

LIVING TEXTS

LEVEL 1/2 CERTIFICATE (J945)

Unit B933 'Comparing Texts – Personal Study'

Exemplar responses and moderator commentaries June 2014

JANUARY 2015



SCRIPT A

Written Task Topic:

Discuss the role of hope and love in highlighting the central themes of Cormac McCarthy's *The Road* and George Orwell's *1984*.

Presentation Topic: A study of cults and their apocalyptic theories.

Answer:

In a television interview, Cormac McCarthy spoke about how in his novel 'The Road' the Father and Son were based on his relationship with his own son John McCarthy. This is why the bond of love is so vivid in this novel and is key to showing the main themes of his book. The main themes of the novels '1984' and 'The Road' are the struggle for individuality, the survival of individuals and humanity, the battle of good and evil and the inevitability of death. The emotions of love and hope help to highlight the main themes in many ways, for example love giving the reason for the Man and Boy to strive for survival in the post apocalyptic world described in Cormac McCarthy's novel. Hope is also used to highlight the main themes of the books that are often sombre or depressing. It is hope that fuels Winston to rebel against the totalitarian regime of the party and believe in the 'proles' who symbolise ignorance and naivety; that they will be the instruments of freedom to abolish 'Big Brother' who rules over Winston's world of Oceania. George Orwell wrote '1984' as a warning of the dangers of totalitarianism and a main concern shown in his novel is how such a regime can remove all hope and love from our society.

The first theme that hope and love highlight in the novels is that of survival. Both sets of characters in the novels have to fight to survive. In 'The Road', the Father and Son symbolise not only a family relationship struggling to live and survive in a dystopia but also the whole world that is slowly crumbling away. Both humanity and the natural world are falling to pieces with cannibalistic mobs, devoid of compassion, killing mercilessly and the world's natural beauty all but gone, covered in a blanket of ash. In contrast to this, Winston's fight for survival is that of an individual. Yes, it is true to say that Oceania is trying to survive against the other nations such as Eastasia or Eurasia but the main struggle for survival is a personal one against the party. Love plays a part in highlighting the struggle to survive for both sets of characters. Winston, in contrast to the Father and Son, struggles because of a selfish love of himself. Everything the hero does in Orwell's novel is in the pursuit of his own interest. It is ironic that although he is so concerned with the preservation of himself and his personality (for example in his diary), his job involves erasing history or destroying other individuals and he does so without any real concern for them. This self-love is shown more vividly when it comes to the later torture in 'Room 101'. His relationship with Julia boils down to insignificance when faced with his worst fears in the room. Through his selfish love he even cries out for pain to be inflicted on the one person who he has an emotional bond with rather than be placed upon him: *"Do it to Julia! Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia!"*. This shows how little his love matters when he needs to survive. In stark contrast the selfless love of the Man towards the Boy in 'The Road' is what drives the Man to survive; the Man is willing to sacrifice himself for the boy, so strong is the bond between them:

"What would you do if I died...If you died I would want to die too...So you could be with me?...Yes so I could be with you"

This is an obvious example to illustrate the love between the two main characters in McCarthy's novel. Hope plays a part in survival in the two books, yet the lack of hope can be replaced by another emotion such as the paternal love shown by the Man. This is not universal as the Mother in 'The Road' loses hope and commits suicide for example. However, despite having no basis for any hope, the Father and Son press on in search of warmth and, through the naivety of the son, hope to find safety with the 'good guys'. Realistically the chances of survival are slim even if at the end of the book the boy does receive hope in the appearance of the new family. On the other hand, there is no hope for Winston in '1984'. The party always wins and the oppressed always lose. This is significant as George Orwell believed in the goodness of the life of those in the lower class. He removed himself from the high class society, ran away from his Eton College education and lived like the poor in the back streets of London. It is this that shaped his belief in the socialist idea of the people being the honest force for good in the world and it was they who would deliver the world from the totalitarian government rising up in the world such as fascist Nazi Germany. However, the hope that Winston has in the 'proles' is futile and negligible as he or they will never be able to defeat the party.

