



AS and A Level English Language and Literature

EXEMPLAR RESPONSES

A level paper 1, section B – drama

Contents

About this exemplars pack	2
Mark scheme	3
EXEMPLAR RESPONSE A	4
Equus	4
Marker’s comments	6
EXEMPLAR RESPONSE B	8
Equus	8
Marker’s comments	10
EXEMPLAR RESPONSE C	11
All My Sons	11
Marker’s comments	14
EXEMPLAR RESPONSE D	15
All My Sons	15
Marker’s comments	17
EXEMPLAR RESPONSE E.....	18
All My Sons	18
Marker’s comments	20
EXEMPLAR RESPONSE F.....	21
A Streetcar named Desire	21
Marker’s comments	22

About this exemplars pack

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

The pack contains exemplar student responses to GCE A level English Language and Literature paper 1 (Section B – drama). It shows real student responses (whether typed or handwritten) to the questions taken from the sample assessment materials.

For schools delivering a co-taught AS and A level course, the drama text will be covered in the second year, as it is not an AS requirement. For schools teaching a linear 2 year A level only, the course content can be taught in any order. Please see the example [course planners](#) for more support on delivering the course content.

The A level drama questions address 3 Assessment Objects: AO1, AO2, AO3.

Students must:		% in GCE
AO1	Apply concepts and methods from integrated linguistic and literary study as appropriate, using associated terminology and coherent written expression	25
AO2	Analyse ways in which meanings are shaped in texts	25
AO3	Demonstrate understanding of the significance and influence of the contexts in which texts are produced and received	25
AO4	Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic and literary concepts and methods	13
AO5	Demonstrate expertise and creativity in the use of English to communicate in different ways <i>Note: this Assessment Objective must be targeted with at least one of AO2, AO3, or AO4, either in the same task or in two or more linked tasks.</i>	12
Total		100%

Following each question you will find the mark scheme for the band that the student has achieved, with accompanying examiner comments on how the marks have been awarded, and any ways in which the response might have been improved. For the extracts, please see the respective [sample assessment materials](#).

Mark scheme

		AO1 = bullet point 1	AO2 = bullet point 2	AO3 = bullet point 3
Level	Mark	Descriptor (AO1, AO2, AO3)		
	0	No rewardable material		
Level 1	1–5	Descriptive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of concepts and methods is largely unassimilated. Recalls limited range of terminology and makes frequent errors and technical lapses. • Uses a narrative or descriptive approach or paraphrases. Shows little understanding of the writer’s/speaker’s crafting of the text. • Describes contextual factors. Has limited awareness of significance and influence of how texts are produced and received. 		
Level 2	6–10	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recalls concepts and methods of analysis that show general understanding. Organises and expresses ideas with some clarity, though has lapses in use of terminology. • Gives surface reading of texts. Applies some general understanding of writer’s/speaker’s techniques. • Describes general contextual factors. Makes some links between significance and influence of how texts are produced and received. 		
Level 3	11–15	Clear relevant application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies relevant concepts and methods of analysis to texts with clear examples. Ideas are structured logically and expressed with few lapses in clarity and transition. Clear use of terminology. • Shows clear understanding of how meaning is shaped by linguistic and literary features. Able to support this with clear examples. • Explains clear significance and influence of contextual factors. Makes relevant links to how texts are produced and received. 		
Level 4	16–20	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies controlled discussion of concepts and methods supported with use of discriminating examples. Controls the structure of response with effective transitions, carefully-chosen language and use of terminology. • Analyses the effects of linguistic and literary features and of the writer’s craft. Shows awareness of nuances and subtleties. • Provides discriminating awareness of links between the text and contextual factors. Consistently makes inferences about how texts are produced and received. 		
Level 5	21–25	Critical evaluative application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents critical application of concepts and methods with sustained examples. Uses sophisticated structure and expression with appropriate register and style, including use of appropriate terminology. • Exhibits critical evaluation of writer’s/speaker’s linguistic and literary choices. Evaluates their effects on shaping meaning. • Critically examines context by looking at subtleties and nuances. Examines multi-layered nature of texts and how they are produced and received. 		

EXEMPLAR RESPONSE A

Equus

Using this extract as a starting point, and with reference to other parts of the play, discuss how Shaffer develops Dysart's changing perspective(s) on his role as a psychiatrist.

