

GCSE English Language

GEN 3

**Applying the annotation conventions
required for Unit 3**

Foreword

Teachers may use this resource alongside Appendix 5 of the *CCEA GCSE Specification in English Language*.

The purpose of this document is to illustrate how teachers should annotate the two Controlled Assessment tasks that make up Unit 3.

Candidate responses to the legacy specification's Unit 4 2017 themes have been used.

Task 1 – The Study of Spoken Language

Theme: Commentaries

Example 1

Using the commentaries for the 1999 Champions' League Final (between Manchester United and Bayern Munich) and the English Premiership League winning match for the 2012 season (between Manchester City and QPR), discuss the Spoken Language techniques which Clive Tyldesley and Martin Tyler use.

Voted Royal Television Sports Commentator of the Year on four occasions, highly acclaimed footballing commentator Clive Tyldesley's instantly recognisable tones are synonymous with the 'beautiful game'. In the final of Man Utd's award winning season of 1999, the Man Utd young guns faced the mighty Bayern Munich in a dramatic showdown, a match with the potential to win either team the highly sought after treble – and possible United's first European Cup since 1968. In what was one of the most memorable football matches in history, Tyldesley commentated alongside former United manager "Big Ron" Atkinson, amidst the "lion's roar" of fever pitch fans willing their team on to victory.

The importance and patriotism of this game cannot be underestimated. The English champions battling it out against their German counterparts, vying for the epitome of European football. Thus, given the context of this match and Tyldesley's initial disappointment at an 'inevitable' United defeat, his subsequent elation, infectious enthusiasm and fevered excitement is totally understandable.

The commentary picks up as the match nears its finale, with Tyldesley gloomily foreshadowing the impending defeat or a one nil down Manchester United, his lasklustre and disappointed tone and the allusion to the alliterative, metaphorical 'treble treadmill' conjoining Man Utd and Bayern Munich who have been "tirelessly running" in pursuit of the prestigious treble throughout the relentless footballing season. Tyldesley's employment of ellipsis elicits a significant pause, highlighting his disappointed tone and suggesting this match has so far failed to live up to the expectations of the footballing public, who expected a nail-biting dynamic affair between two great footballing sides. As a life-long United fan, he is also personally disappointed with their failure to win.

His plosive and emphatic articulation of Bayern's previous coaches and players name "Beckenbauer" highlights the enormity of the task facing Bayern Munich. Not even the great Franz Beckenbauer succeeded to achieve the treble. Tyldesely also successfully prepares the audience for defeat using a hopeless tone in 'Can Manchester United deny ✓ them'. This question lacks the inflection we would expect from such a high octane commentary – thus confirming to us the match has so far failed to live up to expectations. At this point both Tyldesely and the audience are pessimistic about a United victory.

- C A notable tonal shift in the 89th minute elicits a roller coaster of emotions through a series of short rapid, staccato sentences as Beckham and Neville combine. "Beckham, its Neville. Its Yorke", increase both Tyldesely's volume and tempo. As in the job of any Commentator, he must spontaneously adapt his speech, tempo and information to mirror the unfolding action on the pitch. Tyldesely is exceptional in this regard. His speech is imbued with clauses which run seamlessly into each other. "Bayern ... introduce Hasan ... in place of", also having thoroughly researched both teams "Bosian international", his emotionless, detached tone makes it obvious he is simply relaying factual information to us during inaction in the game.

His inclusion of a significant metaphor with inflection on 'motions' – 'Basler motions ... Roll team" highlights the urgency and desperation of Bayern as they implore their fans to guide them to victory. This game needs an injection of action, as indicated by Tyldesley's disappointed monotone "Salihamidzic can't keep ball in play" "Throw in to MU" Whilst dry acerbic humour sardonically implies Utd need time, much more time "What we now ... 20 minutes". Both Tyldesely and the audience are pessemistic about United's dance of victory at this stage.

As Babel makes an error, an excited, personal injection "Oh thats a bit loose" injects hope and optimism in the minds of fans as they ponder a United revival. Whilst the military metaphor, "Base camp/final assault" successfully establishes the notion of a battle as

the audience are poised for a final onslaught. We can now also share Tyldeseley's enthusiasm as he excitedly recounts play "Neville ... Stam ... Janker", he is succeeding in pitching the audience into the midst of the action. In the 90th minute, the commentators excited and defiant in tone declaration "Three added minutes", further increases the tempo and injects hope in the minds of fans whilst dramatic pausing "David Beckham ... Neville" elicits an atmosphere of anticipation as the audience can tentatively ponder success. Tyldesley is now carrying supporters on a fresh wave of hope and optimism.

The fast paced commentaries now mirror the action on the pitch as short, staccato sentences echo sharp United moves "Beckham ... Schmeichel...", an effective rhetorical device – power build – accelerates the excitement with the utterance of every name – as if we at the game live. The crowd is now at fever pitch as Tyldeseley's deliberately loud and exclamatory "Sheringham!" confirms the equaliser and the fact it is now 'game on'. His admiration for the goalscorer is evident in his later repetition of "Oh Teddy Teddy."