Individuality is the next central theme that love and hope highlight in both dystopian novels. In both dystopias

individuality seems not to exist. However, as the main characters show through their own hope and love, individuality can occur. In 'The Road' individuality does not exist. Humanity has been stripped of all moral fibre and identity – as shown in Cormac McCarthy's decision not to give any characters names. The cannibalistic mobs that kill other humans, like animals, are beasts that no longer have human emotion and are devoid of love. They do share the same hope as the Man and the Boy, they too hope to survive. However, unlike the cannibals the man and the boy have a love that creates individuality. It is their hope of them being "the good guys" and being the last source of love and humanity in the world that gives them identity and that cannot be suppressed until they themselves turn into the "bad guys" and kill other people for food. Their duty to "*carry the fire*" and their love for each other is what defines them as individuals and sets them apart from the faceless mass of humanity. Contrary to this, the individuality in '1984' is one that can and is suppressed by the party.

"the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thought-crime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it."

Newspeak and reduction of language possibilities leads to a reduction of the potential to express ones thoughts and feeling towards the Party and hence have an individual identity. Winston uses the diary and his relationship with Julia to create his identity against the wishes of the party. It is the hope that he can rebel and also a love of freedom and expression against the party which makes him do this. Winston by the end of the novel no longer has his own identity. The use of room 101 and torture eventually leads himself to execute his own individuality: "*He had won victory over himself*". As mentioned previously Winston's love was that of a selfish nature. He loves nothing but himself and his freedom. There is a shift of love from himself to the party to create an oneness of thought between himself and Big Brother. This shows why in both novels love and hope are key factors in defining individuality.

This struggle for individuality is part of a wider battle between good and evil in the two books. The evil created in each novel is seen to be created by an external force. In '1984' countries outside of Oceania are seen to be the creators of the people's strife, whereas in 'The Road' evil is caused by the mobs or the aftermath of the apocalypse. As stated earlier the moral code of humanity is broken in both dystopias with the party executing, torturing and brainwashing all those opposing them and in 'The Road' the cannibals harvesting people and killing mercilessly. On the one hand it is true to say that evil is caused by forces other than the heroes of the book. However, if one was to look closer at the decisions and values of the main characters you can see that their morals could also be seen as evil. In 'The Road' the father has no qualms with leaving the people in the cellar to certain death or leaving the old man to die with no food or appropriate clothing. Furthermore, he does not feel remorse for shooting the man who has the bow and arrow with a flare even though they are also the "good guys". This shows how the moral code is broken after the apocalypse and how evil has been implanted on all even those perceived as good. Winston in '1984' bases his moral code on his own thought. This means therefore that it is his love that defines his boundaries of good and evil. For example, when Winston suspects Julia of following him into the 'prole' area his first reaction is to "*smash her skull in with a cobblestone*". This shows how corrupted Winston's mind is when it comes to good and evil and that self preservation is more important to him than the boundaries of morality. Love and hope are central to the determination of good and evil in both dystopias because of the lack of an absolute moral standard in both societies. As a result, love and hope are the basis on which the characters found their beliefs of good and evil and thus lead them to think and act accordingly.

The fight between good and evil has an inevitable ending in both novels, death. Death is all around in both novels - be it the constant presence of death surrounding the Father and Son in 'The Road' or the quiet and hushed removal of people from 'The Party' in 1984. In both novels there is a basic desire not to die. Both Winston and the man know the inevitability of death but the Man does everything in his power to postpone its arrival. On the other hand Winston does not. He actively tries to involve himself with the brotherhood and seeks out his relationship with Julia even though he knows the only possible outcome of his situation is death: "*theyll shoot me i dont care theyll shoot me in the back of the neck*". This shows his desperation about his situation, the realisation that death was a certainty and that there was nothing he could do to prevent it: "*thoughtcrime does not entail death: thoughtcrime IS death*" This is Winston's recognition that the party has complete control and that anything other than life with the party will incur death. Therefore, Winston has lost hope in survival but has already committed himself to the grave. The defeat of Winston's hope and the realisation that his death is now inevitable after the committing of thought crime shows that death is the opposite of hope and that life only exists when the individual still has hope. This is replicated also in 'The Road' where a lack of hope leads to the ending of life:

SCRIPT B

Written Task Topic:

Which character evokes more sympathy from the reader, Charlie in *The Perks of being a Wallflower* or Holden in *The Catcher in the Rye*.

