

GCSE ENGLISH LITERATURE

CPD AUTUMN 2017

EXEMPLAR RESPONSES (UNANNOTATED)

Romeo and Juliet extract question.

Look at how Juliet and her father speak and behave here. What does it reveal to the audience about their relationship at this point in the play.

In the play, Shakespeare presents the relationship between Juliet and Lord Capulet as forceful. In the play lord Capulet says "But fettle your fine joints 'gainst Thursday next, To go with Paris to St Peters Church, or I will drag thee on a hurdle thither. The use of the word "drag" suggests that Lord Capulet wants her to be scared of him. This could be so she will obey him so he can get what he wants This also suggests that Lord Capulet is very violent and is willing to do whatever it takes to get Juliet to marry Paris. This links to the historical context of the play because in the Elizabethan period, rich men/fathers chose their daughters husbands for them. A modern audience would feel shocked about how badly Juliet was treated and how bad the relationship is between her and her father.

In addition, in the Play, Shakespeare presents the relationship between Juliet and Lord Capulet as obliged.

Romeo and Juliet extract question.

Look at how Juliet and her father speak and behave here. What does it reveal to the audience about their relationship at this point in the play?

In the play, Shakespeare presents the relationship between Juliet and Lord Capulet as aggressive. In the play, Lord Capulet says "or I will drag thee on a hurdle thither." The use of the word "drag" suggests that Lord Capulet is threatening to physically harm Juliet and force her to marry Paris. This is reinforced earlier on in the play by the use of "How, how, chop-logic! What is this?" which suggests that Lord Capulet is shouting at Juliet trying to convince her that she has made the wrong choice and that he is very angry about it. Furthermore, this could also suggest that Lord Capulet has been violent in the past towards Juliet. This links to historical context because in the Elizabethan period women were not treated equally and did not have the same rights as men. This is how Juliet is being treated, she is not getting to pick the man she marries and is being forced into marriage at a very young age. This would make a modern audience feel shocked and angry about how Lord Capulet treats his daughter and how Lady Capulet treats his daughter and how Lady Capulet doesn't do anything about it. I think some people might feel really sorry for Juliet because she is being treated in such a horrible way and no one wants to defend or protect her but herself.

In the play, Shakespeare presents the relationship between Juliet and Lord Capulet as disrespectful. In the play Lord Capulet says "Hang thee, young baggage" disobedient wretch". This suggests that Lord Capulet does not care about Juliet's feelings towards Paris. The word "disobedient" suggests that Juliet is expected to follow and obey her father and his rules. This shows how all women are expected to be obedient and controlled by their husbands or fathers and are supposed to do whatever they are told. The use of the word "wretch" shows how Lord Capulet is used to calling Juliet and other women wretches and how that is what most women are known as when they disobey orders. This also links to the historical context of the Elizabethan women and how unequally they are treated because men could control their wives and daughters and could call them whatever they like and would get away with it. A modern audience would be shocked at the way Lord Capulet disrespects his own daughter.

In the play, Shakespeare presents the relationship between Juliet and Lord Capulet as demanding. In the play Lord Capulet says 'or never look at me in the face'. This suggests that Lord Capulet is not happy with Juliet and doesn't want her to speak to him or even look at him. The use of the word 'face' suggests that Lord Capulet doesn't feel proud of Juliet. As most fathers would think that their daughters are amazing and that their faces are beautiful but Lord Capulet doesn't. He thinks that even though Juliet is his daughter he doesn't think that she is great or pretty and so he doesn't want her to look at him. Furthermore, the use of the word 'never' shows that Lord Capulet does not care if Juliet is sad or angry but that he never wants her to have anything to do with him unless she is going to follow his orders.

Romeo and Juliet extract question.

Look at how Juliet and her father speak and behave here. What does it reveal to an audience about their relationship at this point in the play?