His well measured and enunciated declaration "Name-on-the-trophy" is defiant and confident in tone. He really believes United can win and more importantly thanks to his commentary and the action unfolding
C before him, the audience also believe in success. This tonal shift is deeply contrasting to the tone of hopelessness experienced at the outset of this commentary. The now fever pitched fans make it difficult for his voice to be heard, so Tyldeseley now increases the volume of his voice, both to highlight his increasing excitement, but also to overcome the practicalities of speaking amidst a vociferous footballing crowd.

Passionate and disbelieving, there is a momentary tremble in his articulation of "extraordinary climax", whilst descriptive, figurative language and appropriate rhetorical devices – the threat of an alliterative "golden goal hanging like a shadow" (simile), further builds hope and enthusiasm amongst supporters, but also serves as a

reminder things could still go wrong. This is the magical diction of a skilled commentator who has engaged and sustained the readers interest throughout the commentary. “A questioning tone is established “Unless Ole ... another”, further elicits optimism and fills the audience with belief. However as his excitement builds further, his diction slips and Tyldeseley’s clipped words, Mancunian dialect and elision “Ya love te feel ...” becomes apparent. Here Tyldeseley is enthused and we are inspired to share this enthusiasm and belief.

Whilst commentators are expected to remain neutral in their rhetoric, the blatant bias of this Lancashire man for his fellow Northern English team imbues his commentary. This is quite typical amongst sports commentators however, who by the nature of their job often find themselves passionately switching tone and pitch in relation to the unfolding action occurring before them.

As Manchester United reach “their moment”, the emphatic heightening of volume and pitch allows Tyldeseley to excitedly exclaim “And Solskjaer has won it”, confirming both Man United as victors, but also highlighting his personal delight at the victory. Another measured, enunciated, metaphorical biblical allusion “MU ... reached ... promised land” reinforces the tone of pride and joy whilst further confirming the victory – will the measured pace allowing the audience to fully savour the moment. Tyldeseley’s measured pace elicits further admiration for the goalscorer “Ole Solskjaer”.

An excited and flippant tone “Hasn’t been a good European Cup final for a while” ironically implies he is joking – this match will be spoken of for years to come. Tyldeseley is in the superior position of supporting the winning team and there is a smug satisfaction apparent through his use of the paradoxical, rhetorical question “With greatest respect ... who cares?” there is an unveiled mock sympathy quickly followed by a tone of arrogance – he is a United fan and unashamed to declare it. A second question “Now is that it” lacks inflection from Tyldeseley and confirms both he and the audience are longing for the whistle to blow,

whilst Tyldeseley's perfunctory description of the games final actions "Effenburg/Babbel" further confirms his longing for the final whistle.

As the final whistle sounds Tyldesely triumphantly eulogises, "history is made". The emphatic, "Nobody will ever" signifies the enormity of their success, a success exemplified by the triadic, "Champions of Europe ... England ... FA Cup". In his final remarks, Tyldesely's tone is proud and arrogant "They are never out" whilst a final question "were did you see ..."quickly marks this as a historical event and his closing lines "What a party" skilfully encapsulates the moment – a moment to be celebrated.

Much like his counterpart, Martin Tyler established himself as a leading commentator in the 1980's. He was voted FA Premier League commentator of the decade in 2003, yet it is his dramatic commentary during the final day of the 2011-2012 season in Manchester City's match against QPR, most notably his comments when Sergio Aguero sealed the title with a late winner, that defines him as one of the greatest commentators of his generation. In subsequent interviews, Tyler admitted he was glad he didn't "mess up" one of his most defining moments and his finest hour.

The significance of this match cannot be underestimated with Manchester United having won their game at Sunderland, the title looked beyond City's grasp, however a fantastic last goal from Sergio Aguero clinched the title from their cross town nemesis. This was to be a first City title in over 40 years and the result of a billion pound investment by Saudi Prince, Sheik Mansour.

At the outset of the commentary, Tyler's fast pace and excited tone, immediately immerses the audience in the action. Even though the title seems lost, City are presented as indomitable fighters through the metaphor "Still alive" invoking a sense of hope and optimism in fans. Then, in one of the most repeated commentaries ever, the highly

stressed, elongated and exclamatory “Agueroooh!” convey’s Tyler’s shock and disbelief - the Premiership has been won.

Such is his excitement, he uses the unprecedented personal statement “I swear” to further highlight his shock and disbelief at what he has just witnessed, whilst his measured pace invites the audience to do the same, this effect of admiration and awe is also achieved through Tyler’s use of a series of measured imperatives “Watch ... Drink”, compelling the audience to admire this rarest of footballing occurrences. Tyler also now informs of the implications of the goal “They just heard the news” – Man United have lost and Tyler is filled and enthralled with the excitement.

