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Transcripts A, B and C are taken from conversations between two young children and their carer. Sue, the carer, has a very important role here. With young children, she will not only have to attempt to control their behaviour but also prompt them both into speaking by asking a variety of questions. If she pays more attention to one child, she may run the risk of creating competition between the children which may result in bad behaviour.

During the transcripts, Sue has brought the children home from nursery, has initiated play for them and is making them their lunch. It would be expected that her questioning would revolve around these subjects. As for the children, there is a young boy, Josh, who is 4 years and 2 months old and a young girl, Franki, who is 3 years and 4 months old. Both children are within the telegraphic stage of speech, meaning that they can both create sentences and have a relatively large vocabulary but may still not create the exact adult form of what they want to say. I would expect Franki to miss more than Josh due to the fact that she is almost a year younger than him and so her speech will not be as advanced. With there being only two children, there may be a small amount of competition for attention from Sue but, with it being a mixed gender conversation and Franki being younger, Josh may feel as though he should help Franki along and take care of her in a way. It would be expected that the subject of the children's conversations would revolve around the activities that they are partaking in.

Sue, as expected, does forward a list of questions to the two children. Transcript A begins with her saying "what are you going to do now." This is an open question and is very common for carers to ask especially those in the telegraphic stage. Here Sue is trying to get the two children to
create their own opinions about what they want to do for fun. Instead of giving them a simple closed question, she is giving them a chance to explore their minds for a personalised answer. It is believed that the more children are prompted to do things such as this, the quicker they learn. However, when she received no response, she then asked the closed question “are you going to play for a bit.” Although she did attempt an open question, she then changed it to this. The children obviously didn’t have a response for her and so they simply chose not to answer. Sue then made it easier for them by providing them with a question that they only needed to answer with either “yes” or “no.” This was a good idea because if the children couldn’t think of anything to say, they may feel a bit disheartened and disappointed with themselves. It is this kind of feeling that makes children reluctant to keep on experimenting with language for the fear of failure. By giving them a question they can easily answer, Sue has escaped that scenario. Another common feature of childlike language is re-casting. Re-casting is repeating something a child has said incorrectly in the hope that they will realise their mistake and correct themselves. Most children pick up on re-casting in a clever way and are able to then go on to correct themselves. When Franki asks for a drink simply by saying the word “drink,” Sue then says “pardon (.) would you like a drink.” The “pardon” is a clear politeness feature and so will give Franki an idea of what she is missing. Then Sue recreates Franki’s question but still leaves the word “please” off. Franki must then realise because she eventually says the word “please.” Re-casting is a very good technique to use when talking to children who are acquiring language because it prompts them into saying something correctly rather than just telling them very blatantly that they are
wrong. Children respond better when questioned about their speech (rather than having their attempts criticized).

Once Franki does say "please," Sue then goes on to say "please that's a good girl well done." This type of praise is essential when talking to children. By saying "good girl" and "well done," Sue is making Franki feel special and intelligent. Everybody enjoys that kind of feeling and so it is likely that Franki will say "please" more in an effort to keep on getting praise. The more Franki says it, the more it will stick in her mind and well eventually become a part of everyday speech that she doesn't even need to think about. Children who receive praise from their caretakers are more likely to advance in language at a much quicker rate.

The main job of Sue in these transcripts, as child minder to the children, is to keep the peace between them both and she does this in quite a few clever ways. First of all, she doesn't show any favouritism between the children.

Both children will be wanting to impress the only adult present because children love to feel special. Sue manages to keep her attention very balanced. For example, when she says to Franki: "that's a good girl," she then quickly asks Josh the question: "and what have you got on your sandwich Josh." In an effort to keep him a valid part of the conversation. If she hadn't have done this, one child may become jealous of the other. The child could have either played up and misbehaved or could have become more reclusive because they felt left out, both of which would halt their acquiring of language.