Presentation Topic: Exploring the relationship between the two novels.

Answer:

In this essay, I will compare J.D Salinger's Holden Caulfield and Stephen Chbosky's Charlie. Using my knowledge of the texts and personal opinion, I will decide which character evokes more sympathy out of the two.

'I wrote about my brother Allie's baseball mitt...He died'. Holden tells us about the death of his younger brother Allie, of which took place when Holden was only thirteen years old. Straight after Allie's death from Leukaemia. Holden was sent to various schools, where he messed around and failed most classes, 'This is about the fourth school I've gone to'. However, I believe this was the result of his parents not allowing him to properly grieve; they believed that sending him away would help him focus on his education and not on the traumatising death of his dearly loved, favourite brother. I believe that if his parents gave him a chance to grieve and didn't send him off to different schools, he wouldn't be as confused as he is, because he didn't understand why Allie had to die so young and why he couldn't see him again. He could have had a clearer and more optimistic opinion on his education and life in general, whereas he rebelled at school because he didn't understand why Allie had to die. Why did he have to die so young? So soon? Why couldn't he die old, like everyone else? He just wanted answers and time, both of which he didn't receive. In *The Perks Of Being A Wallflower*, Charlie also suffered a very sudden loss at a very young age. On his seventh birthday, his beloved Aunt Helen (his favourite person, the same as Holden favoured Allie) suffered a sudden death in a devastating car accident on the way back from buying Charlie's birthday gift. Charlie immediately blamed his Aunt's death on himself, as she was buying his present for his birthday. This guilt haunts him through the novel. He grew up without any successful friendships, because he was and still is different. He thought a lot and tried to make everyone happy. He wasn't like other children, he didn't upset people and move on, he held onto everything and everyone he possibly could. He had feelings for everything.

Charlie is writing a series of letters addressed to us, the readers. Holden also speaks to us directly. I really like these similar styles, because they can tell us directly how each character his feeling, what they are doing and how they are thinking. Even though Charlie tells us about his emotions and feelings, he doesn't necessarily understand them himself, 'I don't know if you've ever felt like that. That you wanted to sleep for a thousand years. Or just not exist. Or just not be aware that you do exist. Or something like that.' As a teenager, he is oblivious to the signs of his molested childhood, even when he recalls memories through his anonymous letters, such as his witnessing of a rape. When he begins to make friends, the guilt of his Aunt Helen's death begins to reappear in his memory, because he is beginning to love his new friends as much as he loved his aunt, 'We except the love we think we deserve'. However, when Charlie and Sam mess around after kissing, 'It was like everything made sense. Until she moved her hand under my pants and she touched me.' Sam's passionate actions repressed Charlie's molesting memories. I believe Charlie's childhood changed his life forever, but not in a positive way. His negative memories affect him and his way of life/thinking, also making him confused and depressed. Comparing the fictional characters' situations and pasts, I feel more sympathetic for Holden (at this point), because he isn't even given the attention to discover whether he is clinically depressed or suffering from a mental illness, he isn't given time to grieve or to give his side of the story when he is expelled from different schools: he wasn't given a chance to explain how he felt or why he couldn't concentrate in class; he was simply sent to another school in another separate, distant state.

There is a substantial difference between these two characters: Charlie dealt with his loneliness and troubles and made friends, 'I just want to make sure that the first person who kisses you loves you', whereas Holden accepted his 'lonesome' place in society. It is like Holden is trying to create his own society, one that will accept him and his opinions for who he is, 'People are always ruining things for you'. Charlie tried to grow up however, Holden was stationed at the age of thirteen (when Allie died) yet tried to behave like an adult because he believed that was the right thing to do. He did this through excess smoking, 'I just turned to the other side of the bed and smoked like a madman', swearing, drinking and hiring a prostitute. However, he only spoke to the prostitute. He firstly believed