The sense of victory is evident through the inflection on “Snatch”, as in a nailbiting finale, Manchester City have stolen the title from United’s helpless grasp. Tyler’s well measured, incomplete sentence and exclamatory sentence “Stupendous” highlights their awe and disbelief and allows the audience and himself to ponder the enormity of the footballing feat achieved before them today. However, Tyler’s tone, pitch and volume return to normal once the initial shock worn off as he employs the positive metaphor, “start of a dynasty”, allowing the fans to allude to a City revival and the anticipation of a more competitive premiership. The positivity here contrasts “Old City” we “let you down” with “this team” whose “improbable” win has stunned the footballing public, here successive caesura allows elicits the fact the impossible has been achieved and allows reflection upon this from the audience.

The idiolectal and colloquial “ah said” and “winna” states he is still overwhelmed by the situation whilst he used clever wit and rhetoric in the inclusion of the footballing cliché “A... Z. Z ... A” eliciting admiration for the match winner, Sergio Aguero. Like all good commentators, Tyler also recalls the other fixtures from today “QPR safe” “Bolton ... failed” the antithetical “safe” and “fail” remind us of the fine margins of football. Tyler also uses clever rhyme to remind us

the red devils have been defeated because dreams have come “true in blue”.

The road to victory is now recounted, “down”, “second” which compels the audience to admire City’s tenacity. These negatives are negated in the final remark however, which states they have been “overcome” whilst the alliteration of “nemesis” & “neuroses” remind us the final stumbling block has been over come, City are no longer in United’s shadow. The overarching tone of the commentary is one of triumphalism.

Firmly entrenched in the upper echelons of footballing commentary both Tyldesely and Tyler possess inimitable commentary styles defined by impassioned utterances and a genuine love of the beautiful game. Their easily digestible accounts fully fulfill the purpose of a commentary by way of describing and vividly immersing the audience in a match through employment of prosodic features. Due to how these exemplary commentaries still being repeated and spoken of years later, the credentials of these men as commentators at the top of their game is undisputable.

555/30

Task 1 – The Study of Spoken Language

Theme: Commentaries

Example 2

Commentary 1: 'Galapagos', Series 3 Evolution (2016 BBC series)

Commentary 2: Champions' League Final (2005 Radio City Commentary)

Language is adapted to suit the particular context in which a person is speaking. Compare and contrast the ways in which the different commentators vary how they speak to suit their two very different contexts.

Today I will be looking at two very successful commentaries. The first commentary I will be looking at is delivered by the very well known, famous naturalist, Sir David Attenborough and the second is a very different commentary as it is a sporting commentary on Liverpool's 2005 champions' league final delivered by two commentators, Steve Hothersall and former Liverpool player, John Aldridge.

In the first section of Sir David Attenborough's commentary he uses three successive adjectives "Hidden, undiscovered and strange." I feel that the commentator uses these three great adjectives to create a sense of mystery for the listener/viewer and ensure that they are engaged right from the start!

Also throughout the first section of the commentary, Sir David Attenborough makes great use of deliberate pauses this is used before and after he says the words "Galapagos" and "Evolution" I feel he does this to make it seem more dramatic for the viewer and to really outline the focus of the commentary which is 'Evolution'.

The commentator also makes good use of the word "unique" throughout the commentary as he repeats it quite a lot! I feel that he uses repetition of "unique" to really emphasise how special this island is and how different each species of animal is and I feel that this would really engage the listener/viewer as they may be interested in all of the differences they would see or hear throughout.

In the second section of the commentary the commentator again uses a deliberate pause before and after he says "Wolf Volcano" this is again to make it more dramatic and engaging for the listeners, along with the deliberate pauses to create drama for the listener Sir David Attenborough uses a very dramatic sound track to mirror what he is saying.

Also in the second section the commentator makes great use of the adjective "razor-sharp" to give the listener/viewer a good idea of how

hot the “lava” is and he then goes on to say “Almost impossible to cross.” I feel that this really grabs the listener’s attention and makes sure we are fully engaged!

At the end of the second section, the commentator uses a great adjective saying about some animals “Clinging” to life and then goes on to say “Tortoises are Tough. They can survive for months without any food or water.” and I think he does this deliberately to give us a bit of hope that the tortoises might survive. But then he crushes our hopes by saying “And that worsened their fate – it will take them months to die.” I feel that Sir David Attenborough does this to really tug on our heart string, and ensure that the listeners are still fully engaged.

In the third section of Galapagos, the Commentator immediately grabs our attention when he starts talking about “the most successful predatory animal of all” that had arrived in the year 1535, this was “man,” he also talks about the “disastrous effect” that man had on the island. This is also mirrored by a very sinister soundtrack and great visual images to show the viewer how much of a negative impact men had on the island and how the “population of tortoises” was “decimated” because of humans.

In the fourth section of the commentary, Sir David Attenborough builds our curiosity once more when he speaks of an “amazing discovery” that was made. I feel that Sir David Attenborough does this to ensure that the listener/viewer watches on to find out what this “amazing” discovery was and this also ensures that the listener is fully engaged to the very end.