In the play, Shakespeare presents the relationship between Juliet and Lord Capulet as aggressive and controlling. In the play Lord Capulet says 'Or I will drag thee on a hurdle thither.' The use of the word 'drag' suggests that he's going to make her go to church to marry Paris whether she likes it or not. The word 'drag' also suggests he is prepared to do whatever it takes to get her to church even if it means harming Juliet. This could also suggest that he is very disrespectful of her feelings because he doesn't care about the fact she doesn't want to marry Paris because he's going to force her to anyway. Similarly, later on in the play this is reinforced by the use of the words 'disobedient wretch!' and 'get thee to church o' Thursday. Or never after look me in the face', which suggests that Lord Capulet is quite aggressive towards Juliet because he begins to shout abuse at her when she tries to express how she feels to him and refuses to do what he wants which makes him angry. This shows how he is an unsupportive father seen as he wants her to obey him and doesn't care about her opinion. This is unsurprising due to the historical context of the play because women were treated unfairly to men and were forced to do as they were told, no matter what their opinion was. This is shown in 'Romeo and Juliet' because Juliet is made to marry someone she doesn't want to and has no choice in the matter. Women in this time were disrespected. This would make a modern audience feel shocked by the way Juliet's father treats her because in the modern day, no woman is forced to marry or do something she doesn't want to and men care about a woman's feelings and opinions and are more respectful towards their decision therefore aren't so controlling and aggressive.

In the play Juliet says 'Good father, I beseech you on my knees, Hear me with patience but to speak a word'. The words 'Good father' suggests that Juliet really likes her father and believes he is good to her. This suggests that Juliet is quite content as she's being nice to her father even though he's extremely mad and aggressive towards her at this time. Furthermore this quote suggests that Juliet was trying her best to calm her father down which she may have hoped would make him be more understandable and would then change his mind about him wanting her to marry Paris. This would make the audience imagine that Juliet was a very well behaved child as she never spoke horrible to her father even in the most aggressive situations.

Romeo and Juliet essay question.

Even though Mercutio dies at the beginning of Act 3, he is very important to the play as a whole. Show how Mercutio could be shown to be important to the play as a whole.

Mercutio was important to the play because he was realistic. By this I mean that he didn't believe in 'Fate' or 'destiny', he believed that you find the right person after time. Romeo thinks that him and Juliet were destined to be together and it was love at first sight. Because of this, Mercutio mocks and teases Romeo about him and Juliet. This is important in the play because everyone believed they were destined to be together. where as Mercutio knew how love actually worked and evolved making him more realistic than the others. Even though Mercutio teased and mocked Romeo about his relationship, Mercutio takes a bullet and dies for Romeo, showing that, just because he made fun of him, doesn't mean he doesn't care. This happened in Act 3 when a fight broke out between the Capulets and Montagues. This resulted in Tybalt (Juliet's Cousin) having a showdown with Romeo. However when Tybalt was about to shoot Romeo, his best friend Mercutio, stepped in and took his place, suggesting that Mercutio was a very loyal and dedicated best friend towards Romeo.

Romeo and Juliet essay question.

Even though Mercutio dies at the beginning of Act 3, he is very important to the play as a whole. Show how Mercutio could be important to the play as a whole.

Mercutio is shown to be important in the play as he is Romeo's most loyal friend, he gives his life to protect him. Although he is a good friend to Romeo, he usually makes fun of him. For example, in Act 1, Scene 4 Romeo tells him about a troubling dream and Mercutio just mocks him, talking about how it was just Lady Mab coming into his dream and giving him strange fantasies. He is the opposite to Romeo who idealised love where Mercutio just wants sex.

Moreover, he's also important to the play and to Romeo because in Act 3 scene 1 he dies protecting Romeo. Romeo then gets revenge and kills Tybalt because he killed his best friend. Mercutio sacrifices himself so Romeo could live, this causes Romeo to owe him his life but that isn't that long. I feel that Romeo didn't only take his own life, because he lost Juliet but also because the guilt on Mercutio's death was getting too much for Romeo.

Furthermore, in act 2 scene 1 Romeo hides from his friends and apart from Mercutio they're concerned. Mercutio however, continues to mock him. He calls out asking him to come out, but he also mocks him asking him if he's hiding from his friends or from love. It's only later you realise he may have been hiding from both, because Mercutio loved Romeo enough to die for him and Romeo risked death to settle the score with Tybalt. They loved each other like brothers and even death didn't change that.

