy fish /fis/, when asked by the linguists specifically, "is this your /fis/?", the young boy replied "no". But when asked "is this your /fɪʃ/?", the young boy replied "yes". This then explains that children understand the difference between the sounds of phonemes regardless of whether they have discovered the standard place and manner of articulation for them or not. Thomas' father model standard pronunciation, for

example in line 33, where he repeats Thomas' use of the lexeme 'little' /ikəl/ in standard English.

To conclude, this essay has discussed how many features, such as phonology, discourse and lexis, are examples of how Thomas' language acquisition is influenced by his interactions with his parents. His parents use a range of questions, modelling of appropriate turn taking and standard pronunciation which support Thomas in his language development.

Exemplar F: Marker's Comments

This script was placed into level 5 for all AOs and was given a total of 38. Overall, it presents a critical application of language analysis and an evaluative and sometimes discriminating application of a range of concepts while critically examining links to a range of language features.

The student shows understanding of how context will affect the language found in the data before going on to discuss how interaction and the use of interrogatives can help the child develop discourse skills. The section uses sophisticated expression with an appropriate register and a theory is applied alongside effective examples and some detailed and relevant terminology.

Although there are some errors in the clause level analysis, this does not significantly diminish the quality of the response but the slightly unfocused nature of this section means it does not attract significant marks.

The student then moves the discussion to lexis, morphology and phonology, showing their knowledge of language levels and the ability to apply them critically to the data. Again, the student demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate a range of language features and each section includes effective exemplification and control of the structure of the response. Clear references to linguistic theory throughout enables the student to show discriminating application and evaluation of issues and concepts associated with language development. The section on phonology shows some effective integration of the IPA and knowledge of terminology associated with place and manner of articulation which is essential to an effective exploration of this language level.

Mark: 25/30 + 13/15 = 38/45

AO1 and AO2

Level 5	25–30	Critical and evaluative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents critical application of language analysis with sustained examples. Uses sophisticated structure and expression with appropriate register and style, including use of appropriate terminology. • Evaluative application of a wide range of concepts and issues.
----------------	-------	---

AO3

Level 5	13–15	Critical evaluative approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critically examines relevant links to contextual factors and language features. Evaluates construction of meaning in data.
----------------	-------	--

EXEMPLAR G

It is clear that Thomas is in the telegraphic stage of his development as shown from his use of polysyllabic lexicon and pragmatic understanding of communication.

Throughout the communication, Thomas' father uses multiple questioning of 'how are you today?' and 'what's wrong with you today?' This use of questioning appears to be assisting Thomas in his lexical development for he is able to repeat parts of his father's lexis and incorporate it into his own speech. Alongside this, his father also rises his intonation when asking questions to his child, thus, helping the child develop an understanding of the features of spoken language, signalling also Thomas when it is his cue to speak. This use of language used by the father can be related to Bruner's theory of motherese, where the use of heightened intonation and questioning is used to help develop the child's understanding of communication.

Grammatically, both his mother and father are helping Thomas to structure his language in a way deemed correct in his society. This is evident where they both model speech for Thomas to use himself. However, Thomas' speech does display the omission of many determiners of 'the' with his use of 'that's steering wheel'. This could indicate that Thomas has not yet grasped the comprehension of using these features in his language, or perhaps, could indicate that he is pragmatically advanced in cohering with the informal nature of the communication where this lexicon is unrequired.

Phonetically, Thomas displays that he can use the dental fricative with his preposition of 'that'. This is a particularly difficult phoneme to articulate, however he seems to use it with excellence. This could have been acquired due to the imitation of his mother's and father's language using it, as it is a high frequency word in the English language. This use of imitation can be regarded as the child learning behaviourally, coinciding with the thinking of Skinner.

Pragmatically, Thomas displays evidence that he is cohering with the communication rules which his parents have introduced into the communication. This is evident where the parents ask Thomas a question, for Thomas to turn-take and respond. This is evidence that Thomas is using his awareness of adjacent pairs and is reading meaning into his social environment to make sense of what is correct language structure, coinciding with the thinking of Macnamara. It is also clear that Thomas is using Halliday's interactional language structure with his use of turn-taking, thus displaying strong pragmatic awareness. It can be argued additionally that Thomas is able to partake in communication with his parents using these pragmatic devices, for he is in an environment which he feels belonged, supported by Maslow's thinking concerning his hierarchy of needs.

