New Specification

Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2018

English Literature

Unit 1

The Study of Prose

GEL11

[GEL11]
FRIDAY 18 MAY, MORNING

TIME

1 hour 45 minutes.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your Centre Number and Candidate Number on the Answer Booklet provided.
Answer **two** questions. Answer **one** question from Section A and the question set from Section B.
Spend 1 hour on Section A and 45 minutes on Section B.
You should **not** have a copy of your novel for Section A.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark for this paper is 60.
Section A is worth 40 marks.
Section B is worth 20 marks.
Quality of written communication will be assessed in all questions.

stemup.co.uk

Page Index to Questions

Question Number			Page Number
		Section A – Novel	
1	**Golding**	*Lord of the Flies*	3
2	**Hornby**	*About a Boy*	4
3	**Johnston**	*How Many Miles to Babylon?*	5
4	**Lee**	*To Kill a Mockingbird*	6
5	**Steinbeck**	*Of Mice and Men*	7
6	**Doyle**	*Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*	8
7	**Orwell**	*Animal Farm*	9
		Section B – Unseen Prose	
8		Unseen Prose	10

stemup.co.uk

Section A – Novel

Answer **one** question from this section.

1 Golding: *Lord of the Flies*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** Piggy, show how far you agree that Piggy is a **powerless victim**.

(b) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** the boys' behaviour on the island, show how far you agree that life on the island is **violent**.

stemup.co.uk

2 Hornby: *About a Boy*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** Will, show how far you agree that Will **changes** for the better.

(b) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** relationships in the novel, show how far you agree that some characters in the novel lead **isolated** lives.

stemup.co.uk

3 Johnston: *How Many Miles to Babylon?*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Frederick, show how far you agree that life is **difficult** for Frederick.

(b) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** the lives of Alexander and Jerry, show how far you agree that they join the army to **escape their home lives**.

stemup.co.uk

4 **Lee:** *To Kill a Mockingbird*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** the people of Maycomb, show that some of the people who live in Maycomb are treated **unfairly**. Who is treated most unfairly? Give reasons for your opinions.

(b) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** Aunt Alexandra, show how far you agree that Aunt Alexandra is **dislikeable**.

stemup.co.uk

5 Steinbeck: *Of Mice and Men*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** Crooks, show how far you agree that Crooks is a **powerless victim**.

(b) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** life on the ranch, show how far you agree that life on the ranch is **difficult**. Give reasons for your opinions.

stemup.co.uk

6 Doyle: *Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Paddy's relationships with others, show how far you agree that Paddy's mother is the **most important** person in Paddy's life.

(b) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Paddy's school life, show how far you agree that school is the main **influence** in Paddy's life.

stemup.co.uk

7 Orwell: *Animal Farm*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** Napoleon, show how far you agree that Napoleon is a **strong leader** of Animal Farm.

(b) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** the lives of the animals, show how far you agree that the animals continue to **believe** in the Revolution.

stemup.co.uk

Section B – Unseen Prose

Read carefully the extract below and answer the question.

You should spend 15 minutes reading the extract and 30 minutes writing your answer to the question.

8 Show how the writer of the extract engages the reader.

You should consider:

- the thoughts and feelings of the characters;
- the writer's use of language, structure and form.

Extract from: *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* by Mark Twain