~~Equus, written at the time of Conservative government and uprisings ideas~~ Equus, written by Shaffer, is set during the 1970's. At this time, a conservative government was in power and there was vast social upheaval to go along with this. Psychiatry was also growing in popularity during this time, a process in which an abnormal patient, in this instance, Alan Strang, is put through treatment in which to make them 'normal' again. At this part of the play, Dysart seems almost content with the methods that he employs and he is still behind the practice of psychiatry. For instance, in a statement before this, he notices that Alan is 'one more dented little face'. In using this metaphor, Dysart himself is almost expressing that he does not believe

Alan is normal, possibly referencing to a conservative way of thinking, as they have strict boundaries between what is and isn't normal. He moves on to say 'one great thing about being in the adjustment business: you're never short of customers'. He uses humour to express that he is always kept busy and that is a positive aspect. However, in another

While he does seem almost content with his practices during his meetings with Alan, the inner guilt he feels is expressed through his dreams about Ancient Greece. For instance, in Act 1 scene 5, he employs the use of direct speech to address the audience. In the extract, he talks about taking part in a sacrifice wearing a mask. He begins to in which he ~~sacrifices~~ sacrifices children. He begins to feel unwell and wonders whether 'this repetitive work is doing any social good at all'. The mask slips and the other priests witness this and make attempts to sacrifice him before he wakes up. This is a metaphor that expresses his doubt of the profession and the thought that it does nothing to help society, by making children 'fit in' and taking what is special to them. The attempts of the other priests could be a metaphor for other psychiatrists and their thoughts towards him in doubting the profession, or the stigma attached to him from the wider conservative society. Either way, his dreams are an expression of his doubt for his profession and practice.

His discontent does show in more explicit manners in Act 1 Scene 18, in which he talks to Hester about his wife and eventually about Alan. He asks Hester 'What am I trying to do to him?', possibly commenting that he is unsure that his treatments are the right thing to do as it's taking away his worship, his God. This might relate to the fact that Dysart himself feels spiritually deprived. This can be seen in Act 1 Scene 25 with statements like 'I'm jealous of Alan Stearns' and 'What worship has he ever known?'. He feels inadequate because he has never had the same passion in his life that Alan has and because of this, he believes it would be wrong to take that away from him.

His displeasure for his profession comes in a soliloquy in the final scene of the play. He believes he will make Alan 'a ghost', devoid of any sentiments or passions, as he attempts to make him 'rational'. He makes a succinct comment on how 'animals are treated properly' in normal society, though he then makes comments of them being made extinct and sent into 'seclusion', making a comment on the double standards of society.

Marker's comments

- Shows general understanding.
- Detects that Dysart is content with his position at this point in the play but the response does not explore the extract itself in any depth. This restricts potential to reward.
- Exemplification is sparse with very little reference directly drawn from the extract provided.
- Comments regarding Dysart's perspective DO range across the text, however there is limited comment on technique / application of terminology

Level 2 – 7 marks

Level 2	6–10	General understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recalls concepts and methods of analysis that show general understanding. Organises and expresses ideas with some clarity, though has lapses in use of terminology.• Gives surface reading of texts. Applies some general understanding of writer's/speaker's techniques.• Describes general contextual factors. Makes some links between significance and influence of how texts are produced and received.
----------------	------	---

EXEMPLAR RESPONSE B

Equus

Shaffer continuously develops Dysart's changing attitude to his role as a psychiatrist. This is portrayed in the ~~play~~ extract through him and Alan's adjacency pairs. Alan presents himself as hostile towards Dysart's place of authority by replying to his constant attempts to strike a conversation in T.V. Jingles. "Double your pleasure, Double your fun" Alan reacts through his stage directions towards Dysart as 'hostile' when ever Dysart shows some sort of interest or appreciation towards his rehearsed T.V-Jingles "Can i hear that one again?" (Alan starts away from him, and sits on the upstage bench) This signifies the power struggle Dysart has been faced with through the character of Alan. Alan plays a important role in Dysart's developing changing attitude

to his role as a psychiatrist. Throughout the Play Alan presents a himself as a hostile patron of Dysart's. He clearly tries to make Dysart question his authority and his intentions as a psychiatrist. This is made evident in Dysart's monologue of his dream. ~~This monologue~~ ~~Shaffer~~ Shaffer uses Dysart's monologue short after the extract to convey Dysart's true fear and moral intentions of his role as a psychiatrist. The symbolic imagery of a chief priest carving up children and Dysart's mask slipping off ~~to reveal~~ revealing himself as unprofessional ^{his} to his fellow priests, ~~Symbolises~~ ~~Dysart's~~ metaphorically symbolises ^{his} Discontent with his role as a psychiatrist. He feels as if it is a job in which he routinely does his duties for the 'good of society' but the mask slipping off revealing his face conveys Dysart's dilemma of making his victims normal like everyone else. Alan's arrival

