

2 Supported focus – Literary comparison and context

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 10 marks**

KEY WORDS comparative argument • close reading • translation
• relevance • evidence • argument

Objective

- Compare authorial choices across two selected literary works
- Explain how contexts shape meaning without reducing a work to biography


Original public practice; marks below are classroom self-check points, not official criteria.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Paper 2 compares two studied literary works in response to a question.

Use topic-led comparison: connect a specific choice in one work to a related or contrasting choice in the other.

A comparative argument explains a relationship through both texts. Use a shared question, then analyse a distinct choice in each text. “Both concern belonging” is a start, not a developed comparison. The original classroom context supplies no biography; analyse wording before suggesting a broader interpretation.



Original diagram of the worked relationship; read the full wording and qualifications.

Worked example from the native lesson: One narrator may withhold a character’s motives while another presents interior thought. Compare how these choices position readers to judge exclusion. Select precise evidence from the school’s texts and connect it to your thesis.

■ Complete original case context

Original classroom texts, written for this supplement. They are not school-selected assessed works.

Text A – The label Every morning I polished the brass plate beside the door. It carried my father’s name, and visitors asked for him even after I took charge of the shop. I answered their questions, found the parts, and wrapped each purchase. Still, at the door, they thanked the name on the plate. One afternoon I put a small card below it: “Ask for Leila.” The next visitor read the card aloud, hesitated, and then asked me where the hinges were. I left the brass plate shining. The card stayed too.

Text B – A space on the shelf (original poem) I cleared a place beside the cup, not where the cup had been. The shelf kept its old circle; the new wood still looked clean. By evening, two rings darkened it. I did not rub them out.

Context supplied for this exercise: both texts are contemporary original classroom writing in English. No author biography, translation history or evidence about a real society is supplied. Compare what the wording permits; do not invent historical facts. A real course comparison must use the school’s eligible studied works.

2 Practice

2.1 What is suitable evidence for Paper 2? Explain using the worked method. [1]

3 Exam-style questions

Use the complete original case context in section 1.

3.1 Compare how both texts represent making a place for a new identity. Write a complete comparative paragraph with quotations. [3]

3.2 Identify one contrasting reading that complicates a wholly optimistic interpretation of A, without inventing biography. [3]

3.3 Explain how you would transfer this method to two actual studied works and what must be verified before making historical-context claims. [3]

Solutions

Authored self-check guidance: accept equivalent correct methods and supported interpretations. The points check reasoning, not an official grade.

2.1 Specific authorial choices from two studied literary works linked to the question. One narrator may withhold a character's motives while another presents interior thought. Compare how these choices position readers to judge exclusion. Select precise evidence from the school's texts and connect it to your thesis.

Correct response linked to the given case.

3.1 Both texts make identity visible through a small addition rather than complete replacement. In A, "Ask for Leila" gives the worker a public name beside the inherited brass plate, turning unnamed labour into recognition. In B, "beside" rather than "where" preserves the old cup's place while creating another. A's hesitation before a visitor speaks Leila's name stages a social adjustment; B's two darkened rings make coexistence visible without a visitor. The difference is between recognition through language and belonging through shared space, not a simple opposition between keeping and destroying the past.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.

3.2 Leila must add a request to be recognised, and the visitor hesitates, so recognition is not automatic. Keeping the shining plate may suggest respect, but could also show the inherited name retains authority. Both readings need the supplied details and should remain interpretations, not claims about the author's family.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.

3.3 Choose a question-led comparison, select precise scenes and authorial choices from both works, and test a counter-reading. Verify editions, eligible works, reliable contextual evidence and the relevance of that context to textual details. A general biography cannot replace analysis.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.