She went to the open door and stood in it and looked out among the tomato vines and "jimpson" weeds that constituted the garden. No Tom. So she lifted up her voice at an angle calculated for distance and shouted:
"Y-o-u-u TOM!"
There was a slight noise behind her and she turned just in time to seize a small boy by the slack of his roundabout and arrest his flight.
"There! I might 'a' thought of that closet. What you been doing in there?"
"Nothing."
"Nothing! Look at your hands. And look at your mouth. What IS that truck?"
"I don't know, aunt."
"Well, I know. It's jam – that's what it is. Forty times I've said if you didn't let that jam alone I'd skin you. Hand me that switch."
The switch hovered in the air – the peril was desperate –
"My! Look behind you, aunt!"
The old lady whirled round, and snatched her skirts out of danger. The lad fled on the instant, scrambled up the high board-fence, and disappeared over it.
His aunt Polly stood surprised a moment, and then broke into a gentle laugh.
"Hang the boy, can't I never learn anything? Ain't he played me tricks enough like that for me to be looking out for him by this time? But old fools is the biggest fools there is. Can't learn an old dog new tricks, as the saying is. But my goodness, he never plays them alike, two days, and how is a body to know what's coming? He 'pears to know just how long he can torment me before I get my dander up, and he knows if he can make out to put me off for a minute or make me laugh, it's all down again and I can't hit him a lick. I ain't doing my duty by that boy, and that's the Lord's truth, goodness knows. Spare the rod and spile the child, as the Good Book says. I'm a laying up sin and suffering for us both, I know. He's full of the Old Scratch, but laws-a-me! he's my own dead sister's boy, poor thing, and I ain't got the heart to lash him, somehow. Every time I let him off, my conscience does hurt me so, and every time I hit him my old heart most breaks. Well-a-well, man that is born of woman is of few days and full of trouble, as the Scripture says, and I reckon it's so. He'll play hookey this evening, and I'll just be obleeged to make him work, to-morrow, to punish him. It's mighty hard to make him work Saturdays, when all the boys is having holiday, but he hates work more than he hates anything else, and I've GOT to do some of my duty by him, or I'll be the ruination of the child."
Tom did play hookey, and he had a very good time. He got back home barely in season to help Jim, the small colored boy, saw next-day's wood and split the kindlings before supper – at least he was there in time to tell his adventures to Jim while Jim did three-fourths of the work. Tom's younger brother (or rather half-brother) Sid was already through with his part of

stemup.co.uk

the work (picking up chips), for he was a quiet boy, and had no adventurous, troublesome ways.
While Tom was eating his supper, and stealing sugar as opportunity offered, Aunt Polly asked him questions that were full of guile, and very deep – for she wanted to trap him into damaging revealments. Like many other simple-hearted souls, it was her pet vanity to believe she was endowed with a talent for dark and mysterious diplomacy, and she loved to contemplate her most transparent devices as marvels of low cunning. Said she:
"Tom, it was middling warm in school, warn't it?"
"Yes'm."
"Powerful warm, warn't it?"
"Yes'm."
"Didn't you want to go in a-swimming, Tom?"
A bit of a scare shot through Tom – a touch of uncomfortable suspicion. He searched Aunt Polly's face, but it told him nothing. So he said:
"No'm – well, not very much."
The old lady reached out her hand and felt Tom's shirt, and said:
"But you ain't too warm now, though." And it flattered her to reflect that she had discovered that the shirt was dry without anybody knowing that that was what she had in her mind. But in spite of her, Tom knew where the wind lay, now. So he forestalled what might be the next move:
"Some of us pumped on our heads – mine's damp yet. See?"
Aunt Polly was vexed to think she had overlooked that bit of circumstantial evidence, and missed a trick. Then she had a new inspiration:
"Tom, you didn't have to undo your shirt collar where I sewed it, to pump on your head, did you? Unbutton your jacket!"
The trouble vanished out of Tom's face. He opened his jacket. His shirt collar was securely sewed.
"Bother! Well, go 'long with you. I'd made sure you'd played hookey and been a-swimming. But I forgive ye, Tom. I reckon you're a kind of a singed cat, as the saying is – better'n you look. THIS time."
She was half sorry her sagacity had miscarried, and half glad that Tom had stumbled into obedient conduct for once.
But Sidney said:
"Well, now, if I didn't think you sewed his collar with white thread, but it's black."
"Why, I did sew it with white! Tom!"
But Tom did not wait for the rest. As he went out at the door he said:
"Siddy, I'll lick you for that."