In the last section of the commentary the commentator tells us about the “amazing discovery” of a “living male pinta tortoise” he then starts to add a bit of humour to the commentary by describing the tortoise as an “international celebrity” to add a bit of warmth to what he is saying, he also uses this humour again when he says “He’s about 80

years old, and he's getting a bit creaky in the joints. As indeed, am I." I feel that the commentator uses this humour to brighten the commentary up a bit because before he was talking about the tortoises being "butchered" and eaten by pirates!

At the end of the commentary Sir David Attenborough tugs on our heart strings one last time by telling the listener/viewers about the male pinta tortoise dying and that they are now extinct – but he wouldn't be 'forgotten'!

Liverpool vs AC Milan – 2005 Champions' League Final

C The second commentary is delivered by Steve Hothersall and former Liverpool player John Aldridge. This commentary is very different to Sir David Attenborough's commentary as his is a nature commentary, is very scripted and informative but Steve Hothersall and John Aldridges commentary is a *live* sporting commentary, it is therefore very loud and also unscripted. Although all of the commentators speak with an English accent, Sir David Attenborough speaks very eloquent and polished but unlike Sir David Attenborough, Steve and C John, particularly speaks very informally and with a strong Liverpudlian dialect.

In the opening of the second commentary, Steve Hothersall – the lead commentator uses a great metaphor "at football's top table" I feel that he uses this to show us just how important it is for Liverpool to win this match so they can "resume" their place as one of the greatest football teams and I feel that this is to keep me, the listener at the edge of my seat and ensure that I am fully engaged right from the start.

Unlike Sir David Attenborough's nature commentary where the soundtrack is very calming, nature sounds, Steve Hothersall and John Aldridges soundtrack is very loud football fans chanting in the background so they have to raise their voice quite alot so they are

heard. Again I feel that this is to keep us on the edge of our seats and fully engaged throughout.

The Lead commentator also give us the viewers a “do or die” sort of vibe when he says “this season the spirit has been epitomised.” I feel that he does this to really show us that this is a win/lose situation for Liverpool and I feel that this “do or die” vibe really engages me and draws me in!

- C Although Hothersall is mostly formal at the start John Aldridge is completely informal as he doesn't use full sentences and also uses a lot of fillers such as “eh” and informal words like “Wanna, ‘cause, gotta” I feel that this would be even more engaging than Sir David Attenborough's polished, formal language because in everyday life when you are having a conversation with a friend you would use mostly informal language so I feel that me, the listener can relate to what he is saying and understand it a bit more than Sir David Attenborough's.

John Aldridge also makes great use of a metaphor “tools and utensils.” I feel that he is referring to the skills and knowledge required to play this game and I feel that this again grabs my attention and keeps me engaged throughout.

The lead commentator makes great use of a fantastic adjective “impassioned” I feel that it is amazing that Hothersall can use great language devices, even under so much pressure!

Similar to Sir David Attenborough, John Aldridge makes fantastic use of the rule of three “blood, sweat and tears” to show how much work and effort is going into this match by all of the football players.

Throughout the commentary, Aldridge and Hothersall both use repetition “Dangerous, real dangerous” “it's wonderful ... wonderful!”

“just possible ... just possible.” I feel that they do this to make it dramatic for the listener and keeps us engaged.

Towards the end of the commentary when all of the goals have been scored and Liverpool make a great comeback from the match starting at 3-0 to AC Milan and at the end being the victors of the match – we can really see how passionate each commentator is being! Hothersall makes great use of rhetorical questions throughout to the end of the commentary “Will he hand Liverpool the European Cup?” and John Aldridge answers with “Yes ...” and this creates a sense of humour for the viewers as it was a rhetorical question but also he delivered the word aloud for a very long time!

I feel that both commentaries are equally as engaging as each other because throughout I was fully engaged in both and I feel that both commentaries are very successful in keeping me, the viewer fully engaged – but I feel that Steve Hothersall and John Aldridge do this more successfully!

443/21

Task 1 – The Study of Spoken Language

Theme: Commentaries

Example 3

Having listened to two examples of sporting commentary (World Cup Final, Olympic 100m final), analyse the linguistic and paralinguistic devices used in both commentaries with special emphasis on: purpose, context, regional variation and any other relevant observations.

The Olympic Games were held in London in 2012. Brendan Foster a very well known Olympian was on commentation duties. A global event which takes place every four years with billions of BBC viewers watching around the world. Foster was in charge of the 100m mens final. A race full of famous athletes searching for gold. In comparison Guy Mowbray an experienced commentator and Mark Lawrenson a former manager of Oxford United and international player were responsible for commentation on the World Cup final held in Brazil, Rio. The most important competition in soccer which reveals the best team in the world. The final was between Germany and Argentina. Both of these commentators had fantastic knowledge of the game from past experience.