Thomas' language seems to be restricted to the most frequent use of nouns, coinciding with the thinking of Nelson, for these are the easiest to articulate. This is evident with his use of 'tiger' and 'children'. Although, this could be used because Thomas' parents are using closed questions of 'did he eat

everything?' This use of closed questioning would only recall for one answer, thus why Thomas perhaps used nouns in the majority of his language to coincide with the questions. Again, this use of closed questions also coincides with the thinking of Bruner and his motherese, for his parents are displaying multiple uses of this to assist Thomas in his language development.

Thomas' parents seem to be encouraging the use of pluralisation and contractions with their use of modelling the grammatically correct language, however Thomas displays difficulty with his use of 'camed'- being grammatically inaccurate. Despite this error, Thomas, nonetheless applies a grammatical rule to his language, thus displaying an understanding of tense. This can be explained using Chomsky's theory of the innate language acquisition device, for Thomas overextended his understanding of suffixes to use in his language. Although, this language is then repeated by Thomas' father with his use of 'come', thus, cueing Thomas to use this concept of tense. Furthermore, Thomas is also using language structures of subject, verb and object. This use of compound utterances, displays evidence that he is able to produce longer sentences, as appeared with his use of 'yes going to nursery'. Again, Thomas omits the use of 'I am' but this could be because of the informal speech which Thomas is partaking in, but could also be due to his development where he does not understand the use of this semantic structure, so cannot use it, despite his parents using it. This can be explained using cognitive Piagetian thinking where children can only use language once they are ready and understand the topic, hence why Thomas perhaps has difficulty using this.

Finally, phonetically, Thomas tends to use substitution with his language of 'just'. This however, is then re-uttered by Thomas with the correct use of 'just'. This is evidence that Thomas is beginning to make sense of his own language and its effects on others, for he is able to remodel his speech to that considered correct for his audience. This is a difficult skill for children to master, and despite Thomas' early age, he shows that he has an awareness of that which is correct in language. Perhaps this use of language has been imitated by his mother and father's use of correction and repetition of their own speech with 'Thomas, Thomas' displaying to Thomas the conventions of spoken language. This again, relates to the behavioural thinking of Skinner and his imitation theory.

In conclusion, it is clear that Thomas' parents are assisting Thomas in his language development for they use a range of teaching methods to complement his language acquisition and broaden his understanding. However, it seems that Thomas is acquiring language mostly, on his own, for he is using what he already knows in language and accommodating his schemas to the language of the context, displaying Piaget's cognitive theories. Thomas is clearly advancing rapidly in his language development and with the assistance of both parents, Thomas' language is broadening and perfecting very quickly.

Exemplar G: Marker's Comments

This response was placed at the top of level 4 for all AOs and showed a discriminating and controlled exploration of a wide range of concepts and issues while exploring relevant links to a range of language features. The student is careful to keep the focus on interaction throughout their response.

A range of features from each of the main language levels is covered in each paragraph of the response and the student shows a clear ability to evaluate the construction of meaning and to apply language levels critically. Additionally, the student is careful to apply a theory associated with language development to each and in doing so demonstrates that they are able to apply a range of concepts to the data.

Examples are supplied to support each aspect of the analysis and these are consistently relevant. A range of accurate terminology such as 'determiners' and 'dental fricative' are used to illustrate the features under discussion and the student's control over the structure of the response makes the analysis accessible. However, the section on adjacency pairs and turn taking would have benefitted from a specific example and the final section on phonology would have been more convincing had a wider range of examples been discussed and if the student had used the IPA to give a more precise discussion of phonological development.

Mark: 24/30 + 12/15 = 36/45

A01 and A02

Level 4	19–24	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies controlled discussion of methods supported with use of discriminating examples. Controls the structure of response with effective transitions, carefully chosen language and use of terminology. • Discriminating selection and application of a range of concept and issues to the data.
----------------	-------	---

A03

Level 4	10–12	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes inferences about the construction of meaning in data by examining relevant links to contextual factors and language features.
----------------	-------	--