© The Adventures of Tom Sawyer by Mark Twain, 1876. Everything Mark Twain wrote that was published before 1923 is now in the public domain and therefore may be freely quoted or reproduced in its entirety, without permission or fees. http://www.marktwainproject.org/copyright.shtml

Glossary:

- roundabout – a short, tight jacket or coat formerly worn by men and boys
- truck – stuff
- spile – southwestern dialect for "spoil"
- hookey – to truant from school
- guile – a crafty deception
- sagacity – to have good judgment

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for.
In some cases, efforts to contact copyright holders may have been unsuccessful and CCEA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgement in future if notified.

229899

Surname	StemUp Model Solution
Answer booklet	Write the question number in the left-hand margin at the start of each answer.

Question number

1a

I agree to a large extent that Golding presents Piggy as a victim, and by the end of the novel he is undeniably a powerless one, dehumanised and killed by Roger's boulder. However, to call him simply "powerless" ignores the quieter power Golding gives him: the power of reason, of memory and of moral clarity. Piggy is physically weak but intellectually the strongest boy on the island, and Golding seems to suggest that it is precisely because this kind of power counts for nothing among savages that he becomes a victim at all.

From his first appearance Golding marks Piggy out as an outsider. The narrator never gives him a proper name, and the boys seize on the nickname he begs Ralph to keep secret. Ralph's betrayal, "He's not Fatty, his real name's Piggy!", is followed by the detail that Ralph "shrieked with laughter", and the cruelty is all the sharper because it comes from the boy who later becomes his closest ally. The name itself is a piece of grim foreshadowing: Piggy is linked from the start to the pigs the boys will hunt and slaughter. Golding piles up physical details, his "grubby" anorak, his asthma, his fatness and his thick glasses, so that the reader sees him as the boys do, as a body that cannot run, climb or fight. His non-standard speech, such as "I got the conch", also sets him apart from the confident public-school voices of Ralph and Jack, and he is often patronised and talked over. In this sense he is a victim of the group's contempt long before he is a victim of its violence.

Yet Golding is careful to show that Piggy is far from powerless in the early chapters. It is Piggy who recognises the value of the conch and tells Ralph how to blow it, so in a sense the whole democratic structure of the island begins with his idea. He takes names, worries about the littluns and insists on shelters and a

Question number

sundial. The narrator states plainly that "what intelligence had been shown was traceable to Piggy", and Ralph himself reflects that Piggy, for all his "ludicrous body", had "brains". Most importantly, his spectacles become the only means of making fire. Golding turns them into a powerful symbol of science and reason, and the irony is that the boy the others despise literally holds the means of their survival and rescue. Piggy has a kind of power, then, but it is borrowed by others and never respected for its own sake.

This is why the conch matters so much to Piggy. Because he cannot command attention through strength, he relies on the rule that whoever holds the conch may speak. Golding repeatedly shows the limits of this power. In the assemblies Piggy clutches the shell while the others jeer, and Jack's dismissive "Shut up, Fatty" in the very first meeting shows how easily rules can be brushed aside. The breaking of one lens when Jack hits him, followed by the theft of the glasses in a night raid, is presented as a turning point: Piggy is left half blind, and the thing that gave him value has been taken by force. Golding's structure makes his decline mirror the decline of civilisation itself.

There is, however, a moment where Piggy is far from a passive victim. After Simon's death he tries to rewrite events, insisting that it was an accident and that Simon "asked for it". This could be read as a failure of moral courage, or perhaps as the desperate rationalising of a boy who cannot bear to face what the group, including himself and Ralph, has become. Either way, it complicates the idea of Piggy as an innocent figure, and suggests that even reason can be used to hide from the truth.

His final scene is arguably the moment when he is at his most courageous and his most powerless at once. Determined to confront Jack, he declares that he will go

Question number

to him with the conch in his hands, and at Castle Rock he asks the tribe, "Which is better, to have rules and agree, or to hunt and kill?" The balanced rhetorical questions show Piggy at his most articulate, appealing to the ideals of order and law. Golding, though, answers him not with words but with violence. Roger, "with a sense of delirious abandonment", releases the rock, and Piggy "fell forty feet". The cold, almost clinical description of his body, his "arms and legs twitched a bit, like a pig's after it has been killed", completes the link set up by his nickname. At the same instant, "the conch exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist", so Golding makes the death of Piggy and the death of democracy a single event.