he wanted to have sex and experience what Stradlater and other people had experienced, however Sunny, the prostitute, made him realise he isn't like other people. He doesn't want the same things. He just spoke to her about her life and his life, he didn't even kiss her. He felt guilty, in a way, that such a young girl was having to live such a low life. But, by the way he tried to 'act like an adult', he demonstrated a pure example of how children believe adults act. But, Charlie tried to overcome his loneliness and lack of companions. Charlie's attachment to Sam and Patrick, talent in English and strong beliefs in standing up for his friends and making everyone happy, makes me consider if he suffers from a social interaction disorder such as Autism. He put himself out of his comfort zone, for his benefit. However, Holden couldn't because he didn't know how and he had no one to show him how. He was lonely and his mind was isolated. He was trapped in the body of a tall, skinny sixteen year old with the mind of the thirteen year old boy. He stopped growing up as he was stationed in the past with Allie, whereas Charlie couldn't remember his past. I sympathise more with Charlie at this point, as he is completely oblivious to his cruel childhood that is affecting his life dramatically, the memories that left him confused, curious and companionless.

Both of the endings in these books result with the protagonist in mental health care/hospitals. 'How I got sick an all, and what school I'm supposed to go to next fall, after I get out if here.' However, they both don't dwell on it. They mention it briefly and continue, as if they are trying to forget. I believe both characters need help with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, and with other individual issues. P.T.S.D often occurs when a traumatising event takes place early in someone's life, with symptoms that Charlie exhibits, such as blocking out people; and memories only coming back in later life about his Aunt Helen's death and her abuse of him. But, Holden also displays symptoms, not just because of Allie's death, but through seeing James Castle's dead body, and nobody but only one teacher helped pick up his body. 'Finally, what he did, instead of taking what he said, he jumped out the window.'

The male protagonists in *The Catcher In The Rye* and *The Perks Of Being A Wallflower*, may appear very different due to their locations, decades and pasts, however, their ways of thinking, psychological disorders and experiences make them very similar. But, I feel more sympathy for Charlie. I feel he is a very innocent teenager who just wants to make everyone in the world happy. He has feelings for everything and everyone and doesn't like seeing anything hurt or broken. He is very fragile due to his experiences, and loves Sam through making her happy, 'You can't just sit there and put everybody's lives ahead of yours and think it counts as love'. He feels happy for once and can clear his mind when with them. Charlie wants to help people, while Holden doesn't care. 'People are always ruining things for you'. I sympathise with Holden for he cannot help the fact that he was sent away to schools by his parents, instead of healthily grieving, but he is so depressing. He always has pessimistic attitude and doesn't really care for anything, but when he does he can become too attached and just end up emotionally hurting himself again. His negativity suggests he will never be able to fit into our world. Charlie tries his best but he can't understand his past until the night where he stays at Sam's house, 'It's okay Charlie. Just go to sleep.' Sam said. But I wasn't talking to Sam anymore. I was talking to someone else'. In the dream where he 'speaks to Aunt Helen', the dream where his whole childhood floods back to him, drowning him in confusion and depression. He remembers Aunt Helen leaving him on the evening of Sam leaving him (for college). Charlie can help his future, Holden can't. 'Oh, I feel some concern for my future, all right...I thought about it for a minute...not too much, I guess'.

Moderator commentary:

This candidate begins with an engagingly personal and committed approach to the presentation of the two central characters. The sense of an individual personal response to these texts is very strong. As the piece progresses the writing becomes more analytical as textual evidence from both texts is introduced to support the viewpoints expressed. The use of embedded quotations is particularly effective. There is perception and insight in the exploration of the similarities and differences between the two central characters. The writing is consistently clear and accurate. The response is well-structured moving from the heartfelt reader response of the opening to the cross-text summative approach of the ending. The writing presents a confident and cogent response to the task.

The presentation focuses again on the relationship between the two novels but broadens out from the central protagonist focus. The very detailed centre commentary on this presentation not only demonstrates excellent practice in recording and assessing candidate work but also evidences just how much this candidate has achieved in their work for this unit.

Band 2 Mark 35

SCRIPT C

Written Task Topic:

Compare the representation of animals in Jack London's *The Call of the Wild* and Melvin Burgess' *Cry of the Wolf*

Presentation Topic: The role of animals in children's fiction

Answer:

The two books I have chosen to read both contain unusual central characters, as the main character in each story is an animal. Although common to have small children's stories centring around animals from Peter Rabbit to Charlotte's Web, these books are different. They are fully developed novels, but from the unusual viewpoint of a non-human. *The Call of the Wild* by Jack London, tells the story of a dog, who devoted to his master is left to fend for himself after his master's death; whereas Melvin Burgess' *The Cry of the Wolf*, tells the story of the last living wolf pack in England and the struggle for their survival.