In Act 2 scene 4 he is told about Romeo being challenged to fight Tybalt and he was petrified for him. He takes Tybalt on saying how it would be the fight of a lifetime. I don't know if he meant it literally but he did end up dying. Mercutio loved Romeo, but Romeo didn't love Mercutio enough to tell him about the wedding. If they were such good friends, then surely Romeo could have trusted him enough to tell him about Juliet. Even if she was a Capulet.

Also, he continues to be important in the play because he isn't forgotten. His character was witty and funny. He was the nicest character. Juliet only was thinking about herself when she pretended to be dead, whereas Mercutio actually died. Moreover, she kills herself because she killed her love, whereas Romeo killed himself because he thought he'd lost another love, he now felt like he had three deaths upon his shoulders. However, I don't feel like Romeo felt as if her death was his fault, but he knew Mercutio's and Tybalt's were.

Furthermore, he was also important, because although he wasn't a main character he was the most likeable and the most memorable. This is why I feel Mercutio is important in the play.

Never Let Me Go

Friendship is a key theme throughout *Never Let Me Go*. One friendship which we see develop and grow throughout the novel is that between Kathy and Tommy. The friendship is obvious from right at the start of the novel when Tommy throws a tantrum on the football pitch. While Ruth is counting down to when he will start, Kathy seems notably worried about getting his poloshirt muddy. We understand that there is probably a deeper feeling towards him. This connection continues to grow at Hailsham with Tommy confiding seemingly everything with Kathy such as his talks with Miss Lucy about being creative. We assume that they would be a natural couple however it is Ruth who ends up going out with Tommy. This is what Kathy describes when she says 'see whatever damage she'd once done to us' in how Ruth has stopped her and Tommy from being together. The quote is however tinged with a sense of forgiveness in saying 'once done' suggesting that Kathy no longer holds it against Ruth – that it was done 'once' and is now well into the past. The idea of forgiveness will be discussed in more detail later.

Tommy's friendship with Kathy and him going out with Ruth is perhaps symbolic of a deeper message within the novel. Ishiguro uses their friendship to present the idea of being complicit or going along with something with which you don't really agree. Tommy and Kathy were obviously very close at Hailsham even well after leaving Tommy still remembers the 'secret talks [they] used to have' showing how they must have meant something to him at Hailsham. We assume therefore that Tommy wanted probably to be in a couple with Kathy however Ruth probably asked him first and he could not bring himself to say no. This shows, on a more **comprehensible** scale, the 'damage' and regrets that being pushed or complicit with things you don't want can have. The larger message of this is perhaps to do with the idea of human cloning and how, as is said in their visit to Madame, people want to dehumanise the clones so they can bring themselves to take their organs. While nobody really from the outside apart from the guardians is really described we may take it that many of them would be against using the clones yet none of them will say no to it. This is one of the characteristics of a dystopian novel. Presenting an idea that is present in society – people not saying no to things they don't agree with – and showing the damage this can cause through the storyline of the novel.

While Ruth seems in many respects to have spited and hurt Kathy they still remain close even up to the point where they complete. As Ruth needs completion, in one last act of true friendship, she tells Kathy to go out with Tommy. This is shown in the extract with, 'she [Ruth] wanted the best for us at the end.' While there seems a sense that they feel some spite towards her, as the quote suggests they recognise she behaved badly before, Kathy says she has got no anger left for her now. This presents the idea of forgiveness and how she could never truly bring herself to hate Ruth in spite of what she did.

Perhaps one reason for forgiving Ruth is that she still thought that there was chance of a **deferral** for the other two. While we may question whether she really thought this or whether it was her trying to allow herself to have some excuse and forgiveness for what she had done. We get the impression from the extract that Kathy believed the former when she says that things 'couldn't be repaired as easily as she had hoped.' Ruth thought they would have more time together and this is perhaps one way in which Kathy can forgive her. It is the donations process that is stopping them from being together.

