



National Certificate of Educational Achievement  
TAUMATA MĀTAURANGA Ā-MOTU KUA TAEA

## **Exemplar for Internal Achievement Standard English Level 1**

This exemplar supports assessment against:

**Achievement Standard 91924**

**Demonstrate understanding of how context shapes verbal language  
use**

An annotated exemplar is a sample of student evidence, with a commentary, to explain key aspects of the standard. It assists teachers to make assessment judgements at the grade.

New Zealand Qualifications Authority

To support internal assessment

Grade: Achieved

For Achieved, the student needs to demonstrate understanding of how context shapes verbal language.

This involves:

- describing the context
- describing characteristics of verbal language used in the context
- describing how the characteristics of verbal language are typical of the context
- supporting descriptions with specific examples.

This student has described the context as “*the early period of the First World War*”. Further description of context indicates the text type as a poem, with the purpose of persuading men to fight in World War One.

Four verbal language features typical of persuasive poems and early WW1 poetry are accurately identified and described. The student selects two examples to support the description of each language feature, and describes generally how they are typical of the context of World War One propaganda poetry.

Each example is followed by a description of the characteristics of the language feature. For example, “*Who’ll grip and tackle the job unafraid? This encourages the reader to think about how they could look tough for going to war and being a hero for their country, and helps us understand the context of the early period of the First World War because they are making war sound a lot better than it actually is.*” The description of the function (to persuade listeners) and effect (demonstrating bravery) of the euphemism is explicitly linked to context.

For Merit, the student could give more detail of the context, and more specific explanation of verbal language usage that is common in that context. This would support an explanation of how the context influences the language.

Achieved

NZQA Intended for teacher use only

In the poem 'who's for the game?' There are many language features used to persuade people to go and fight in the war. Some of these language features are euphemism which is used to make bad things sound better than they really are, repetition which is when you repeat a word or phrase to show that it is important in the text and rhetorical questions which are there to make people think about an idea.

One of the main features of the language propaganda used here is euphemism. An example of this is 'Who'll grip and tackle the job unafraid?' This encourages the reader to think about how they could look tough for going to war and being a hero for their country and helps us understand the context of the early period of the First World War because they are making war sound a lot better than it actually is. Techniques like this are typical of early First World War poetry because they are trying to encourage people to go to war because they need as many people to go as possible so they are trying to make it sound way better than it really is because they knew it was going to be horrible. Another quotation that builds on this idea is 'Who's for the game, the biggest that's played'. This line is used to make the reader think that it is just going to be a fun game even though it was actually going to be a horrible big war where they could easily get killed. From this we can see that euphemism is very important in this poem because they are making war sound way better than it actually is because if they knew what it was actually going to be like no one would want to go because they would know that there is a big chance that they would die.

Another language feature used here is repetition. Repetition is Repeating a word or phrase to show that it is an important part. An example of this is 'Your country is up to her neck in a fight' The words 'your country' are used a lot in the poem. This encourages the reader to feel like they have to go and fight because they need to protect it and the people who live there including their own families and themselves. The word 'her' is also used a lot in the poem. It is used to make the reader think about how the women can't go to war and fight so they have to. 'Her' is also used to make the reader think about how they have to protect the women because they can't do anything to stop it and only the men can. Another reason it is used is because the men can impress the women by going and if they stay behind they will be thought of as soft because they aren't going. From this we can see that repetition is a key part in this poem because they said the main words multiple times to make the reader mainly think about them and make them want to go to war.

Another language feature in this poem is rhetorical questions. Rhetorical questions are questions in a text that aren't there to be answered but they are there to make the reader think about what is being said in the text. An example of rhetorical questions in this text is when it says 'Who'll give his country a hand?' This encourages the reader to think about how he could help his country out by fighting in the war. This is important because they will be known as a hero when they come back because they protected their country and their families. Another quotation that backs up this idea is 'Who would much rather come back with a crutch Than lie low and be out of the fun?' This makes the reader think about how if they go to war they might get injured but at least people will praise them for being a hero and fighting for their country, whereas if they don't go they won't be injured but people won't

respect them because they didn't go away and fight. From this we can see that rhetorical questions are a big part of this poem because the writer is trying to encourage people to go to war by making them think about how great they will be if they go.