Most books containing animals are based around love and happiness. They are often allegories for human relationships and simplify these emotions so it is easy for children to understand them. The relationship between animals and other characters in the book as caring, loving, relationships. However, in the books that I have been studying, the writers have represented animals from a very different perspective. Both writers have chosen a canine to be their central character. Although Buck is a dog and Greycub is a wolf, both had been described in very similar ways. Both canines were described as "cunning" animals suggesting that they were very independent individuals. For example when Buck learnt that any man in a red sweater with a club wasn't to be messed with or how Greycub hunted down the hunter himself as of him finding his weakness. Throughout each book the writers mentioned the "muscle" that each of their animal had and how big built each of them where. They talked about how large they looked and how strong each of them was. It gives the impression that they were dominant and that they were not to be messed with; making me admire them. This showed us that they were very healthy and well fed. However, during each book both canines faced a section of their lives where food was a struggle to find, that this occurred during a long period of time and that both of their health was increasingly bad. That each dogs "muscles had wasted away to knotty strings, the flesh pads had disappeared, so that each rib and every bone in his frame were outlined cleanly though the loose hide that was wrinkled in folds of emptiness". Though soon after they re-gained their "strength", their "muscles" and they were "strong" once more. This shows us that these canines lives were represented in a similar way to humans lives as all humans have to go through a part of their life that is a struggle but they get through it and everything is well afterwards. In both of my books the struggle for food is a common instinctive 'need' that all animals need to survive. This enables us to sympathise for the characters even though they are characters because we can easily understand that needy requirement. From each of my texts we get a clear view that both of the central characters have the struggle of getting food.

Both books have been written in a very different narrative structures. Jack London has chosen to write his books in the 3rd person, but with a lot of detail into Buck's thoughts. In my opinion having the book viewed from the main character's point of view is very effective as you get a clear understanding of their feelings and opinions. "Best of all, he loved to lie near the fire, head raised, and eyes blinking dreamily at the flames. Sometimes he thought of Judge Miller's big house". From this quotation we get a very clear understanding of his feelings that occurs when he is by the fire. We get a clear insight of the emotions he feels and the memories that he thinks of at the time. We get a very peaceful image, showing us how relaxed Buck is and feels. The word "dreamily" from that quotation connotes that Buck feels safe. That he is not worried about anything at the certain point in the book and feels secure. On the other hand, *The Cry of the Wolf* by Melvin Burgess is written in a less personalised 3rd person. In some cases, from this narrative structure that Burgess keeps throughout the book, we can not fully understand the emotions that the central character is feeling and what the character is thinking. "Greycub had no difficulty learning. This was knowledge that he was waiting for.". From this quotation I can only get a vague overview of the thoughts. However, I can't get a clear view of his feelings. I prefer the *Call of the Wild* by Jack London as in my opinion I prefer to clearly know what's going through the characters minds and their emotions. In both books we get varied relationships between animals and human, based on who the human is. In the *Call of the Wild* we get a very strong, caring relationship between Buck and John Thornton. Buck stays loyal to him up to when he dies and after. The relationship between them is very loving and caring. John saves Buck's life and Buck saves his. Everyday they showed their love for one another when John "shook Buck back and forth and cursed him lovingly". The quotation "Buck never

left camp, never let Thornton out of his sight” also shows us the true, passionate, care between canine and human. However, Buck’s relationship changed when he was with Hal. Their relationship had no love nor care. The quotation “in itself a sufficient reason to drive Hal into rage. He exchanged the whip for the customary club” can show us this. The fact that Hal can whip Buck, and hit him violently with a club whilst Buck is close to death, and Hal not caring at all that Buck could lose his life represents that there is no love there between them in their relationship. Whereas Greycub in *The Cry of the Wolf* builds up no strong relationship between any humans. However, the boy in the farmyard does show some love and care towards the wolf. We know that the boy, Ben Tilley, did look after the wolf, cared for him. However, in the end the wolf had to leave, even when Ben didn’t want him to, Greycub had to go. “Just the longing for his own kind that was taking him away”. In my opinion I feel like we shouldn’t feel sympathetic for Ben as the Wolf is wild and had to go, as living in a house obviously wasn’t a suitable environment for him. The relationship between the hunter and Greycub was unstable. They despised each other at every point in the book. “He snarled and went for the Hunter’s hand”. Through the whole book I never felt sympathetic for the hunter and I was never on the human’s side thought out the whole of the book. The fact that the hunter wanted to wipe out the whole of the remaining wolves in England made me feel only hate for him. The relationship they had was dark. They hunted each other until one of them was successfully killed and they didn’t stop until they did. Greycub was successful in doing this and he got his revenge for when the hunter had killed every other one of his kind.