This idea of compassion, love and friendship are all characteristics which ensure the reader comes away feeling that the characters are truly human and not just 'clones'. It makes Ishiguro's message even more powerful as he is able to convey it through characters which seem so real that the reader can almost share feelings with them. As we see Ruth complete and we know the same fate awaits Kathy and Tommy it makes the reader question to themselves if they could ever live in a society like

that. It is in this that Ishiguro has achieved the objective of the dystopian novel – to convince a reader the novel could be real and show them the horrors that can come if we allow them.

A Taste of Honey

At the start of the play 'A Taste of Honey', Helen (the mother) is portrayed as being a drunken middle aged lady who only cares about herself, we know this because she says "I've always done my best to forget that." This is said in context to Jo (The daughter) asking what day she was born.

This shows that Helen wants to forget the start of Jo's life, this shows that Helen only cares about herself.

Helen is also described as being a semi-whore and that Jo and Helen live off her immoral earnings, this shows she doesn't have a proper job and has not got a lot of money.

Helen is also portrayed to be a person who lives life to the full, Helen is a person in the play that is shown as doing something when she wants to do it. This is shown when Helen and Peter leave for the weekend and leave Jo to stay home alone on her own this shows she only cares about herself and will do something in the moment.

Towards the middle/end of the play Helen finds out that Jo is pregnant. This is one of the few times in the play Helen cares about others, She says to Jo "Don't make the same mistake I did" this is showing that Helen is caring about Jo at some stages in her life.

Helen is also caring towards Jo when she finds out that Jo is moving in with Geoffrey.

A Taste of Honey

In 'A Taste of Honey', a play by Shelagh Delaney, the character of Helen plays a huge role. At different points in the play, she shows different sides to her. Helen is portrayed as witty yet rude, selective and rude yet not hypocritical. Her character **differentiated**, relating a lot to who she speaks to.

Firstly, Helen is the mother of Jo, a young 16 year old of the 1950's and Helen isn't shown as the greatest of mothers. Helen is stated as an alcoholic semi-whore – immediately not the perfect role model – concerned **alot** about men, money and sexual relations. Similarly, she is shown as working class – specifically in the scene where daughter Jo finds a magazine which her mother has borrowed from downstairs. Jo quickly patronizes her stating she 'didn't think...she'd...buy it', this shows that even her daughter notices her mother's **mischevious** ways. This including Jo describing Helen's earnings as 'immoral'.

On the other hand, Helen is understanding and veers away from being hypocritical. Helen isn't oblivious to her mistakes and knows she has made them. Helen expects her daughter to learn from her mistakes rather than teaching Jo herself. This shows that Helen is depicted as a lazy mother. Though Helen understands that she has made mistakes, could easily fall back into traps she already has.

Thirdly, Helen is presented as scatter-brained and oblivious to the effect her words and actions have on others. To Jo's black boyfriend, Jimmy, Helen is extremely rude and racist about his culture. This may be due to her culture herself this being written in 1958. This is also highlighted when she talks to Geoff, Jo's homosexual friend as she is presented to have homophobic views.

However, with her husband Peter, Helen reveals a lot of lust and trust towards him. She also relies on him a lot. There are two different views given off by her relationship with Peter: It's for love or It's for money. Helen; at some times, is profoundly in love and wants to get married to Peter but however at times, such as when Peter is talking about the new house that they will live in Helen's attention seems to dwell into a want for luxury.

Relating back to a previous point, Helen can easily neglect or disrespect her daughter – not considering her feelings. Helen comfortably describes Jo's father as 'a rat', not seeing why this would upset Jo.

But Helen does show spurts of real affection towards her daughter, specifically for a short moment when talking about her **daughters** artistic talent but quickly tangents onto how sad she looks in a painting.

Helen's appearance is always important to her and this is shown throughout the play.. Repeatedly, Helen is found making herself look better for men – especially Peter. Even though throughout, she looks semi-drunk, she is still viewed as a pretty woman looking for her fancy men. In conclusion, Helen is viewed as a oblivious yet intelligent, neglecting character with hidden bursts of affection for her daughter but more for her men as they always come before Jo. She is realistic 1958's Mancunian **women** with stereotypical views.