Finally, Golding restores to Piggy the dignity the boys denied him. In the last chapter Ralph weeps for "the end of innocence, the darkness of man's heart, and the fall through the air of the true, wise friend called Piggy." The adjectives "true" and "wise" are a final judgement that overturns the mockery of the opening.

In conclusion, I largely agree that Piggy is a victim: he is mocked, excluded, robbed and finally murdered. However, I do not fully agree that he is powerless. His intelligence, his spectacles and his faith in the conch make him the moral and practical centre of the island. Golding's tragedy is that this power is real but fragile, and that once fear and savagery take hold, a society that despises reason will destroy the very person who could have saved it.

Ib

I agree that life on the island becomes overwhelmingly violent, but Golding does not present it as violent from the start. Instead he structures the novel as a gradual descent, in which play turns into ritual, ritual into hunting and hunting into murder. The violence is presented less as something done to the boys by the

Question number

island than as something that grows out of the boys themselves, and this is what makes it so disturbing.

At first the island is presented as a paradise and a playground. Ralph stands on his head with delight, the boys swim in the lagoon and the expedition up the mountain is described as a kind of adventure story; the boys even compare their situation to adventure stories such as "Coral Island". Golding's imagery is bright and full of colour, and the early mood is closer to a game than to anything violent. The conch, the assemblies and the plan to keep a signal fire suggest an attempt to build an orderly little Britain. The keyword of this early world is order, and Ralph's remark that they will have fun until the grown-ups fetch them shows how innocent their expectations are.

Yet Golding plants the seeds of violence even here. When Jack first finds a piglet caught in the creepers he raises his knife but cannot bring himself to strike, "because of the enormity of the knife descending and cutting into living flesh". The noun "enormity" shows that, at this stage, killing is still unthinkable. Jack's promise that next time there will be no mercy, however, is a clear piece of foreshadowing. In chapter four Roger throws stones at the littlun Henry but deliberately misses, because round the child was "the protection of parents and school and policemen and the law." Golding presents civilisation as an invisible barrier that holds back violence, and the reader senses that this barrier is weakening.

The first successful hunt marks a turning point. The hunters return chanting "Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Spill her blood." The repetitive, rhythmic imperatives turn killing into a song, and Jack is excited and boastful about the blood. Golding shows how quickly violence becomes thrilling and addictive. At the same moment

Question number

the signal fire has gone out and a ship has passed, so the structure of the chapter sets violence directly against rescue. When Jack hits Piggy and breaks one lens of his glasses, the violence is turned for the first time against one of the boys, and it damages the very symbol of reason and hope.

The violence then spreads beyond the hunters. In the mock hunt the boys pretend that Robert is the pig, and the game becomes frightening as "Robert was screaming and struggling with the strength of frenzy." Even Ralph joins in, and Golding writes that "the desire to squeeze and hurt was over-mastering". This is a crucial moment: if Ralph, the novel's figure of decency, can feel this urge, then violence is presented as part of human nature rather than the vice of a few bad boys. Jack's suggestion that next time they could use a real littlun is said half as a joke, but it shows how close the line between play and murder has become.

The death of Simon is the climax of this process. During the storm the boys dance and chant "Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!", and when Simon stumbles out of the forest to tell them the truth about the beast, they mistake him for it. Golding's description is shockingly animal: there were "no words, and no movements but the tearing of teeth and claws." The boys have become a single predator, losing language and individuality at once. The tragedy is heightened by irony, because Simon is the one boy who has understood that the beast is "only us", and he is killed by the very savagery he has recognised.

By the final chapters, violence has become deliberate and organised. Roger, who once threw stones to miss, now kills Piggy "with a sense of delirious abandonment", and the explosion of the conch "into a thousand white fragments" shows the destruction of order. Jack's triumphant "See? See? That's what you'll get!" shows no guilt at all. The last chapter turns Ralph himself into prey: the

Question number

hunters set the island on fire and Roger has sharpened a stick at both ends, an image that hints at the fate of the pig's head on the stick and suggests Ralph's head is meant for the same end.