Perhaps the cleverest method of keeping the piece that Sue uses comes when she is serving the children their lunches. She has to get Josh's first and Franki could've been this as unfair and may have made a fuss about wanting hers at the same time. However, Sue says: "Franki I'm going to get Josh his first (cos he's got to..."
get ready () and go to nursery in a minute.” By explaining the whole situation to Franky, she has made him aware of why Josh is getting his dinner first. This way Franky has nothing to argue about and no fuss can be created.

The children’s language is very much what you would expect to find. Both are able to create full sentences but both also don’t quite get the adult form at times. For example, Josh says in Transcript A, “we having a picnic.” He has done extremely well with the majority of the sentence. He has included the word “we” meaning he understands and can use pronouns efficiently. Pronouns are extremely hard for a child to learn because people can call themselves “me” or can be called “you” by others and so it can all become very confusing for a child. Josh has done very well to get this right. He has managed to get the determiner “a” in, which is also a feature of a developed child’s language. However, he hasn’t got the tense of the statement quite right. The whole attempt reads “we going or having we having a picnic.” This makes me believe that Josh is talking about something he will be doing at nursery later on and so he meant to say “we are going to have a picnic.” I think Josh got confused because of the present tense “going” and then the past tense “have.” This type of future tense is difficult to learn and Josh did make a good effort but he just needed a bit to learn before he got it right. Also, there is the verb “are” in there to learn as well. “Are” is a static verb and so it is very understandable that Josh missed it out. A dynamic verb is an action that you can see happening before your eyes but a static verb such as “are” describes a state of mind or being that is invisible to us. It is much easier for children to talk about things that
they can actually see and so words such as dynamic verbs and concrete nouns will come before others.

A common feature of child language is over-extension. Over-extension is a child who uses one word to describe a lot of things, they are making the meaning of the word bigger than it is. When Sue tells the children to take their shoes off, Franki says "not going on." Perhaps Franki doesn't know the phrase to use for taking your shoes off and so takes something she knows is related to shoes and uses it to try and express herself as best she can. Noam Chomsky said that children are born with the ability to just learn language and learn rules. I think that this over-extension from Franki proves Chomsky's theory to a degree. Franki will never have heard somebody say "not going on" when they have been taking their shoes off, and so she has not mindlessly copied off somebody instead she has thought about something she could possibly say in order to get her message across and has applied the rules that she knows to the situation.

When Josh says "it be cold to play in the rain" it may look incorrect but Josh has done relatively well here in an attempt to create a difficult sentence. Although "be" should be "is," Josh has still managed to get in a suitable verb. "Be" and "is" are of the same group as well, so he is really not far off perfecting his suitable verbs. Also, I think that the word "be" is missing because I think that Josh meant to say "it is too cold to play in the rain." Although it seems easy to adults, placing that "be" within the sentence would prove difficult for children. Young children haven't been taught about homophones and so don't understand that has words that sound the same can actually have different meanings. This
and show their intelligence because they have probably heard people say things such as "It's too cold to play in the rain" but, because they don't understand it themselves, they choose not to use it.

Overall, I think both the carer and the children are working together well here. Sue is helping develop the children's language by asking a lot of questions and getting both children fully involved within the conversation. Her control over the two children is what gives her the opportunity to help them with their language. The children are obviously picking up new things all of the time. Sometimes they make little mistakes but sometimes they get the perfect adult form, for example Franki says "they not mine" then straight after says "sink they are mine." With constant interaction with other children and a certain level of guidance from carer's, children will acquire language fully.

See page 12.
Texts 1 and 2 were both written at very different times within our country. There were different values and different attitudes back in 1934. Text 1 is taken from an old newspaper. I would expect to find a lot of information because newspapers were created to supply people with as much information as possible. This contrasts directly with what I would expect to find in Text 2. Written in 2008 and published on a website, I would expect to find much less information because browsers want a website to be as clear and as understandable as possible.