The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night Time

At the start of the extract I can tell that Ed is trying to reassure and comfort Christopher, a quote for this would be "I'm sorry" "it's okay" "I didn't kill Wellington" "I know" So this shows Ed does care about how Christopher is feeling and **trys** to make him feel safe any way possible. Also after reading the book and finding out what happens, Ed says "I know" so this shows me that Ed knows the real culprit of who killed Wellington.

However after that comfort Ed does start to show that he does still care about him but he wants **christopher** to understand it **alot** better by putting it more sharp "Christopher you have to stay out of trouble ok?" "I didn't know I was going to get into trouble. I like Wellington and I went to say hello to him, but I didn't know that someone had killed him. " Just try to keep your nose out of other people's business" This shows me that Ed is trying to make Christopher not to ask random people questions, also it might be a way to make Christopher get off his tracks.

At one point in this extract Ed gets really offensive about making **christopher** stop trying to carry on I know this because of these quotes "Yes I know what you were saying but when someone gets murdered you have to find out who did it so that they can be punished" "It's a bloody dog Christopher, a bloody dog". So this chance to get offensive with what he is saying to him it might throw Christopher off his tracks.

Near to the end of the extract you can tell that now Ed really wants him to drop the act, I know this by these quotes "Leave it" "I wonder if the police will find out who killed him did punish the person" "I said leave it for **god's** sake". This shows me that Ed can be rough on **christopher** and also by this point in time Ed is being serious.

When ever Christopher asks Ed if he is sad about Wellingtons death he **replise** with this "Yes Christopher you could say that. You could very well say that" **emptying** that he is sad but it isn't only about the dog.

The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night Time

In the play, their relationship is shown in different ways, even contradicting each other, going from a bad and violent one to a relationship based on love and understanding.

Starting with the extract, the type of relationship shown at this point is quite bad knowing that Ed killed the dog Wellington we can deduce from the quotes "It's OK", "I know", that he **do** not even think that Christopher killed the dog because it was him who killed it. The word "OK" was used to transmit Christopher security and show that Ed **do** believe what Christopher says. The statement "I know" is very revealing at the **end-ish** part of the play and in some way he admits that he killed the dog. The quotation "Just try and keep your nose out of other people's business" shows that Ed is feeling **uncomfortable** with the conversation about who killed Wellington. He tries to make Christopher stay away from the case **to not discovered the murder his father**. Even more, he **sais** "Were you listening to what I was saying, Christopher?" To make sure that he said clearly his propositions, he was still insecure with himself because Christopher got involved in that, and he knew that Christopher **wont** give up. The quote **it's** a bloody dog, a bloody dog" make the same **function** as the last one mentioned, but "Leave it" shows **annoyement** from Ed, being fed up with his son's intentions, the same as "Leave it, for God's sake". But another relevant quote is "Yes, Christopher you could say that. You could very well that."

That quotation is said in a sarcastic mode, that Christopher could not understand, that is shown by the repetition of the phrase, even "very" shows the sarcasm of the sentence.

When I specified at the **begining** that their relationship **that** was quite in contrast I **ment**:

-There is a fight scene between them: "Ed grabs **Christopher** arm", "Christopher screams", "Ed shakes Christopher hard" etc. Which for me demonstrates a fairly aggressive relationship. The fact that Ed grabs his arm and only shakes him demonstrates that he could barely control his actions instead of just punching him, but this truly shows that Ed was out of control.

-In contrast with that, Ed, at the very end of the play in London tries to remake their relationship. "Ed bought Christopher a dog". This is very important for the readers because in the **play is** shown as a bad person, and how he tries to remake their relationship in a smart and emotional way. He killed a dog because of that he deserved pardon from his son.

-At the **begining** of the play Ed is show as a quite uninterested father. When Christopher was caught by a policeman, punched him and then went to **in comisary**, Ed went to take him home. The fact that Ed is **uncomprehensive** is shown when his son starts talking about stars and galaxies and "Ed says nothing". That quiet shows quite a lot of their relationship.

But he also seems to try to **apparent** interested with "Is that right?". **It does** not transmit fully interest, he could say that it is interesting but he said that.

