**A level ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

**Component 1**

**CPD MATERIAL 2018**

**Component 1: CPD Material 2018**

**Section A: three paragraphs (engaging with meaning)**

1. Both extracts use prosodic stress to emphasise particular words. In Text A, the word “power” which is an abstract noun is emphasised by the voiceover to suggest its importance. This is different from Text B where there are different words emphasised. An example would be the adjective “extraordinary” which makes the reporting more interesting to the viewer and shows the reaction of the speaker. Another characteristic of documentaries is the way in which the speed of the delivery varies. Again, this is done so that the viewer does not lose concentration as it helps to engage their interest. The opening line in Text A, for instance, has several pauses which enable the viewer to take in the information being given. This is important since the viewer of the documentary may not be familiar with the topic and will need time to understand it. In contrast, Text B tends to speed up certain sections such as the clause “there were two thousand more men on the way”. The use of the noun phrase “two thousand more men” allows the viewer to picture the precise number of people involved, which again is interesting.
2. The use of pauses in the opening line in Text A establishes the sad tone of the voiceover from the start. In the same way, the falling intonation before the noun “church” on line 9 prepares the viewer for the horrific killings that are then described. In contrast, in Text B, the language makes the conflict seem exciting. The adjectives “spectacularly” and “extraordinary” are both emphasised to show that it was a difficult battle for the British and that they had not expected the Argentinians to invade in the first place. This makes the British victory seem all the better.
3. The use of falling intonation on the adjective “dead” and the concrete noun “church” conveys the mournful tone in the first part of Text A. This is also reflected in the slowing down when saying “into this church”, which prepares the viewer for the brutal murder of the innocent villagers. The horror of this incident is used to show the destructive nature of the conflict on a global stage which is conveyed by the asyndetic listing with proper nouns “in Poland (.) in Russia (.) in Burma (.) in China”. In contrast, Text B focuses on the local nature of the conflict in which the noun phrases “small group of islands” and “sleepy little seaside town” makes the Falklands seem a curious setting for a war between two large nations.

**Section A: Two Student Exercises**

*Exercise 1:*

Which of these analytical sentences is the most successful and which the least?

1. “the women and children…were driven into this church” (Text A lines 9-10).
2. The use of the passive verb phrase “were driven” suggests not only that the villagers were given no choice but also that they were treated like cattle by the soldiers, reinforcing the viewers’ sympathy for the victims.
3. The nouns “women” and “children” make the viewer sympathetic to the victims of the atrocity since it suggests that they were defenceless.
4. The use of the concrete noun “church” makes the viewer aware of the setting which is important in any documentary.
5. “an invasion by Argentina (.) provoked one of the most ambitious military undertakings in British History” (Text B lines 2-3).
6. By using the prepositional phrase “in British History”, the programme is made to seem important, as if it is dealing with a very significant historical event.
7. The use of the abstract noun “invasion” and the verb “provoked” clearly identifies Argentina as culpable in starting the conflict while, in contrast, the adjective phrase “most ambitious” makes the British response appear heroic.
8. The opening sentence is a declarative which provides information about the conflict and who was involved, which is very important since not all viewers will necessarily have a wide knowledge of history.
9. “they had to fight up here in freezing conditions on exposed hill tops and across wide open ground” (Text B line 9).

1. The use of the adverb “here”, which is a deictic expression, is characteristic of the documentary form where the speaker, in this case Dan Snow, is present in the places where the events occurred to make it more convincing.
2. The third person plural pronoun “they” is used referring back to the previous section so that you have to be following the documentary if it is to make sense and the viewer is expected to be listening carefully.
3. The triadic structure with the use of the pre-modifying adjectives “freezing”, “exposed” and “wide open” emphasises the vulnerability of the British troops, implying their heroism in coping with such difficult conditions.

*Exercise 2****:***

* Give students the set of cards with quotations from the texts (Column A below).
* Ask them to choose one (or two) from each text and to write an analytical sentence about them.
* Hand out the analytical sentences (Column B below) and get them to link each one to a quotation card.
* Ask them to compare the one on the card with their own analytical sentences and decide which ones are better.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COLUMN A (quotations from texts)** | **COLUMN B (analytical sentences)** |
| “down this road (1) on a summer’s day in 1944 (1) the soldiers came” (Text A lines 1-2). | The syntax is inverted here and the main clause “the soldiers came” is postponed making it more ominous while the anonymity of the noun phrase “the soldiers” leaves it unclear as to whose side they are on. |
| “they stayed only a few hours (1) when they had gone (.) a community which had lived for a thousand years (1) was dead” (Text A lines 5-6). | The contrast between the two adverbials of time “only a few hours” and “for a thousand years” stresses how rapidly the entire village was destroyed, with the use of the collective noun “community” underlining how united the villagers were, making the atrocity appear even more shocking. |
| “Germany 1933 (1) a huge blind excitement fills the streets” (Text A line 17). | The shift in tone is indicated both by the fronted adverbial “Germany 1933” and the use of the present tense verb (“fills”) while the adjective “blind” implies that the German people were not fully aware of the nature of the Nazi regime. |
| “Hitler seized his chance to suspend all civil liberties” (Text A lines 33-34). | The use of the past tense verb “seized” suggests that Hitler acted quickly, as soon as power had been granted to him, with the determiner “all” indicating how autocratic he was from the start. |
| “but the odds were **spectacularly** uneven” (Text B line 5). | The emphatic stress on the adverb in the adjective phrase “spectacularly uneven” emphasises how disadvantaged the British were. |
| “it was one of the most improbable conflicts **ever**” (Text B line 14). | The use of the noun phrase “one of most improbable conflicts” seeks to make the Falklands war sound intriguing which is further underlined by Peter Snow’s possibly hyperbolic stress on the adverb “ever”. |
| (accel) “there were two thousand more men on their way” (Text B line 32). | The quick tempo of the clause is used by Dan Snow to convey the excitement and the immediate sense of threat posed by the arrival of more Argentinian soldiers. |
| “trapped inside the British Governor Rex Hunt broadcast a defiant message” (Text B 44-45). | The sense of British heroism is conveyed through the combination of the past participle “trapped” which implies that Hunt is in danger and the adjective “defiant” which shows his courage. |