Metaphors are also used in this poem. Metaphors are when you say something is another. An example of a metaphor in the text is where it says 'Who wants a turn to himself in the show? And who wants a seat in the stand?' The writer is saying that if you go to war it is like you are playing a big game that everyone who doesn't go to war will be watching and if you go it is like you are the equivalent to a professional sports player that everyone looks up to. Another example of metaphors in the text is 'Who knows it won't be a picnic' this is making the reader think about how it could actually be really easy and not to overthink it. If they think the war is going to be really hard then the people who are unsure about going definitely won't go but because they said it could be easy it makes them not as nervous about it but they still didn't promise it would be easy. This tells us that metaphors are important in this poem because they are using them to make war sound really easy when it actually isn't.

In conclusion there are many language features used in this poem mainly used to make war sound better than it really is. They use euphemism to make war sound a lot better than it really is, repetition to make the reader think about the main words used in the poem, rhetorical questions to make the reader think about what the writer is saying and metaphors to make war sound fun and easy. From these language features we can see that they are trying to do anything they can to get more people to go to war mainly by using euphemism to make it sound better than it is.

Grade: Merit

For Merit, the student needs to explain how context shapes verbal language use.

This involves explaining the connections between specific examples of verbal language use and how the language is influenced by the context.

This student has clearly described the context of mental health, and has selected a podcast that is aimed mainly at a teenage audience. Accurate and specific details about audience, purpose, and text type are provided. The topic of 'self-talk' is explained using six verbal language features common to social issue podcasts.

A specific and detailed explanation of the characteristics of each language feature is provided. The explanations explore the function of the language feature, e.g. "... *because the speaker... wants the listener to focus on the problem the rhetorical question raises*". The explanation is further developed by considering the effect, "*the use of this question forces the listener to become aware of how you cope with negative self-talk, helping us to realize the things we do wrong, so we can try to improve our self-talk.*" The examples are further elaborated by considering how the two characteristics are typically combined within the context "...*help us feel a connection to the podcast.*"

The student explains how each example of verbal language use is typical of social issue podcasts. This is linked to an explanation of the connection between the context influencing the language. For example, pejoratives, "*are used to make us aware of how serious and harmful this issue is*" which "*raises awareness about the subject...*" Each of the techniques (emotive vocabulary and pejoratives) are then identified as "*very typical for podcasts, especially mental health podcasts.*"

For Excellence, the student could draw conclusions about the interplay between the context and verbal language use. This could include explaining how the context of a mental health podcast with a defined teen audience requires careful use of specific types of language features to both engage and reassure the listeners in an age-appropriate way.

**Introduction:**

Let's talk about mental health episode 9: Let's talk about... self-talk [Podcast episode \(Spotify link\)](#)

The audience of this podcast includes people with mental health problems. As suggested at the beginning of the podcast, the podcast is for all ages, but mainly focused on teenagers. As a large number of teenagers (approx. 1 in 5) suffer from mental health issues, this information is entirely appropriate. The main purpose of this podcast is to provide information on self-talk. The podcast provides information, facts, and solutions to problems we may face with self-talk. The context of this podcast is set with our host, (Jeremy Godwin) and his talk about ways to improve self-talk and turn negative into positive. Many people have negative thoughts / tell themselves things like “I can't do this”. The podcast speaker introduces ways he has dealt with these problems and also introduces ways other people may deal with the problems too. This social issue can also stop us from making risky decisions, as we think that we cannot do things that we may be able to do.