However, Golding does offer some evidence that life on the island is not only violent. The friendship between Ralph and Piggy, Simon's kindness to the littluns and the boys' early hope of rescue show other possibilities. The arrival of the naval officer, who sees only "fun and games", also reminds us that the boys are children. Yet this ending is deeply ironic: the officer is himself part of an adult war, and the island's violence is presented as a small-scale version of the world beyond it.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that life on the island is violent, though Golding shows it becoming so rather than being so from the beginning. By tracing a structured decline from hesitant hunting to ritual murder, and by allowing even Ralph to feel the urge to hurt, Golding suggests that violence is not an accident of circumstance but something waiting inside human nature, held back only by fragile rules.

2a

I largely agree that Will changes for the better, but Hornby presents this change as slow, reluctant and incomplete rather than a sudden conversion. Will begins the novel as a man who has deliberately arranged his life so that nothing and nobody matters to him, and he ends it as someone who is "involved" in other people's lives. Hornby's comedy, however, keeps reminding us that Will's selfishness never entirely disappears, which makes his growth more believable.

At the start Hornby presents Will as shallow and self-centred through a satirical close third-person narration that sits inside his head. Will lives off the royalties of

Question number

a Christmas song written by his father, so he has no job and no responsibilities. He measures his own worth by how "cool" he is, and he even awards himself points for having money without working for it, "he awarded himself an extra five points for not having to work at all for it". The game-like scoring system shows how he turns his whole life into a kind of private quiz, judging surfaces rather than substance. His attitude to his friends John and Christine and their baby is contemptuous: he views them as "brain-washed" by parenthood, and Hornby's irony lets the reader see that it is Will, not them, whose life is empty.

Will's relationships with women at this stage are equally selfish. When he discovers that Angie is a single mother he wants to "push the table over and run", and yet he soon realises that single mothers might be the perfect partners for a man who wants no commitment. Hornby presents his invention of an imaginary son, Ned, in order to join SPAT as both absurd and disturbing. The comic detail he puts into the lie shows his creativity, but the purpose is cynical: he wants "bright, attractive, available women". Even Fiona's suicide attempt is first experienced by Will as a dramatic event, and he thinks that what Fiona does is "her lookout". He decides the "most interesting thing about her was her suicide attempt", a line that is funny in its honesty but chilling in its lack of empathy.

The turning point comes through Marcus, and Hornby's structure is crucial here. The novel alternates chapters between Will's and Marcus's points of view, so the reader sees Marcus's loneliness before Will does, and then watches Will slowly catch up. At first Will sees Marcus and Fiona as "good deeds" replacing the "soup kitchens" he never visits, which suggests his kindness is still about making himself feel better. But as Marcus starts turning up at his flat after school to watch television, the visits become part of "the fabric of his day". The metaphor suggests something woven into him rather than added on, and it marks a shift from

Question number

treating people as entertainment to treating them as part of his life.

Will's growing protectiveness shows real change. He apologises, "I'm sorry, Marcus. I was being dim", which is striking from a man who rarely admits fault. When he sees boys throwing sweets at Marcus he is angry, and he buys him new trainers so that he will fit in. Hornby is careful to make this ambiguous: the trainers are stolen from Marcus almost immediately, and Will's instinct is to solve problems with money and image, the only tools he understands. Yet his frustration with Fiona, "You haven't got a clue, have you?", shows that he now sees Marcus's unhappiness more clearly than Marcus's own mother. Will's insight that "Marcus needed help to be a kid, not an adult" is perhaps his most mature moment, because it shows him thinking about someone else's needs rather than his own comfort.