to the institution makes Dysart question his role of taming ~~of~~ the insane. Almost to the point Shaffer Audience Question whether Dysart could possibly be jealous of Alan's intimate sense of worship for the god-like Equus. ~~When~~ Alan ~~arrives~~ arrival at the institution made ~~him~~ Dysart ~~almost empathetic~~ more empathetic towards his patients as a psychiatrist than previously. When Dysart first heard of the case in Scene 1 with Hesther, he described his duties very carelessly and effortlessly "No - just a fifteen year old schizophrenic, and a girl of eight..." He almost has a surchastic tone towards his job. Whereas later in the play, having met Alan his conversations with Hesther somewhat intensify.

Shaffer uses repetition in Dysart's speech to illustrate Dysart's new found empathy towards his patients particularly Alan. "He can hardly read, No paintings... No music... No friends" this illustrates the reality of Alan's life something Dysart had to let Alan reveal to him. Dysart conveys his empathy by signifying just how isolated Alan truly was and through this he justifies ~~him~~ with Alan's longing for worship. Dysart's justification of Alan's long to worship is also relevant to Dysart's changing attitudes to his role as a psychiatrist. This is made evident in the Dialogue between him and Hesther on his marriage. "If I had a son, I bet you he'd come out exactly like his mother. Utterly worshipless," "The boy with the stare, he's trying to save himself through me".

Marker's comments

- Shows understanding and responds with some focus to the task, especially when broadening across the whole text
- Logically structured
- Investigation of the extract itself is rather thin and this does impact negatively on the potential for reward.
- Does address central dynamic (and thee adjacency structures through which this is developed) in the extract
- Considers stage and direction thoughtfully – this is a strength in terms of the stage as context
- Offers some terms- applied accurately – to evidence technique and effect – but range is rather limited

Level 3 – 12 marks

Level 3	11–15	Clear relevant application <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applies relevant concepts and methods of analysis to texts with clear examples. Ideas are structured logically and expressed with few lapses in clarity and transitioning. Clear use of terminology.• Shows clear understanding of how meaning is shaped by linguistic and literary features. Able to support this with clear examples.• Explains clear significance and influence of contextual factors. Makes relevant links to how texts are produced and received.
----------------	-------	--

EXEMPLAR RESPONSE C

All My Sons

Using this extract as a starting point, and with reference to other parts of the play, discuss how Miller develops the characters' dilemma with the morality of the business world.

In 'All My Sons' Miller effectively demonstrates conflicting attitudes towards morality by contrasting the fundamental ideals/morals of two characters, Chris and Keller. Miller's primary aim was to reveal how the 'American dream' can manipulate a person's values and morals, this is revealed through the behaviour of Keller. Miller appears to criticise the 'American dream' through Chris, by sending embedded and sometimes explicit messages to the audience. This explains why ~~the~~ the contemporary audience in America ~~did~~ criticised Miller's play, due to the era in which the play was written many of the audience would have known someone who would have died in the war. Therefore, the impact that the play had then compared to now is totally different.

In particular, the extract selected is theatricalised ~~and~~ by placing this scene at the end of act two, thus contrast to the realism of the play, but does conform to the expectations of the play. This scene shows the contrast between Keller and Chris and reflects two ways of looking at the 'American dream.' Keller seems to place more emphasis on business and money, evident in the repetition 'out of business'. Whereas Chris is against the emphasis that Keller places on business and money, this is evident in the

frequent use of short ^{interrogative} ~~declarative~~ simple sentences such as 'Where do you live, where have you come from?'. This creates a sense of emotion, drama and creates tension within the play. Miller structurally places the act the end of act Two to create drama, and facilitates a shift in the play's possible outcome.