To start off, Brendan Foster deliberately uses a filler in the first few words of his commentary. “Oh”. This filler suggests to the BBC viewers that Brendan Foster is hesitant on what to say next, and that he is trying to think. The filler can also be seen as quite strange as Brendan Foster knew that he was going to be on commentation duties on this particular race. Perhaps he is gob-smacked at the speed of the athletes running in this enchanting race. In contrast Guy Mowbray uses phatic language in his opening comment. “A tournament that’s generally been played in good spirits”. The use of this device is almost like an invitation for Mark Lawrenson to share his thoughts with the billions of BBC viewers in the world that are watching such an important final. It might even suggest that Guy Mowbray is trying to create conversation and fill an empty space.

Brendan Foster uses deletion when referring to an athlete. “Gatlin”. This suggests to the viewers Gatlin's fame when he does not use his first name. Brendan Foster is assuming that the BBC viewers know who “Gatlin” is since he is running in such a global race which is being watched by billions around the world. In contrast Mark Lawrenson using colloquialism in his opening comment during the World Cup final. “Yeah very good generally.” The use of this device suggests to the viewers that Guy Mowbray is a much more formal commentator

compared to Mark Lawrenson. Mark Lawrenson's voice, tone and pitch is much more laid back and laconic throughout the commentary. Repetition also occurs with the word "generally". This suggests that the two commentators are feeding off each other.

Brendan Foster uses a variety of short sentences throughout his commentary. "Usain Bolt storming through." Brendan Foster gives Bolt his full title. This is emphasising Usain Bolt's fame to the billions of BBC viewers who are watching around the world. It is almost as if Bolt is the King of the race which is taking place. This quote also suggests that Usain Bolt is almost like a force of nature when the word "storming" is used. In contrast Mark Lawrenson uses reverse syntax with the word "cos". He moves on to ask not only one, but TWO rhetorical questions. "Shall I?" "Shall I not?" Once again Mark Lawrenson's voice and tone are less formal than his commentating partner Guy Mowbray. It is almost obvious to the viewers that Mark Lawrenson is trying to create conversation with Guy Mowbray and think what he is going to say next.

When the men's 100m final is over and the athletes have crossed the line to retain their prize Foster uses statistics. "9.64". This time is the fastest and Usain Bolt has broken the world record. Brendan Foster makes it clear to the world that Usain Bolt is a deserving champion in the sport of running. "9.64" is the only thing that he says before he starts a new sentence. This suggests Brendan Foster's shock and reaction to the overall pace and speed of this vital race between the top athletes in the world. In comparison Guy Mowbray uses superlative language when referring to Mario Gotze the winning goal scorer. "There's the coolest man in Rio." This is also an example of hyperbole towards Mario Gotze. Mark Lawrenson juxtaposes the amazing feet of Mario Gotze with his laid back post goal celebration.

"Usain Bolt of Jamaica is the fastest man on the planet." Brendan Foster uses factual hyperbole and maximises his voice, tone and volume. He thinks of Usain Bolt as a godliness character and he is

trying to influence the BBC viewers to see him the same way. He refers to Bolts country of birth and tries to emphasise to us just how proud Jamaica is of one of its own sons tonight. In comparison even though Mark Lawrenson's strong Northern accent can be difficult to understand the use of the word 'e' adds to the excitement of Mario Gotze's World Cup winning goal. For most of the soccer fans watching this marvellous spectacle of football they may agree that Mark

C Lawrenson is just a side kick. Guy Mowbray is much more official, and informative towards the billions of viewers who are watching.

Further on Brendan Foster uses deletion in his bias against Gatlin. "Gatlin attacked". The use of war language suggests to the viewers that Foster thinks that Gatlin is a treacherous enemy who is waiting to invade Usain Bolts crown. He clearly wants Usain Bolt to cross the line first and get his hands on the gold medal. In contrast Mark Lawrenson's inability to finish sentences adds to the sensational match which is being commented on. "He got early ball which was the key." It is becoming very obvious that Guy Mowbray is the much more professional commentator. He appears to have a better background knowledge of the sport of soccer. Overall Mark Lawrenson is only present to fill in any unwanted moments of silence in the commentary box.

C

In conclusion both of the commentaries were very much excellent. But personally I preferred Brendan Foster commentating on the men's 100m final in the 2012 London Olympics. It is almost as if Brendan Foster's tone and speed of voice matches the quickness of the athletic, athletes who are sprinting for gold in such an important race.

Task 2 – The Study of Written Language

Theme: Change

Example 1

A change in environment and culture can be beneficial or damaging. Analyse the presentation of change in the poems you have studied.

Change - an act or process through which something becomes different. In life we all experience change, for some it is a conscious choice, for others it is beyond their control, forced upon them in an act of coercion and a period of confusion. The evocative poem “Spirit Belong Mother”, by the Aboriginal poet Eva Johnson skilfully presents the fragmented thoughts and confused identity of a race negatively and irreparably changed by colonialism. Conversely James Berry’s rhythmic poem “Black Kid in a New Place” presents change as positive – a celebration of new beginnings and opportunities resulting from emigration. Such a view is not initially shared by Carol Ann Duffy in “Originally” – a child’s journey through emigration which intertwines the confusion of a changed life, loss of identity and an inability to define one’s culture, culminating in an acceptance of change as an inevitable aspect of life.