**Section B: paragraphs from essays**

*Q2: Adults’ use of Child Directed Speech*

Candidate A

Chomsky’s account of language acquisition focuses on the Language Acquisition Device. This suggests that children have an in-built mechanism that allows them to acquire language. He argued fiercely against BF Skinner’s idea that we are a blank slate and that it is only through imitation and reinforcement that we learn to speak. One piece of evidence that he presented was the use of overgeneralisation by children where they change the endings of verbs, such as saying “breaked”. Both of these views, known as Nativist and Behavourist theories, were challenged by Interactionists such as Vygotsky and Bruner. Similarly, Piaget has a different viewpoint, suggesting that children only use language when they have knowledge. There are lots of different views and it is hard for anyone to decide which is right.

A boy called Jim, who was a child who could hear but whose parents were deaf, was studied by the linguists Bard and Sachs in 1977.

Candidate B

Chomsky’s challenge to Skinner’s Behaviourist model has implications for the role of Child Directed Speech. If the acquisition of language is essentially genetic as Chomsky suggests and does not depend on input, then Child Directed Speech is obviously less important. The evidence provided by overgeneralisation here is crucial: if a child makes an irregular past tense verb regular (e.g. they say “runned” rather than “ran”), they are highly unlikely to have heard that form before. This is, according to Chomsky, clear evidence of a Language Acquisition Device that allows children to develop language irrespective of how adults speak to them.

On the other hand, Bard and Sachs’ case study based on Jim, the hearing son of deaf parents, suggests that interaction with parents is actually crucial to language acquisition.

*Q3: Speakers’ use of language and social class*

Extract C

Labov’s work on Martha’s Vineyard looked at how fishermen who lived on the island off Massachusetts in America. Many tourists, mostly from quite wealthy backgrounds, came in the summer to visit the island and many had a different accent. Labov looked at the pronunciation of the diphthong in words such as “house” and discovered that the many younger people used the non-standard pronunciation most commonly used by the fishermen. This feature appeared to be more common amongst those who were proud to be from the island. Interestingly, Labov set about the work by interviewing people about their ideas about life, rather than getting them to read a list. He argued that this made the research more reliable in that people were less likely to be self-conscious about their pronunciation.

Similar work was undertaken by Lesley Milroy in Belfast.

Extract D

Many people pre-judge speakers who use non-standard forms, as Trudgill suggests, looking down upon them as not speaking “properly”. However, research suggests that some speakers deliberately use non-standard forms to show that they are proud of their class background. The linguist Labov who was an American wrote about how young people living on Martha’s Vineyard (an island) used the non-standard pronunciation of some words to make themselves sound more like the fishermen who lived there rather than wealthy tourists. He claimed that this was an example of “covert prestige” in which speakers use accent and dialect in a particular way to help to make themselves part of a group. Some speakers are proud of who they are and their background and use language to emphasise their identity.

Milroy’s work in Belfast argued the same thing about the importance of class for some speakers.

*Q4: Language use in different situations*

Extract E

While McDonald’s exchange with Robbins is obviously co-operative and shows mutual respect, many other interviews are more confrontational. In political interviews, in particular, the interviewer is much more likely to use language that challenges the politician. Famously, Jeremy Paxman repeated the same interrogative (“did you threaten to overrule him?”) twelve times when interviewing Michael Howard, using an increasingly weary tone as well as ironic use of politeness features such as “I’m sorry”. The repetition highlighted Howard’s inability to answer directly and made him appear deceitful. In contrast to this, Paxman’s interview of Russell Brand showed language being used differently by both speakers. While Paxman is more directly face-threatening, using the adjective “trivial” to dismiss him, Brand uses a mixed register with non-standard forms such as the determiner “me” in the colloquial clause “I’ve got a lot on me plate” with sophisticated noun phrases such as “tacit complicity” and “economic disparity”. In this way, he seeks to appear both an ordinary person outside the political classes and an intelligent thinker.

In a television chat show, however, the language differs again. When Brand appeared on Graham Norton’s programme…

Extract F

Speakers often use power over others when they talk. A famous example of this is when Jeremy Paxman was interviewing Michael Howard, a Conservative politician. He asked him the same question many times, repeating the complex interrogative “Did you threaten to overrule him?” The repetition showed that Howard was unwilling to answer the question and that Paxman, as the topic manager, could control the interview. In this way, the interview was an asymmetrical exchange since Paxman had the power. Sometimes, the interviewer has less power such as when Paxman interviewed Russell Brand. Here, Brand’s replies suggested that he was unwilling to allow Paxman to be the powerful speaker. He used the vocative “Jeremy” and the imperative “come on” to challenge Paxman’s power. At the same time, his use of elevated lexis such as the noun phrase “narrow prescriptive parameter” tries to make him sound at least as intelligent as Paxman. In this way, he competes for power with Paxman and does not allow him to dominate in the way he did with Michael Howard.

Fairclough’s notion of synthetic personalisation is also a helpful idea when talking about the way people speak.