Conclusion

Ed appears to me like a father that it is indeed caring of his son, loves him, etc. But the fact that his wife left him alone to take care of his son affected Ed until the point of being fed up of his son, which is not a normal thing from a parent. The lies that he told to Christopher were quite important, the supposed death of his mother, the fact that he killed Wellington just for jealousy. He tried to make out in relationship with Mrs Shears but wasn't **successful** and Ed killed the dog. So in my opinion their relationship isn't good along the play, only supposing that Ed changed after the end we could say that is good.

An Inspector Calls

Priestly presents Gerald as an eligible bachelor due to his father's name, which means he is quite a catch for the women around the town. However, his engagement to Sheila shows a more self-assured side as his parents don't approve of his marriage to Sheila, although he is an 'attractive chap' who has his pick of women.

His approving nature of Arthur Birling's comment on the worker's and how he refers to them shows he also has contempt for them, showing that he also believes in Capitalism. The audience's opinion of him becomes even more tarnished as his affair with Eva Smith is revealed.

It is clear that Eva Smith had more feeling for Gerald than he did for her and was quite "gallant" about the affair coming to an end. This depicts Gerald as unfaithful as he frequented where the "women of the town" ply their trade. Initially greatly upset by the news of one woman he had slept with, but later tries to justify his actions since he had practically paid her off to keep quiet, which would diminish the favour the audience had held him in for before, as the help he gave was short term. Rescuing her from sexual advances from a senior individual may have painted Gerald as somewhat hero but only to make her his mistress. Albeit he did face what he did honestly.

However, after his exit and return to announce to the Birling family that they had been "had" it is now evident that he'll become insensitive to the whole topic at hand, and instead searches for the Inspector's legitimacy. Coming back to say "the man wasn't a police officer" shows he wants to be back in the favour of Sheila and her family. However, Sheila has become empowered through the Inspector's visit and whether or not he was real does not matter any more. He is triumphant in the revelation and she is not.

This is clearly an escape route for Arthur Birling and immediately calls to verify and make "certain" that the Inspector was indeed a fraud. Since they now believe due to Gerald's announcement they no longer have to feel responsible for Eva Smith's death. To the audience it is clear that Gerald is part of the comp that remains unchanged after the event and still holds an un-malleable upper class mentality. Even believing Sheila would continue with the engagement after everything that had occurred.

Overall Gerald is presented as an individual who cares only for his own needs which may lead to charitable efforts with ulterior motives and also someone who does not recognize the enormity of Eva Smith's death as something he had to share the responsibility for. Pretending that the events would just disappear is the mistake that he makes as at the end of the novel the police call back to say there is a dead girl fitting the description in the "infirmary". Also Inspector Goole tells them they will learn their lesson in "blood, fire and anguish", foreshadowing the world war where many people lost property, wealth and titles.

An Inspector Calls

Gerald Croft is presented as an eligible bachelor who is confident and 'easy well-bred'. But he turns out to be an anti-hero who has, both good and bad qualities which get revealed throughout the play. Gerald Croft is an eligible bachelor who is the son of Sir George Croft and Lady Croft. He is an 'attractive chap' who is young, handsome and overall quite a catch. However, there are cracks in Gerald's story where it gets revealed that one summer Gerald 'hardly came near Sheila'. This leads to the revelation that Gerald had been disloyal and had an affair with Daisy Renton, who is also Eva Smith. Gerald refuses to admit to Inspector Goole that he had had an affair with Daisy Renton and also expects Sheila to help cover this affair up.

Through Inspector Goole we learn that Gerald met Daisy Renton in the palace bar, which is a place for 'women of the town'. Although Gerald went to this place, he rescued Daisy Renton from 'old man Meggarty' because she was not 'the usual type' which leads the audience to believe perhaps Gerald had gone to the Palace Bar more than once. Gerald installs Daisy Renton as his 'mistress' and becomes a sort of 'prince' for her. Daisy Renton, of course, falls in love with this 'knight in shining armour' but he later breaks her heart. Gerald admits Daisy was 'gallant' about it and knew 'the affair had to end' but the reality is Daisy Renton was devastated. Gerald gives Daisy 'money' to ease his guilty conscience but he just sees Daisy as a commodity to own and to exploit. Gerald is presented as shallow, a cheat and a man who exploits vulnerable women. Gerald then leaves the house for some 'air' in disgrace after he had just been humiliated in front of the whole Birling family.