Eva Johnston’s “Spirit Belong Mother” written in first person narrative, is composed of 3 stanzas, each of 3 different lengths, this lack of uniformity in the stanzaic lengths reflect the speakers disjointed life. Each of the stanzas tell of a different chronological stage of the poets journey. Johnson presents change as a negative experience where the new environment is “real cold”. The skilfull deployment of pathetic fallacy can be interpreted ambiguously as both an immediate hostility toward change and also a longer term view – as to how her true identity has been negatively affected. Conversely, James Berry sees change as positive when the persona refers to himself, utilising the effective natural metaphor “transplanted sapling ... blossoming to show how he is thriving in his new environment. Unlike Johnson, he sees change as having given him the opportunity to grow and further broaden his cultural horizons. Carol Ann Duffy originally portrays change as a confusing experience, epitomised by the animalistic simile “shredding its skin like a snake” which depicts her struggle of losing her Scottish dialect as she became more immersed in English culture. Yet as the tone of the poem changes to acceptance emphasis is put on

change being a natural process (like a snake shedding skin) and part of life's journey.

"Spirit Belong Mother" powerfully articulates change through a series of key language features which evolve in complexity to become more polished and refined. The language of the opening stanza is infantile and disjointed – it is retrospective – reflecting upon her earliest recollections and the pain she experienced at being taken from her motherland. There is a strong sense of dislocation. "All time I cry". Strong colloquialisms and pronounced dialect, "bin take me from you" combined with a lack of connectives reflect both uncertainty and discomfort. We are empathetic, we feel pathos for the child's loss and confusing as we learnt they "gave me white mother", "gave me new name" in order to erase who she was and the culture of where she came from. The letter form, combined with effective repetition of "gone" skilfully conveys this loneliness evolved by change – loss of mother, identity and homeland.

Her pain is evident in the phrase "I not see you long time now. I not see you long time now". Where caesura encourages us to stop and share her pain. The speaker is clearly unaccustomed to mainstream cultures, which foreshadows her ability to integrate. Yet as resignation of change grows, a more fluid grammatical style is adopted, with less reliance on Aboriginal colloquialisms "picaninny" and more reference to specific cultural traditions like "brolga". The evolution of language as the poem progresses is representative of the poet's growth and maturity – conveying her conviction to regain her true identity.

The second, less fragmented second stanza is reflective in tone "I grow as woman now" yet the speaker's desire remains unchanged. The metaphor "I am your spirit" pledges conviction to regain her identity "I'll fight for your land." Time has passed, yet the speaker has not lost focus on reclaiming her identity. The lengthy enjambed final line "We will silence ... long time now" reflects her stream of consciousness. She wants to reclaim her identity now as much as she ever has. The

powerful triplet “this burden, this longing, this pain” encapsulates an image of being trapped by racism and colonialism with a longing for all she has lost. Like a haunting echo her desire for true identity ends the poem, an effect achieved by caesural pause. “I not see you long time now. I not see you long time now.” The lack of regular stanza lengths suggest she is unsuccessful in finding any contentment or uniformity in her life, even by the end of the poem.

Standing in stark contrast, James Berry’s “Black Kid in a New Place”, present change as positive and enthusiastically embraces it. The uniformity of the 3 lined stanzas (up until the quatrain) tells us he has embraced this change and is well integrated. Caesura in the opening line immediately establishes his identity “I’m here. I see”, something Johnson was unable to achieve. Berry sees his own self worth and importance “I make part of a little planet”. This positivity also lacking in Johnson. Berry sees change as a big opportunity and sets him self the challenge “I stretch myself” in order to make the most of it. Unlike Johnson, Berry has no desire to return home, using the effective natural simile “I am like a migrant bird who will not return from here.” this illustrates the way in which he embraces change. The language of the poem is vibrant and energetic.

The metaphor “I shake out colorful wings” highlights his enthusiasm for change whilst also referencing his old Jamaican culture. A sense of nostalgia is established as he talks of “palm free bluesky” a nod to his old Jamaican climate which is antithetical to the “winter mists” of Britain. The positivism of the poem is evident in the rhythmic qualities of the poem and the timbre of his voice, as he speaks of “dance” and “carnival” – both synonymous of Jamaica and its vibrancy. The poem concludes with a metaphor in the quatrain “I am a transplanted sapling, blossoming”. Reinforcing all the views Berry had of change being beneficial to our development as people and how it can makes us grow. Subsequently Johnson sees change as having inhibited her personal development. Ultimately for Berry, change has been positive.