Setting has been used to represent how us humans would feel more comfortable in nature than these canines have felt in it. In *The Cry of the Wolf*, all wolves have had to hide away in nature, they haven’t been able to relax and they are always moving. “Congratulations did not take long; they had been in one place for too long already”. Connotes that they never feel safe or secure. In *The Call of the Wild*, we get told that the dogs feel weary about the ice that they travel on, always worrying if they are going to fall though at anytime. “For the ice was very thin, and where there was swift water, there was no ice at all”. However, in neither books have the mentioned that any of the human characters have felt at ease within nature. This adds to the feel that the human characters are the dominant characters, and the animals are at their mercy.

I believe that both books worked and they were successful books. However, I only believe that *Call of the Wild* concluded in a satisfying manner. This is my opinion because the ending concludes the whole of the story, it brings it to a acceptable stop and sums up the whole book. “He sings a song of the younger world, which is the song of the pack”. This represents that he found his place in the world, that he had been seeking for and he is where he wants to be. It brings the whole gist of the story to a nice stop. However, I feel like *The Cry of the Wolf* hasn’t ended properly. I feel that the ending sentence should have been about Greycub, about what his going to do next, where he is going to go and how he felt about his successful hunt. I felt more sympathy for Greycub in *The Cry of the Wolf* because no one asked for the hunter to go and kill the last remaining wolves in England, he just went and did it for his own entertainment. The wolves were helpless, unable to defend, unaware when the attacks would be unleashed. Greycub didn’t ask to be brought into such a cruel world but then again everyone doesn’t ask for a lot of things to happen but they still do.

In my conclusion, I feel like that both of the texts that I looked at have successfully created animal characters. I feel like they’ve interpreted them in a way that most readers wouldn’t normally view them in. Both books have represented these animals in ways that we as readers aren’t use to seeing them. Both central characters are unusual but not in a way that we haven’t been able to understand them, therefore making them successful individuals within each of my texts.

Moderator commentary:

The candidate explores both texts and how they link with each other in a clear and thoughtful way. The response begins with an interesting proposition as to how animals are often depicted anthropomorphically in literature, particularly books for children. The candidate explores how these particular texts represent animals in a non-human way and the impression created from this. Sections on narrative structure and settings develop some specific ideas on the texts and how they work as novels. These points are supported by appropriate textual detail. The writing is clear and accurate and gives a good account of how meaning and effect are created. The candidate’s engagement with both texts is evident in the informed personal response that permeates the response.

The presentation topic on how animals are depicted in children’s fiction represents an excellent extension from the writing task.

Band 3 Mark 30

SCRIPT D

Written Task Topic: Compare Explore the ways the characters are psychologically affected by events in *Lord of the Flies* by William Golding and *DNA* by Dennis Kelly

Presentation Topic: Presentation not completed

Answer:

DNA- a play written by Dennis Kelly about a group of adolescents who struggle through a situation which results in the death of an innocent boy due to bullying- strongly portrays how being placed in difficult situations can severely affect people's physiological state. Correspondingly, *Lord of the Flies*- a story from 1954 by William Golding showing the difficult times another group of adolescents face after they're stranded on an island- depicts this too.

For example, in DNA we see Lou repeatedly say the line "We're fucked". Though short, this sentence perfectly epitomises the fear and angst that Lou feels is controlling him as well as the other members of the group due to the fact they've got themselves involved with a terrible situation that is seemingly difficult to get out of.

Similarly, in the beginning of *Lord of the Flies*, Ralph says "Fat lot of good we are. Three blind mice. I'll give up". Though Ralph's character dramatically changes throughout the book, at first he can be perceived as quite a weak character, much like Lou, who doesn't have much faith in himself or those he is surrounded by.