Gerald returns to the Birlings triumphantly and 'excitedly' because he has information which can help win back the Birlings' affection. He exposes Inspector Goole as a fraud and is pleased by the Birlings' response when Arthur Birling says 'A fake!' and Sybil Birling says 'Didn't I tell you', although they are both pretending that they knew Goole was a fake. Gerald becomes so confident of his place that he 'cut in' and interrupts Arthur Birling to reassure him that he 'passed it off' and that there was no reason to fear over a scandal breaking out. Gerald agrees with Arthur and says 'we've been had'. Gerald is arrogant enough to think Sheila will continue with the engagement and that 'everything's all right now'. In the end Gerald, just like Arthur Birling and Sybil Birling, do not learn their lesson and will only learn their lesson in 'blood, fire and anguish', unlike Sheila and Eric Birling who have learnt their lesson and are truly sorry for what happened.

An Inspector Calls

As Gerald Croft comes from a wealthy upper class family, he is loved by Arthur Birling immediately and despite everything that is revealed about Gerald, Arthur still willingly accepts him into the family.

In Act 1, Gerald is presented as an eligible bachelor, who is the son of Sir George Croft and Lady Croft. They are a wealthy family, respected by all. However, as the Birlings are upper middle class, Gerald's parents don't approve of his engagement to Sheila. He is favoured by Arthur, who tells him that he is "just the kind of son-in-law I've always wanted". It is obvious here that Eric, Arthur's son is a disappointment to him. Sheila is considered as lucky to be engaged to Gerald as he is young, handsome and wealthy. It is clear that Gerald does genuinely love Sheila as he is upper class and she is middle class, so he has nothing to gain from this marriage. However, it is later revealed by Inspector Goole, that Gerald may not be as perfect as he appears to be. There had been a year when he hardly came near Sheila because he was at the Palace Bar, where the women of the town usually are.

Even though the evidence is against him, Gerald refuses to admit his affair with Daisy Renton in fear of losing Sheila and public humiliation. Gerald shares the same capitalist view of women as Arthur does. He objectifies them and expects Sheila to cover up his bad actions as she is his fiancée.

Through Inspector Goole, we learn about Gerald's affair with Daisy Renton. He now knows that he can't escape the truth so there is no option but to reveal his secret. Gerald meets Daisy at the Palace Bar, which makes us question his respectability as this is the place for the women of the town.

We ask why Gerald was with other women when he was with Sheila at the time. He tells us that he met Daisy when he rescued her from getting molested by Meggarty. He admits that he rescued her because she "wasn't the usual sort", which suggests that he sleeps with prostitutes often. He describes her as a "young and fresh and charming", with "soft brown hair" and "big dark eyes".

Gerald claims to have had no intention of sleeping with Daisy when he rescued her, but it is clear he has his mistress. Gerald soon becomes her "wonderful fairy prince", and Daisy falls in love with him. When his affair with her becomes inconvenient, he breaks her heart and sends her away with some money to ease his guilty conscience. Like Arthur Birling, Gerald sees Daisy as a commodity of his own, he can use to exploit for his own purposes. Here, Gerald is presented as a shallow cheat who exploits vulnerable women. It is clear that Gerald did genuinely care about Daisy as he defends their relationship when Sybil Birling calls it "disgusting". He is so humiliated that he has to leave the house for "air" in disgrace.

Gerald returns to the Birling's house triumphant and smug. He comes back looking to win back affection from Sheila and the other Birlings. He slowly says "The man wasn't a police officer", knowing that this news will save Arthur and Sybil the fear of having a public scandal. In fact, he is so confident that he's won back the Birlings' trust that he "cuts" Arthur off to tell him he is "dead certain" the Inspector was a fake. "They'd been had" and Gerald is positive that he has become their son-in-law again. He believes that now that they know the Inspector was a fake, he can resume his relationship with Sheila again.

By the end of the play, we learn that socialism has no impact on him.