His love for Rachel completes this change. The fact that falling for her takes him "completely by surprise" suggests that he has been changed without fully noticing it. Rachel's description of him, "You're involved, and you care, and you understand him, and you worry about him", uses a list of verbs that would have been unthinkable for the Will of the opening, and it is significant that the judgement comes from an outsider, as if Hornby wants to confirm the change objectively.

However, Hornby does not allow Will to become a saint. He still thinks that "No problem was his problem", he is unwilling to deal with Fiona's depression, and he finds her sadness like something you could be "dragged under" by. When Suzie confronts him about Ned, he runs from responsibility, and he even lets Rachel believe Marcus is his son, teaching Marcus that lying can be useful. These moments suggest that his old habits remain.

Question number

In conclusion, I agree that Will changes for the better, but only partly and against his own will. Hornby presents him moving from a man who sees himself as an island to someone who accepts that other people, with all their mess and clutter, give his life meaning. The comedy and the setbacks make this change convincing, and Hornby seems to suggest that becoming a better person is less a dramatic transformation than a gradual willingness to care.

2b

I strongly agree that several characters in About a Boy lead isolated lives, most obviously Will, Marcus and Fiona. However, Hornby presents isolation as something different for each of them: for Will it is a choice, for Marcus it is a burden imposed by others, and for Fiona it is a kind of illness. The novel's structure moves all three from isolation towards connection, suggesting that Hornby sees human relationships, however messy, as the answer to loneliness.

Will's isolation is presented as deliberate and even proud. Hornby makes much of the idea of men as islands, and Will sees himself as one: self-sufficient, free and untouched by other people's problems. Because he lives off his father's royalties he has no colleagues and no routine, and he fills his days with small activities, measuring time in units. The comic precision of this system shows how empty his life really is, though Will himself cannot see it. Hornby presents him as someone who believes he can "peek over the fence at other people's lives" without ever climbing over. The image of the fence is revealing: it suggests a safe barrier between himself and the world. He ends relationships when women want something more "solid", and he recoils from the thought of children because of the "Clutter!" they bring. The exclamation captures his horror at any kind of mess or commitment, and Hornby gently mocks him for it.

Question number

Yet Will is not completely alone. He has short relationships, he visits John and Christine, and they even ask him to be godfather to their second child. Hornby shows, though, that these connections are shallow: Will does not want the responsibility and judges their lives as dull. His isolation is therefore less about being physically alone than about refusing emotional involvement, and that is arguably more serious.

Marcus's isolation is very different because he wants to belong but cannot. Hornby uses his chapters to show the world from the viewpoint of a twelve-year-old who has just moved from Cambridge to London and does not understand the rules of his new school. He is bullied, called "weird" and largely ignored, and he does not tell anyone what is happening. The description of him feeling himself "floating away from everyone" is a powerful image of loneliness, suggesting a boy drifting with nothing to hold on to. His innocent habits, such as singing aloud without realising it, are presented with comic sympathy, so the reader laughs but also feels protective. His father lives in Cambridge with a new partner, so Marcus faces the consequences of his mother's depression alone, and the burden of caring for her makes him isolated even within his own home.

Fiona's isolation is perhaps the most painful in the novel. As a single parent struggling with depression, she seems to have nobody to support her, and Hornby presents her suicide attempt on the day of the duck incident as the result of a loneliness so deep that even her love for Marcus cannot reach it. Hornby handles this through Marcus's shocked perspective, which makes the event more distressing because the reader shares a child's confusion. The group SPAT, Single Parents Alone Together, also shows that isolation is a shared experience: the name itself is a paradox, uniting people through the very fact that they are alone.

Question number

However, Hornby balances this by showing how relationships gradually break down isolation. Suzie takes charge when Fiona is taken to hospital and looks after Marcus. Will and Marcus form an unlikely friendship built on afternoon television and conversations about music and clothes. Ellie, the rebellious older girl at school, gives Marcus a new kind of confidence, and Will's Christmas present of a Nirvana CD helps Marcus keep that friendship. Will also falls in love with Rachel, which takes him "completely by surprise", and he finds himself involved with her son Ali too. Hornby presents these connections as untidy and often comic, but they work. Even Fiona benefits, since Will's advice helps her to understand her son's behaviour, so the friendship spreads outwards rather than staying between two people.