Keller asks to ask for forgiveness and understanding from Chris evident in the complex sentence 'I'm in business... hell's it to them?' and the repetition of the question 'what could I do?'. Chris' response contrasts significantly to earlier in the play where he appeared to believe his father evident in the proper noun 'Joe McWats'. At this ^{extract} ~~part~~ of the play Chris appears very direct with his father evident in the emphasis of 'thought' and the use of direct simple sentences 'It means you knew they'd crash'. The use of ~~more~~ ^{simple} language 'Jesus God' reflect the emotional state that Chris is in, and in particular this section of the play was criticised by religious figures of the time. Miller was accused of a severe degree of blasphemy, this would have been particularly shocking to the contemporary audience because Christianity was the main religion. Although today it might not seem very shocking anyone, it is deemed as being shocking to some individuals.

The last line in the second act incorporates repetition, ellipses, ~~and~~ proper nouns and ~~the~~ a personal possessive pronoun 'Chris... My Chris'. This creates drama and theatrically is exasperated by it being the last line of the act. It resembles Keller's shift towards accepting what he has done as it sounds like a plea to Chris.

Miller develops the morality of characters by showing how an event, that theatrically has happened before the play, can cause people's opinions of one another to change, including the audience's opinion of the character's. Initially, Keller creates a facade of success and achievement, even contrasting to the end of the play it is revealed that he has been living a lie. The audience are made to like Keller at the start, and are gradually encouraged to ~~not~~ understand why his morals are what they are. Keller's morals are based around family ^{and} money, ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~or~~ this fundamentally breaks down the 'American dream'. This is remembered by the short simple sentence 'For you, a business for you!' This exclamatory sentence creates emotion and conviction and shows Keller's desperation. Throughout the play and through Keller, Miller is able to show how the 'American dream' can be interpreted in ways that can affect their morals.

Miller effectively uses the neighbors to reveal how significant a facade is in maintaining the ideal of the 'American dream'. The neighbors have 'always known' about the cracked cylinder heads, if the Keller were to be told, ~~then~~ the friendly, ideal atmosphere would no longer exist. Structurally Mother is told this at the start of Act three where Jim says 'Don't be afraid, Kate I've always known'. These two simple sentences combine ellipsis to create an informal tone and maintain the realism of the play. Through this, Miller is able to reveal how the 'American dream' is up to an individual's interpretation of it. ~~Here~~ ~~is~~ Through the neighbors Miller is

able to imply that people often place a significance on family and creating an ideal setting home. Miller incorporates dramatic irony to manipulate how the audience see Keller, perhaps implying that some of the audience should feel sorry for Keller. This is because he has been put under social pressure as to what is expected of ~~the~~ ~~and~~ an individual.

Marker's comments

- effective structure and expression
- consistent and apt exemplification – well integrated
- analysis is accurate, sometimes fluid/integrated to link form and function consistently
- clear consideration of writer's technique and choices
- valid comments on contextual factors

Level 5 – 21 marks

Level 5	21–25	Critical evaluative application <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents critical application of concepts and methods with sustained examples. Uses sophisticated structure and expression with appropriate register and style, including use of appropriate terminology.• Exhibits critical evaluation of writer's/speaker's linguistic and literary choices. Evaluates their effects on shaping meaning.• Critically examines context by looking at subtleties and nuances. Examines multi-layered nature of texts and how they are produced and received.
----------------	-------	---

EXEMPLAR RESPONSE D

All My Sons

Through Keller and Chris's differing opinion on the way business is acceptably carried out, the morals of business and their responsibility to society Miller develops the idea of conflicting attitudes to morality in the business world.

Through Chris's language Miller emphasises the outrage he feels at Keller's actions. The repetition of the singular pronoun 'you' and the pronoun 'them' emphasises Joe's responsibility for the actions in Chris's mind as well as placing emphasis on the verbs, 'killed' and 'murdered' further highlighting Chris's disbelief at his father's actions. Keller's retort to these ^{accusations} ~~accusations~~ however highlight his own denial to both the severity of his actions and his own disbelief at Chris's reaction to his crimes. This denial is apparent in both his use of the rhetorical question, 'How could I kill anybody?' emphasising his own feelings of innocence and the stage directions, 'as though ... before Chris', suggesting he believes with all his soul he is innocent. Chris's use of the short exclamatory minor sentences and repetition, 'Dad! Dad!' show his own frustration for his father's inability to accept his guilt but also perhaps Miller's own frustration with societies own inability to take a greater social responsibility. Chris's anger at both his father's actions and his inability to understand why he is guilty are made more apparent in his rhetorical question, 'what do

you do?', his repetition 'explain it to me ... explain it to me' and his crescendo to an exclamatory sentence which, compared to his ~~beginning~~ manner in the beginning of the play, seems out of character, 'or I'll tear you to pieces!' further highlighting his anger. Keller's ellipsis and inability to finish his own sentences, 'Don't, Chris, don't...' and 'If you're going to hang me then I...' suggest a sense of frustration at Chris's inability to see his side of the argument but also perhaps a realisation that he is completely innocent. Chris's considerable use of repetition, rhetorical, interrogative and exclamatory sentences throughout this interaction highlight his anger, disappointment and frustration.