Reading the two texts, the most obvious difference between them is their levels of formality. In 1934, the class system was still very much a part of people's lives and the upper class were still looked up to. People aspired to talk like the upper class and so newspapers would be written in a formal fashion as it exudes power from the words. Words such as "prominent," "intelligent," and "splendidly" create a very formal style and create distance between the writer and the audience. Compare that with words and phrases such as "Pompey," "great stuff," and "all sorts of well-wishers." The English language has undergone a massive formalisation since 1934 and this is evident in the language used on the website. Formal language is now seen as "smugly" and "pompous" because we have a much higher sense of equality now and, although the class system does not exist, it plays nowhere near as big a part in our lives. While the newspaper article involved the reader in no way and looked as though there was a distance being attempted to be made between reader and writer, the website article spoke directly to its audience.

Caroline asked "No hanging about is there?" A rhetorical question such as this is very common in modern texts as a form of direct address. It is used because, over the years, we have found that people will respond better to a text they feel involved in and that they have h
In modern English, we are much more likely to say "had it" than "had it not been for the fact that". In modern English, "had it not been for the fact that" is archaic. This text is about the codification of British as an "Empire" language. Language change is continually changing. In 1934, the phrase "odds and ends" was not considered archaic, but in modern speech it is.

The phrase "odds and ends" is used to refer to the remaining items after the main items have been taken care of. It is used to describe miscellaneous items or things that are left over. For example, if you have a lot of books and you decide to give them away, you might say that the remaining books are "odds and ends". In modern speech, "odds and ends" is used to refer to the remaining items after the main items have been taken care of. It is used to describe miscellaneous items or things that are left over. For example, if you have a lot of books and you decide to give them away, you might say that the remaining books are "odds and ends."
not been." Partly because it comes across as less formal but also because we get rid of the word "if." In a world in which we type everything and speak in a hurried manner, time is of the essence and by missing out even the smallest word such as "if," saves us time.

The graphology of the two texts is extremely different, which would be expected from two texts of such different time zones. In Text 1 there are large capital letters to begin every new speech, italics are used and the font is a very typical Times New Roman type choice. All of these features make the whole appear more formal. People would have reacted much better to this in 1934 than they would do now. People in 1934 looked up to all things intelligent and so would have trusted that this intelligent looking whole would give them all of the information that they needed. On the other hand, the website from 2008 is written in all of the same rounded font, with only a few bold words that show important information. The rounded font is easier to read and comes across as much more friendly and informal. This is what people look for these days because they want a relaxing read rather than one that looks as though it's going to make them really think.

The way in which the chosen speaker thinks about the game is also very different between the two texts. In Text 1, speakers are saying things such as "I'm speechless for once. Harry's a legend now isn't he? He's off to him." Here, the speaker is describing his reactions to the game rather than the game itself. This is because he doesn't need to describe the game because almost every single person reading that article would have watched the game for themselves on a television. Things were much different in 1934, when Text 1 was written. When talking about the match, one of the article's
speakers said. "The ball did not run well for us, but our lads were always fighting." Another said "At Wembley they did their level best, but the conditions were against us." Both of these speakers are actually describing the game in a sort of story format. This is perhaps because they know that television's are not readily available and so not many of the readers will have watched the match, so they are trying to paint a sort of picture for them. As time passes, we talk about things such as sports in less detail and this feature comes hand in hand with the introduction of new technology.

Overall, I believe that the main differences between the two texts come from the informalisation of the country's language and the introduction of new technology. With our language being much less class related and much more about making things easy for ourselves, many of the terms found within Text 1 appear very outdated and archaic. Introductions of new pieces of technology have given us the opportunity to spend less time discussing small details and more time giving opinions. The introduction of new pieces of technology has also given us the chance to change the way we present our information to make it clearer and easier to understand.

See page 12.
Q1: Begin to analyze. Content writing but took a long time to get in points.
   Q2: Line review—began to write ineffective
   Q3: Less context, something needed in long features.

Q4: Changed view. Used an object with some analysis from evening.
   Q2: Key concepts applied improved.
   Q3: Clear and sound explanation.