**Body Paragraph 1:**

One of the significant verbal language features in this podcast is rhetorical questions. Rhetorical questions are very typical for podcasts of all genres. Rhetorical questions are used during this podcast because the speaker (or producer) wants the listener to focus on the problem the rhetorical question raises. “So, how do you work through your self-talk and how does it impact your self-interests?” - the use of this question forces the listener to become aware of how you cope with negative self-talk, helping us to realize the things we do wrong, so we can try to improve our self-talk. They also help us feel a connection to the podcast. Personal pronouns are another technique used to help us feel a connection to this podcast, words like “you”, “we”, and “our” have been used to make us part of the podcast. Both of these language features are incredibly common/typical in podcasts. They are arguably the most effective language features because they make us feel included, part of the talk, podcast, or conversation. These language features also reinforce the main purpose of the podcast by engaging us and thinking about ways we can improve our self-talk, which is what he wants us to do.

**Body Paragraph 2:**

During this podcast, The speaker uses Comparative language to compare (and in some cases contrast) these issues with real-life problems he has faced. (a very typical language feature for podcasts). He compares his stories to the issues he discusses during the podcast. These comparisons connect us with his story, and how he has handled his self-talk. “In my first two years of my depression, over that period when things were at their absolute worst, the voice in my head had an absolute feel today. Anything that I didn't like about myself was amplified.” - in this example, he connects us with his life and how it compares to the podcast title or scene. This quote also connects us with our next language feature, Providing personal anecdotes. Providing personal anecdotes includes the speaker telling us stories, or issues he has faced throughout his time of depression, he tells us about the type of self-talk that he faced and how he dealt with it. It is a reference to his real-life situations and complications/issues, providing us with his experiences throughout his hard time with depression.

**Body paragraph 3:**

The speaker uses emotive vocabulary repetitively throughout the podcast. Partially because the issue is quite an emotional subject, especially for someone like the speaker who has suffered from depression, an emotional disorder. "Worthless", "lazy", "unworthy", "sad", and "angry" are some examples of emotive vocabulary used during this podcast. The speaker is focusing on self-talk, so it is only necessary that the speaker uses appropriate language - things that he has said to himself and things he thinks we might have said to ourselves too. Other language features, like pejoratives, are also used heavily during this podcast. Using harsh, strong words are used to make us aware of how serious and harmful this issue is. These words include harmful, insecure, and many other examples. The reason I chose those two words is because these words made me feel that this podcast is truly serious, it raises awareness about the subject the speaker is talking about. Both of these language features use somewhat emotional words, phrases, or sentences. Making us realize how serious this issue is and connecting us with the podcast emotionally is what these language features do. These two examples are very typical for podcasts, especially mental health podcasts.

**Conclusion**

This podcast uses very appropriate and necessary language features inside the context/ theme of this podcast. the purpose of this text has greatly met/exceeded my expectations, and the language feature used during this podcast was overall very typical for podcasts, and even more typical in mental health podcasts. Overall, language features were used effectively and repetitively throughout the social issue podcast and have greatly achieved the podcast's purpose, theme, and context.

Grade: Excellence

For Excellence, the student needs to examine how context shapes verbal language use. This involves drawing conclusions about the interaction of the context and specific examples of verbal language.

This student has identified and clearly explained the context of a speech made during a debate about nuclear weapons. The explanation includes details about audience, purpose, text type, time, and place. The accurate and clear explanation of context establishes a firm foundation to draw conclusions about how context shapes verbal language use.