The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde

In the novel Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde tension is created throughout the novel. In this essay I will explain and analyse the contexts of the novel in the extract and throughout the novel. Robert Stevenson wrote the novel in the Victorian era. Victorian London was very repressive and showed duality, secrecy and repressed religion. Stevenson represents this to the reader throughout the novel. Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde is a book based on the secrets of science and how Dr Jekyll (a scientist) finds a potion turning him into Mr Hyde.

In the extract it starts off calm and with little tension. Mr Utterson is sitting by his fireside one evening. He receives a visit from Poole. Already the tension rises as Poole is a Butler and it is unusual to have a Butler call on a Victorian gentleman. The tension rises more when Mr Utterson fires questions at Poole, 'What ails you?... Is the doctor ill?' This shows the reader panic and that there is a reason for panic something is not right. The reader feels the tension as it is not revealed what or why Poole has called. This creates tension as the reader has unanswered questions making it anxious or causing tension to build.

Stevenson's choices of words help tension build in the poem. Utterson is a calm, kind character however when the tension builds he is referred to as 'the lawyer'. Lawyers are seen as stern, serious characters immediately addressing tension in the novel. Stevenson uses the words 'he's shut up again'. Shut up suggests trapped and as there is no specific information on what has actually happened the reader begins to think the worst. Trapped is a very powerful dominant word making the reader feel tension. By the change of word choices the whole atmosphere of the scene changes. This creates tension in the chapter.

Poole says "Mr Utterson, Sir, I'm afraid" this causes a natural pause adding to the tension build up in the chapter. 'Afraid' is more powerful than 'scared' as 'Afraid' suggests an emotion whereas 'scared' suggests a feeling. As Poole says he is afraid the reader and Utterson are curious when the lawyer asks for an 'explicit' answer to why? Poole is said to have 'doggedly disregarding the question'. This fills the reader with unanswered questions creating tension in the novel.

Poole creates the tension as nothing is explicit. Utterson says 'there is something seriously amiss'. 'Something' could be anything and this creates tension as we automatically think the worst. Poole says 'foul play!' in a "hoarsely" voice. Foul play suggests cheating or something illegal and it had to be bad as his voice was affected by the emotional distress Poole was feeling. We do not know what could possibly be so bad and again we begin to wonder a terrible thing that could have happened which causes tension with secrecy. The last sentence suggests it is too bad to say and has to be seen otherwise the lawyer will not believe what he says. This creates tension as we really feel that it is the worst it can be.

Tension in the novel is everywhere (throughout the novel). In chapter two Mr Utterson gathers information about Hyde and he finds that in Dr. Jekyll's will everything is left to Hyde. Of what Utterson has found he starts to build a dark, dodgy and shady character. Mr Utterson describes Hyde as a 'fiend'. A case starts to build against Hyde, and a character starts to form. It is suggested that Hyde had forced himself into Jekyll's will. Tension builds as we as readers start to imagine the evil character of Mr Hyde. Utterson is scared by who Hyde is and this builds tension as Hyde is still unknown.

In chapter three Jekyll hosts a dinner with Utterson and friends. Utterson is still curious about Hyde so asks Jekyll of what he knows. Jekyll's 'face grew pale to the very lips'. This is suggesting that Jekyll is hiding something and we begin to think what link there is between Jekyll and Hyde. To go pale at the thought of Hyde is very big and there must be something to be unravelled. We do not know why which is why tension is caused. The link between Hyde and Jekyll wants to be known causing anxiousness and tension between the two characters. Back in chapter one we know that Hyde 'trampled calmly over the child's body'. If Hyde can do this we wonder why Jekyll has grown pale. This causes tension in the novel as Utterson can see this.

In chapter nine the tension gets very intense. Dr Lanyon sees something that is making the reader anxious. He sees Mr Hyde drinking a potion and turning into Jekyll. "He drank the potion... restored

from the dead Henry Jekyll". This is the climax of the novel and all of the unanswered has been answered. Tension is built up and up and now it is revealed, however we still wonder what happens next. The next chapters name makes us think there is more. "the last night'. This cause tension and we are anxious to know more.

In the novel tension is displayed throughout. There is a climax and the tension is from unanswered questions to abnormality. In the novel Stevenson represents tension in many ways throughout.