Joe follows this interaction with a long speech attempting to justify his actions to Chris. Keller's repetition of the noun 'business' throughout this speech highlights the importance and justification he places on business. Joe's repetition of other words and phrases in this speech, 'I'm a business, a man is in business' highlights the many arguments he is proposing to justify his actions. Joe's blunt simple declarative sentence, 'I swear to God', shows his conviction in the justification he formed in his own mind for his actions. Joe's shift from long complex sentences at the beginning of his argument to shorter simple sentences show an increasing conviction in his mind that his actions were justified.

The series of short, overlapping sentences was apparent by the ellipsis 'I didn't say that ... But you...' show both character's inner conflictions to the actions of themselves and the other character. Chris's use of repetition of Joe's words in an exclamatory sentence, 'You were afraid maybe!' followed by his use of blasphemy

'God in heaven ... are you?' however suggest that Chris has offered their is no justification for Keller's actions. Chris' repeated use of rhetorical questions which are short and contain mild taboo language add to the pace of his speech and highlight his disbelief at his father's justification: 'What the hell... what are you?'. Chris' use of the personal pronoun 'I' in his rhetorical question demonstrate the conflict he feels in his own mind towards his father's action: 'What must ... what must I do?'

Through Keller and Chris, Miller creates a conflicting attitude to morality in the business world. Joe like the majority of America is deeply focussed on his nuclear family and the American dream and his own consumption. This dedication to his family would have seemed normal and admirable to an audience at the time and the eventual image of a guilty man Joe is given at the end of the play was seen as 'red' and left wing. The reason a conflict is perceived is that the voice of Miller, who is critical of American consumerism is apparent in the character Chris who deeply condemns Joe who is his own father. However through Joe's eventual acceptance that he is guilty however it could be perceived that the conflict is one sided.

Marker's comments

- good focus on the task
- consistent and apt exemplification
- terms applied in good range and with accuracy
- logically structures and well expressed
- contextual points valid

Level 4 – 17 marks

Level 4	16–20	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applies controlled discussion of concepts and methods supported with use of discriminating examples. Controls the structure of response with effective transitions, carefully-chosen language and use of terminology.• Analyses the effects of linguistic and literary features and of the writer's craft. Shows awareness of nuances and subtleties.• Provides discriminating awareness of links between the text and contextual factors. Consistently makes inferences about how texts are produced and received.
----------------	-------	--

EXEMPLAR RESPONSE E

All My Sons

Language + terminology

concepts 1 + 3.

attitudes/values/ideas.

In this extract from Act II, which, structurally, is placed at the end of Act II, Miller develops the conflicting attitudes toward morality in the witnesses, we through Miller and Chris. Keller and Chris.

We can very clearly see how. For example, Keller says through the use of a compound sentence 'you killed them, you murdered them' Keller and Chris have very different attitudes toward morality. Contextually, Chris Keller's views on morality: that he committed the crime for the his own fun, based on the idea of the American Dream. Keller can't understand Chris as he says through the use of the minor interrogative sentence 'What, killed?'

It Miller wasn't. Another idea is that there is a conflict between Keller and Chris, who is whom Miller speaks through, between capitalism and communism and this is very evident in this extract. The army criticised the play for being 'lyrical' & 'dated'.

At the time, after the war, as I earlier stated in the play, Chris and others in the war, who also share Miller's view, would have thought that

we want change people's responsibility to each other; but instead, he found that people were even more obsessed with consumer products.

This is why there is such a conflict between Keller and Chris, and this is what Miller felt about the American Dream has been interpreted in the wrong way, and with its emphasis on consumerism and capitalism.

This is very evident in this extract, through the use of language, structure and form and how it is placed in the play, which theatrically is placed at the end of Act II, where the truth was out Keller's crimes have been revealed.