Three verbal language features are accurately identified and explained. In each case, several thoughtful examples from within the text are provided to demonstrate how context and verbal language features interact. The function, quality, or effect of the feature is examined and linked to the overall purpose of the debate. The student then draws conclusions about the impact it has on the listening audience. For example, *“Lange uses humour in an informal matter to demonstrate that he is conversing with someone who he doesn’t believe should be viewed with respect or referred to formally, furthermore indicating his dominance in the debate.”*

The student draws conclusions about the reasons for the interplay between context and language. For example, *“Speaking with a lot of metaphors can be confusing because the audience needs to be able to understand what the comparisons mean. David Lange knew exactly what type of audience he was talking to, and this will have helped him confidently choose these metaphors, knowing they would understand them.”*

Conclusions about why the interaction of context and language have occurred are fully developed, demonstrating an examination of how context shapes verbal language use. For example, *“triples in this context are used to shine a light on the future. By doing this Lange has created a sense of fear that he can harness to help draw people away from the opposing side.”*

**URL link to the text:** [Sound: Oxford Union debate on nuclear weapons | NZHistory, New Zealand history online](#)

This text is a speech presented by David Lange as a segment of an Oxford Union debate on the morality of nuclear weaponry. In this section, he answers a question presented to him about why New Zealand hasn't left the ANZUS alliance at the time, which was an alliance between Australia, New Zealand and the USA to remain allies and back up the other allies if the threat of nuclear fatality was presented. However, when New Zealand announced that they no longer wanted anything to do with nuclear weapons the USA demoted them from allies to friends. He answered that question in this speech. The purpose of this oration is to persuade and convince the target audience that New Zealand's stance on nuclear weapons is morally correct, and as it is part of a debate, trying to win the debate with intellectual points and responding to arguments made by the opposing team. The intended audience of this text is the supporters of nuclear weaponry outside of New Zealand and also people who are associated with Oxford University, which is a very old, influential British university. It isn't directed towards New Zealanders as it states facts that reflect on what New Zealand has gone through and New Zealand decisions that the public of New Zealand had experienced firsthand. It demonstrates formal features that target the more sophisticated minds of the world, hinting that it's aimed at world leaders and powerful individuals. This fits into the context of the speech as it is presented at a formal international debate. The purpose remains to win a debate where David Lange is a part of the affirmative team and to promote awareness of the dangers of nuclear weapons and that New Zealand is taking great steps to remain nuclear-free and healthier overall. The verbal language used creates a forceful tone and mood as it is part of a competitive debate. It incorporates language that makes the text sound more persuasive, but David Lange also uses some sarcasm and irony to keep the audience engaged and create a lighter tone in places. By portraying this tone, Lange can put across his points in a way that can increase his chances of being heard and taken seriously. A summary of the text shows that David Lange believes that nuclear weapons are "morally indefensible". The verbal language I have identified highlights how he was able to win this debate and demonstrate his points.

In the 1980's New Zealand's anti-nuclear position caused a huge political issue with the USA and England and David Lange went into the debate knowing that he was possibly going to make things worse with those countries. Despite this pressure he opened his speech using humour, which David Lange states in a satirical rhetoric form. This means that he is using his time to ridicule one aspect of the opponent and the opposing topic to bring more attention to the issue and to promote his side as the 'correct' side. At the beginning of the text, he makes a statement after an arguer for the negative voices their question on why New Zealand hasn't dissolved the ANZUS alliance. He replies with the phrase, "And I'm going to give it to you if you hold your breath just for a moment ... I can smell the uranium on it as you lean towards me!". The humour is used to point fun at the opposer as it states that because he supports nuclear weapons he must also be aware of its side effects and how bad they can be, and must surely have accumulated those side effects themselves. The statement also makes a subtle dig at the USA at the same time as the speaker is representing his country's position. Lange uses humour in an informal matter to demonstrate that he is conversing with

someone who he doesn't believe should be viewed with respect or referred to formally, furthermore indicating his dominance in the debate. Humour is used in many speeches as it makes both the audience and the speaker more comfortable with the presentation and more receptive to the ideas presented. This is also very helpful in succeeding in a debate. In this case, David Lange's statement was probably not planned, he was thinking on his feet, but it did bring out a strong, positive response from the audience, which would increase his confidence with the more planned parts of his response.