Like the other poems, Carol Ann Duffy's "Originally" is an autobiographical poem which charts the physical uprooting of a family and the confusion and fear experienced on their journey through emmigration. Enjambment in the opening line suggests panic and immediacy, reflecting a lack of control over the situation. A lack of any structured rhyme scheme throughout the poem represents the confusion experienced by the young persona, whilst employment of three octets and their equal length allow the story to be told in an ordered, chronological manner. The person of the poem is a young child (Duffy) and both syntax and imagery further instill confusion and uncertainty in her. Her rampant imagination giving her the notion she travelled in a "red room" – the red having connotations of danger, anger and fear. Memories of home assail her thoughts as she remembers "the street, the house ... any more". Internal rhyme "loose tooth" adds to the fluency of the language whilst effective aural imagery of "brother bawling", "Mother singing" adds realism to the poem. We have all experienced journeys like this, but possibly never as unsettling. The poet's anger and confusion is compounded by the image of the "miles which rushed back to the city", giving her the impression everything else was going in the opposite direction to them and she felt as though she ought to join them. She is frustrated when we learn her "blind toy", a sign of comfort and familiarity cannot share her anxieties. She clutches its "paw" in fear.

C The second stanza opens philosophically raised through the metaphor "childhood is an emmigration", Duffy implies change to be a journey up "an avenue where no one you know stays". The problems faced by an immigrant child are listed; "your accent wrong", "shouting words you don't understand". Much like Johnson, Duffy feels alienated by her new surroundings. There is a shared sense of loneliness amongst the two female poets and we are empathetic towards the two little girls who are confused and fearful of change. An effective simile is used to describe the parents anxiety "stirred like a loose tooth ...". Illustrating to us how part of the speaker's anxiety was shared by her parents. The image of the child worrying for her parents makes the child's concerns

palpable. The second stanza ends with an italicised, child-like plea from Duffy which lends a plaintiff tone to the poem and reflects her anguish at change. Direct speech enhances the pain. "I want our own country"

- C A tonal shift is indicated by the word "But" at the beginning of the third stanza and the triplet "you forget, or don't recall, or change" suggests an acceptance of change is growing amongst Duffy and her family and they are beginning to integrate, especially her brother. The sibilant phrases "swallow a slug", "sounding just like the rest", "skelf of shame" suggest a sense of shame that her brother (and perhaps herself) are losing their cultural identity and dialect. However Duffy's employment of the dialectal term "skelf" suggests she is not prepared to completely relinquish her dialect and identity, even if her brother is. The confusing nature of change is epitomised by Duffy in the sibilant simile "shedding its skin like a snake" which initially conveyed the loss Duffy felt at losing her dialect. Yet positive aspects of the simile emerge as it highlights change as inevitable and something we must ultimately accept to be a natural aspect of our journey through life. The sense of change is evident in the flowing rhythm of the poem – highlighting change to be a constant journey that will follow us from birth until death.

The poem concludes with a question presented to Duffy "Where do you come from?" The question mark indicating hesitancy and uncertainty as Duffy through her immersion in change is now only certain of where she came from "Originally."

- C Each poet presents change from very contrasting viewpoints. For Eva Johnson, change has been traumatic – leaving her bereft of identity. Contrastingly James Berry sees change as positive a joyful thing that contains opportunity in abundance and sees it as a new beginning to be able to grow as a person, and broaden horizons. For Duffy change is a confusing experience initially yet she ultimately presents it as being an inevitable aspect of your journey through life. My personal

preference of the three poems is "Black Kid in a New Place". I personally believe we need to experience change in our lives in order to immerse ourselves in all the opportunities and experiences the world can give that would otherwise be wasted to us. We can experience this change through different forms be it a change in scenery or a change of career. I also like the view raised by Carol Ann Duffy as one of change being inevitable and we must ultimately accept it. As Harold Wilson once said "He who rejects change is the architect of decay."

555/29

Task 2 – The Study of Written Language

Theme: Change

Example 2

Analyse how John Steinbeck presents and develops the theme of change through Curley's wife's character in his novella, 'Of Mice and Men'. In your answer you must comment upon the following key aspects and how they engage and affect the reader: language, grammar, structure and presentation.

Change is unstoppable. Every new day is different from the previous day. Sometimes change happens without you even realising. So far I have experienced many changes in my life, for example changing from primary to secondary school and also learning to walk and talk. Change also does us good in life and I hope to see lots of changes in the future. For example I hope to get a highly paid job and get married. When we meet Curley's wife in Steinbeck's glorious realisation of how unfair life was in the States in the 1930's she has just gone through the changing process of marriage. However her character longs for real change that allows her to escape the ignorant 20th Century America.

John Steinbeck purposely uses a simile to describe to us a real life image of Curley's wife's hair. "Her hair hung in little rolled clusters like sausages." She is described like this simply because all of the stereotypical white men on the ranch treated all women like a piece of worthless meat which was there to be discarded. The majority of women were treated like possessions, prizes or even livestock. Women were exploited and not seen as being useful for anything. "She wore a cotton house dress and red mules, on the insteps of which were little bouquets of red ostrich feathers." John Steinbeck describes to us Curley's wife's appearance. He uses poetic colourful, imaginative vocabulary to underline just how misplaced Curley's wife is on the ranch. She is trying to change her surroundings and is hoping for a better life. When Steinbeck describes the "red mules" he is emphasising to us the dangerous impact Curley's wife is going to have on the lives of all the stereotypical men on the ranch and herself. She will go from being a woman longing for change to a woman who cannot control the speed of the change that is happening to her.