The stage direction 'as though throwing his whole nature open before Chris' is very significant as it could mean that Keller is explaining the language. Keller says through the use of the interrogative sentence 'How could I kill anybody' which shows that Keller can't understand how he has killed anyone. Does this mean that he can't look beyond and have responsibility for anyone else or outside his family? Again, this shows the contrast between Keller and Chris' moral point of view.

This is further shown through the use of the two exclamations, 'Dad! Dad!', which convey both his anger and his confusion about what Keller did. He can't understand it. Again, Chris' anger is further emphasised in the imperative 'explain', which is repeated again. Again this conveys Chris' anger. 'I'll leave you to pieces', which is quite hyperbolic, through the use of an fi violent lexis 'I'll leave you to pieces.'

to drive
the new
car,

does not really care for life the loss of life. As such Chris is raising an issue that ~~he feels~~ 'I feel' wrong to be alive, to open the ~~door~~ ^{fridge} to see the new refrigerator'. The use of this asyndetic list to give examples of what the modern American wants and enjoys, a more materialistic lifestyle, and that the loss for these goods is all the deaths of World War II is unacceptable. This can be epitomised in the compound declarative sentence "Otherwise all you ~~really~~ have really is lost, and there's blood on it". The use of the end focusing on the entire noun ~~blood~~ in the figurative phrase "there's blood on it" shows how ~~dirty~~ he feels using all the new American invention ~~the toaster~~ such as the toaster. Chris also suggests that in war you have a responsibility for each other, shown in the declarative ~~sentence~~ ^{clause} ~~'Man for man'~~ ^{two minor declarative clauses} 'Man... of responsibility, Man for man'. This is important as it shows the morals of a soldier compared to the morals of a businessman and the attitude to Americans after the war.

Marker's comments

- Achieves a degree of balance between investigation of the extract and the broader text
- Offers reasonable focus on the task
- Exemplifies with reasonable consistency
- offers terms at word and sentence level to afford comment on technique
- context is considered - could be more developed

Level 3 – 13 marks

<p>Level 3</p>	<p>11–15</p>	<p>Clear relevant application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies relevant concepts and methods of analysis to texts with clear examples. Ideas are structured logically and expressed with few lapses in clarity and transitioning. Clear use of terminology. • Shows clear understanding of how meaning is shaped by linguistic and literary features. Able to support this with clear examples. • Explains clear significance and influence of contextual factors. Makes relevant links to how texts are produced and received.
-----------------------	--------------	---

EXEMPLAR RESPONSE F

A Streetcar named Desire

'A Streetcar Named Desire', by Tennessee Williams, is a play that revolves around a range of themes, such as; loneliness, desperation, conflict, love and class. The characters Blanche and Kowalski are particularly interesting throughout the play, and especially so within the extract, in which Blanche expresses her dislike for her sister's husband.

Set in post-war America, the characters of 'A Streetcar Named Desire' are each attempting to rebuild their lives, in particular Blanche Dubois, who's character is desperate for love and attention, though attempts to disguise this – and her mysterious past – through her secretive and pretentious nature. Within the first line of the extract, '*May I – speak – plainly?*' we are given a sense that Blanche is speaking down to her sister, as if she were still a child, highlighting her pompous attitude, her patronising tone exaggerated by the pauses. The adverb '*plainly*' also serves to reinforce her disregard for all politeness principles and asserts her dominance as the older sister. This first line also initiates her speech on class, in which she refers to Stanley Kowalski as 'common', whereby she is suggesting that she and her sister are above Stanley's lowly standing and that he is unsuitable for her sister as a partner.

Ironically, whilst Blanche's reasoning for her dislike of Stanley is prejudiced and unsupported, she is surprisingly perceptive about Stanley, describing him as 'bestial' 'ape-like', 'sub-human' and 'an animal' and even suggesting that '...he'll strike you or maybe grunt and kiss you...' which Williams reveals to be true to the audience in later scenes when Stanley performs animalistic actions such as raping his sister-in-law and beating his wife. Stanley alludes to his rape of Blanche as being destined from the outset, suggesting Blanche may have had an insight into his character, or to the aggressive conflict between the old and new South, as personified in the characters of Blanche and Stanley.