Both characters are psychologically affected in a way where they become increasingly anxious and fearful, and though Lou stays the same throughout the book- not causing any drama and at least attempts to control his new mentality- Ralph, on the other hand is seriously affected and turns to violence and hatred as a method of dealing with the problems bestowed upon him.

In DNA, John-Tate states "I'm finding this all quite stressful, you know that? I'm under a lot of stress. You lot shouldn't put me under so much stress."

This quote intimately depicts the extent of the mental and henceforth psychological dispute that is happening within him. Due to the copious amount of stress put on him by the other characters in the beginning of the book, it seems as though he is transforming into a perceptibly impassioned and indignant person as he can't cope with the pressure that he is newly under.

Much like John-Tate, in the beginning on *Lord of the Flies* it is Jack who is made chief and consequently has to take charge of the group and face up to problems, regardless of whether he want to or not.

"I'm chief. I'll go. Don't argue."

This quote from Jack, though it does sound somewhat reluctant, portrays how he understands that he is to take control, and he does not want to be interfered with. His use of short sentences and the bluntness shows that he may perhaps be slightly troubled and anxious about what may lie ahead. He seems to want to be the one on the island who is the most dominant and the closest thing to an adult, but often he does seem to be quite sufficiently held back within himself.

Though John-Tate is a lot more forward with his feelings and confronts his group about the stress he's facing, Jack takes a more conscious approach but it is evident that both characters are under a tremendous amount of trepidation.

In DNA, Leah, a highly prominent character throughout has the stage direction 'She strangles herself, her face turning red'.

Needless to say, this action alone conveys the depths to which she has been psychologically affected. Leah is left causing harm and pain to herself purely to gain attention from those around her, in this case the boy she likes, Phil. Leah is isolated in a world where she doesn't particularly have many friends, and never seems to get the deserves attention from Phil, so she says and does ridiculous things to attempt to gain a reaction. As well as that, she is now faced with an exceptionally complex situation where she has been wrongly dragged into a crime, and due to this situation she ends up moving schools and leaving everything behind.

"Piggy said nothing but nodded, solemnly."

Though Piggy's actions aren't anywhere near as dramatic as Leah's, Piggy is the main target and victim in the book and is constantly being ignored, like Leah, and dragged around by everyone else, and due to this, both characters may be mentally affected by problems such as depression, self-consciousness, paranoia, and perhaps even insanity.

"We're in trouble now. We need your help. If you don't help us we'll kill you." This quote by Phil from DNA conclusively summarises the intensity that is brought on by being faced with such a difficult situation, and how quickly someone who was once just purely quiet and introverted can turn into someone who is undeniably terrifying and perhaps even psychotic.

Much like Phil, Jack from Lord of the Flies- a character who also started off as being somewhat withheld by himself and his conscience- shouts repeatedly throughout the book "*Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Spill her blood!*"

This sentence which oozes violence and hatred and complete insanity, much like the quote from Phil, perfectly portrays the how easily a person can elevate from being relatively normal and an unquestionable part of society, to someone who perhaps may never be able to be normal again due to the depths to which they've been psychologically affected. Jack went from being in the choir and a prefect to someone who is murderous and completely unjust in all his actions.

Overall, it is evident that both situations within DNA and Lord of the Flies- though completely different- have highly negative effects on the characters regardless of who they are and whether they began as normal people or complete savages from the start. There is a large list of psychological problems that are caused to the characters, but anxiety and fear are the predominant two that seem to encapture each and every character.

Moderator commentary:

This response maintains topic focus and comparison throughout. The opening paragraph establishes links and connections between the texts in a straightforward way. The candidate develops specific connections between the texts and illustrates these with textual references. The piece is written with flourish and there is ambition and flair in some of the writing. The piece is analytical in approach and arrives at some conclusion in response to the psychological damage that has been wrought. The candidate's work fulfils the descriptors of Band 3, a clear and developed response.

The absence of a presentation reduces the marks that could be awarded to the candidate as both elements of the task must be completed in order to qualify for the full range of marks available.

Band 4 Mark 23



GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.

© OCR 2015 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England.

Registered office 1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

ocr.org.uk/livingtexts