Steinbeck deliberately uses an adjective to describe to us Curley's wife's tone of voice. "Her voice had a nasal brittle quality." Her voice is a massive change compared to all of the voices of the husky throated men. Her voice is rather irritating and makes her stand out. Curley's wife intentionally uses her voice to sound suggestive because

deep down inside she is desperate for a conversation and some company. Curley's wife's voice also indicates to us that she like every other woman is unable to provoke change on the ranch.

"Think I don't know where they all went? Even Curley, I know where they all went." Steinbeck uses this quote to make us aware of Curley's wife's feelings about her husband. Emotive language is used to inform us that she does not care that her husband is with other women. The pronoun "They" is used to identify the group of men on the ranch as the bigger, stronger group. This quote also shows us that Curley's wife's love and passion for her husband no longer or maybe never did exist. She physically is incapable of changing Curley's mind of going to the cat house on a Saturday night. Instead she has to stay at home with the "weak ones" because in 1930's America women were seen as possessions who were to be bought and sold and treated like dirt on the shoes of the stereotypical men.

C "Well you keep your place then nigger." This piece of evidence is an example of Curley's wife's attitude towards "The weak ones" on the ranch. The "nigger" falls into this category. Steinbeck deliberately makes a sudden aggressive change in her behaviour compared to her flirtatious behaviour earlier on in the book. This shows two different types of personalities and therefore is linked to change. Curley's wife is a lady born into racism and most importantly because of her gender she is unable to change a single thing about her husband or untouched future. Men on the ranch are simply rude to her and in return she attempts to act the same towards the "bindle stiffs" on the ranch.

C "She stood still in the doorway, smiling a little at them." Curley's wife smiles at them to try and provoke change and have a decent conversation. She deliberately stands still so the men on the ranch would notice her and have to talk. By smiling a little she got their attention temporarily. This is an immediate comparison with her behaviour when she meets George and Lennie for the first time. She is a lot more conservative and not really attention seeking although she

physically charms them. She wants to find acknowledgement that she exists because in reality she is unable to see beyond her gender's imposed limited vision. Assonance is used to highlight her isolation and how the doorway is a glass ceiling for all women in 1930's America preventing them from making the simplest of changes to their day to day lives.

"Her body flopped like a fish, and then she was still for Lennie had broken her neck." In this quote Steinbeck uses a simile and compares her to an animal, this shows no change from when she was alive. Curley's wife's broken neck represents her broken dreams that she had of being in the "The pitchers", although her mother never let that happen. Instead she stays still and we no longer see her on the search looking for Curley. The way Curley's wife dies makes you want to feel sorry for her as she dies in such a horrific way. You change your opinion of her as you realise she wasn't who you thought she was.

"It was quiet in the barn and the quiet of the afternoon was on the ranch." In this quote Steinbeck makes us aware that the death of Curley's wife has had a major impact on the lives of the men on the ranch. The world and time all of a sudden seemed to stop. Poetic lyrical emotive language is used, this suggests that every death changes the world for a small period of time. Curley's wife's death had a greater impact on her surroundings than her life actually did. "Half covering of yellow hay." This is an informative description of Curley's wife at the time of her death. Curley's wife's death bed is seen to be hard and uncomfortable similar to the dead puppies bed. "Half" emphasises to us that Curley's wife only ever got to live half of her life and now in her deathbed nothing at all appears to have changed.

"Now her rouged cheeks and her reddened lips made her seem alive and sleeping very lightly." John Steinbeck deliberately uses repetition here and repeats his physical description of when we first met her in chapter two. When Curley's wife is in her deathbed her appearance has not changed, neither has the attitude of men on the ranch.

C Steinbeck deliberately repeats lines to inform the audience of the extent that Curley's wife had to go to by doing herself up but yet men still treated her badly. Really Curley's wife was hiding all of her frustration beneath a layer of make-up. No matter if she was dead or alive she was seen by most men as a "thing" which was to be used and then discarded.

Change can be seen by many as instant and quite obvious, but it can also be slow with no real obvious evidence. Curley's wife wasn't aware that by living with stereotypical men on the ranch she had already one foot in her deathbed and that the life changing event of death was creeping upon her. Curley's wife's desperation for human contact led to her unfortunate death. She was trapped in limbo purgatory between the Suffragettes Movement in the 1910's and The Civil Rights Movement in the 1960's. She was abandoned, used and abused. Curley's wife attempts to change the disrespectful attitude of the men on the ranch because she is only seen as a possession to be ignored and only co-operated with when needed. Curley's wife is simply unable to demand change on the ranch and her attempts to outrageously change their hearts and minds only leads to her sudden but welcome death, ironically at the hands of the only man on the ranch who was innocent of her murder.

444/24