Williams employs a semantic field of animal behaviour 'swilling' 'gnawing' 'grunting' 'hulking' in Blanche's descriptions of Stanley and his friends, de-humanising them and in so doing, elevating Blanche's contrary position as superior and sophisticated. Blanche's description of Stanley's conversations, 'grunting' 'growls', are animalistic and also onomatopoeic, evoking the sounds of the farmyard and further extending the metaphor of Stanley as a beast. Interestingly, the stage directions indicate Stanley 'licking his lips' and leaving 'stealthily' which could also be interpreted as animalistic actions, although more subtle and snake-like than the hulking beast that Blanche describes, and so possibly more cruel and dangerous than even Blanche imagines. The animal metaphor is turned around towards the end of the play, for whilst Stanley approaches Blanche with his tongue out, and 'springs' on to her, it is Blanche who is described as an animal 'tiger tiger' although it is Stanley who commits the animal act.

Blanche's character is accustomed to a more lavish lifestyle and resents the false splendour of the developing cities, which Williams uses to create a stark contrast with the residents of the Old South, immediately highlighting a divide in class and wealth. Blanche comes from a wealthy family, as indicated throughout the play by the references to the large family plantation, Belle Reve, that she was supposed to be caring for, which establishes her character and the hierarchy that she believes in.

Student Exemplar Responses
A level paper 1, section B – drama

In this extract, Blanche's dramatic speech on Stanley suggests that her sister and herself are superior to Kowalski and perhaps all of those that Stella associates herself with, who are backwards 'Don't - don't hang back with the brutes!' The false start intensifies the force of the imperative and suggests, through their association with high culture, 'poetry and music' that Stella and Blanche are at the top of the evolutionary ladder, whilst Stanley and his friends are cave men 'survivors of the Stone Age' at the bottom of the ladder with the animals.

Throughout the extract, the dialogue is exaggerated by the use of exclamatory sentences and extended pauses, which both heighten the inappropriateness of Blanche's speech and her self-importance. This is supported by her poetic style, 'In some kinds of people some tenderer feelings have had some little beginning!', which Williams uses to reinforce the dramatic nature of Blanche's character and convey her level of education and class which divides her from Stanley. Stella meanwhile is curt and brief in her responses, with Williams using this varying sentence length to heighten the distinction between the overwrought and apparently sophisticated Blanche, and the more direct and circumspect Stella, who has already left her upbringing behind. This echoes the start of the play during which Blanche comments on Stella's silence upon her arrival, to which Stella responds 'you never did give me a chance to say much, Blanche. So I just got in the habit of being quiet around you.' Blanche dominates Stella and also Stanley verbally, as shown again in this scene. Towards the end of the play however, Stanley comes to dominate Blanche, both physically and verbally, as he tears down her façade of fantasies, to which she can only respond 'oh!' The total domination of Blanche by Stanley may be representative of Williams's presentation of the New South triumphing over the Old.

Within the extract Stanley finds it amusing to act like the primitive, poorly educated man that Blanche believes him to be, responding to Blanche's direct and impersonal assumption, 'You must've gotten under the car' with the line, 'Them darn mechanics at Fritz's don't know their can from third base!' Stanley is using colloquial language such as, 'them' and 'darn' intentionally as a response to appeal to Blanche's degrading tirade, which Williams uses to suggest that he finds Blanche amusing and ignores her attempt to establish her superiority and power over him. Stanley is aware of the conversation and yet has no requirement to engage with her sense of superiority, as he is embraced 'fiercely' by Stella, thus showing that he has already won.

Marker's comments

- Sustains focus on the central issues of the task and comments (and evidence) show some discrimination.
- The dynamic between the characters (and the language through which this is constructed) is considered with some insight.
- Applies controlled discussion of concepts and methods supported with use of discriminating examples – exemplification is not fully consistent, however.
- The overall structure of the response is sound and coherent. Transitions are effective and expression largely fluent. Use of terminology is accurate and in reasonable range – could be sharper/more specific at times and sentence level analysis could be more developed.
- Has clear sense of Williams as author and the representative nature of the characters he develops (which links to context).
- Aware of the historical context of the play but issues of production and reception lack detail/development
- Relates extract to broader play with some success.

Level 4 – 18 marks

Level 4	16–20	Discriminating controlled application <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applies controlled discussion of concepts and methods supported with use of discriminating examples. Controls the structure of response with effective transitions, carefully-chosen language and use of terminology.• Analyses the effects of linguistic and literary features and of the writer’s craft. Shows awareness of nuances and subtleties.• Provides discriminating awareness of links between the text and contextual factors. Consistently makes inferences about how texts are produced and received.
----------------	-------	--