Most major countries had accepted and adopted nuclear power and weapons, but the New Zealand government and people took a different position. As a small country that not many people knew about in the 1980s, it was important for David Lange to be able to quickly explain why we were anti-nuclear and what the impact of nuclear war would have on our country. David Lange incorporates a triple of negative verbs into his speech to show this. In the speech he expresses the phrase, "We in New Zealand, you know, used to be able to relax a bit, to be able to think that we would sit comfortably while the rest of the world **seared, singed, withered**." In the debate, Lange uses triples to list the characteristics of the dystopian world that could occur because of nuclear weapons. By doing this he can create emphasis and an impactful tone on the effects of his thoughts on the future if nuclear weapons are welcomed both in NZ and across the whole world. Triples help to define a point with more detail while being short and sharp, making it easy to grab the listener's attention. That is why they are often used in debates as they can help to relay easy to remember information without taking up too much of the listener's time. By doing this the speaker can ensure that they are increasing their chances that the listener has not only heard but understood what they are saying. Triples in this context are used to shine a light on the future. By doing this Lange has created a sense of fear that he can harness to help draw people away from the opposing side.

Aotearoa New Zealand is the land of the long white cloud, but has also been known as God's Own or Godzone for many years. Nuclear weapons don't fit into that vision of our country so in the debate, David Lange is emphasising New Zealand's unique position at the bottom of the world by using a biblical metaphor. He comments that he believes New Zealand is some kind of "Antipodean Noah's Ark". He uses this metaphor in a way that portrays New Zealand as isolated and free from the world of nuclear weaponry as well as what would happen if it destroys the planet. This metaphor compares New Zealand (antipodean means coming from New Zealand or Australia and being on the other side of the world from Britain) - without nuclear weaponry, to the story of Noah's Ark. The story of Noah's ark shows how life was rescued from a disaster because of a safe space that was created by Noah. Lange is hinting that New Zealand was always seen as a safe space in the event of a nuclear collapse but that this is now changed. By using metaphor he has quickly developed an image of a safe land, helping the listeners understand what is at stake if New Zealand relents to America's demands to accept their nuclear warships. David Lange may not have been religious, but the story of Noah's Ark would be well known by this particular audience of Oxford students, academics and the wider international audience, so using this comparison would be effective. He defines New Zealand as the saviour (Noah's Ark) because they don't use nuclear weapons. Another metaphor, "nuclear winter" is also used to emphasise what will happen to the whole world if nuclear war breaks out. Furthermore he says that "we will freeze with you" if New Zealand accepts the USA's position and allows nuclear weapons. A nuclear winter was a new idea in the early 1980's, and by David Lange

using this metaphor in this context with this educated audience would quickly emphasise another negative effect of nuclear weapons. Speaking with a lot of metaphors can be confusing because the audience needs to be able to understand what the comparisons mean. David Lange knew exactly what type of audience he was talking to, and this will have helped him confidently choose these metaphors, knowing they would understand them.

To conclude, this speech demonstrates persuasive properties because of the verbal language it uses. Because of this, this speech is still recognisable from his famous one-liner; “I can smell the uranium on your breath.”. It helped David Lange to secure his win at the Oxford Union debate and changed the minds of many people around the world about the ethics of nuclear weapons. He focussed on his verbal vernacular to ensure that he could deliver his points in a way that would be listened to and recognised. The purpose of a debate is ultimately to win, to convince the other side of your points and use whatever you can to demonstrate your ideas. While also showing off verbally, Lange was also known for his charisma and tone. How he performed his speeches orally helped to strengthen his ideas and make a greater impact of what he believed and was trying to promote. By displaying his ideas in an authoritative manner this helps him to convince the audience by making them feel that he has important knowledge worth sharing. He used humour to help him to connect with the audience and bring down his opponents. Triples were used to provide impact on specific points in a short snappy way that is easily heard by listening audiences. Metaphors help to explain certain ideas and provide comparisons with other aspects that might be more relatable to the audience. The correlation of these language features helps to bring the speech together making it easy for the audience to acknowledge his overall point. Nuclear weapons are “morally indefensible”.