The ending reinforces this theme. Marcus comes to realise that relying on just one person, his mother, is not safe, and that he needs a wider network of people around him. Will, meanwhile, has moved from his island into a web of relationships with Marcus, Fiona, Rachel and Ellie. Hornby does not offer a fairy-tale ending, since Fiona and Will never become a couple and Fiona's problems are not solved, but the characters are less alone than they were.

In conclusion, I agree that some characters lead isolated lives, especially at the start. Through contrasting viewpoints, comic irony and powerful images of fences, islands and floating, Hornby presents isolation as a common modern condition. Yet the novel's movement is towards connection, and Hornby seems to suggest that no one, not even Will, can truly live as an island.

3a

I largely agree that life is difficult for Frederick, particularly within his marriage and his family. Johnston presents him as a lonely, gentle man trapped in a cold household, dominated by his wife and kept at a distance from the son he loves.

Question number

However, Frederick is not presented as entirely miserable: he finds real satisfaction in his land, his horses and his routines, and these give his life a quiet dignity. His difficulty lies less in his circumstances than in his relationships.

It is important that we see Frederick only through Alexander's eyes. The novel is a first-person retrospective narrative, told by Alexander as he waits in a cell for his own execution, so Frederick is filtered through the memory of a son looking back on a strange and unhappy childhood. This narrative method makes Frederick seem distant and slightly mysterious, glimpsed at the edges of scenes rather than at their centre, which itself suggests how marginal he is within his own home.

The clearest source of difficulty is his marriage to Alicia. Johnston presents it as loveless and full of tension. Alicia does not seem to enjoy his company and does not want him to touch her, and meals at the house are often formal and silent, conducted with exaggerated politeness that barely hides hostility. Alexander describes his parents almost as if they are performers acting out a marriage for an audience, and this sense of theatre suggests that nothing between them is genuine. Alicia's sharp, cutting remarks and Frederick's mild, weary replies show the imbalance of power: she bullies and he endures. The reader may feel that Frederick has long since given up trying to win her affection, and it is a sign of his patience that he rarely seems to retaliate.

His relationship with his son is also made difficult by Alicia. She keeps Alexander educated at home rather than at school, partly, it seems, so that she will not be left alone with her husband. Frederick suggests that Alexander should go to school and meet other "chaps", a gentle, old-fashioned word that shows his well-meaning but awkward attempts to give his son a normal life. He is overruled. Similarly, when Alicia takes Alexander on a trip to Europe, Frederick is left behind, and his

Question number

exclusion from this important part of his son's growing up emphasises his isolation. Even his attempts to talk to Alexander seem to annoy Alicia, as if any closeness between father and son is a threat to her.

The war brings his difficulties to a crisis. Frederick wants Alexander to stay at home and look after the estate, but Alicia is determined that he should go and fight. In the cruellest moment of the novel, she reveals to Alexander that Frederick is not his real father, and when Alexander asks about the real man she answers casually, "Oh, he's dead. Long since". The flat, dismissive tone of this reply makes it shocking. For Frederick the revelation is devastating even though he is not present, because the one relationship that gave him purpose is undermined. Johnston leaves the reader to imagine his pain, and the restraint makes him all the more sympathetic.

However, Johnston also presents parts of Frederick's life that are not difficult. He is described as a "man of method", and he seems to take comfort in order and routine. He is devoted to his estate and insists that "the land is our most important asset". His long speeches to Alexander about how the land must be cared for, with their repeated warnings about what must never be done to it, show a deep and almost spiritual attachment. In these moments he seems content and even wise, as though the land gives him the loyalty that his wife withholds. He also enjoys hunting and horses, and his solitude does not always seem unwelcome. Some readers might feel that Frederick has chosen to retreat into his work as a way of coping, which suggests resilience rather than simple suffering.

Frederick's attempts to connect with Alexander are also among the most moving parts of the novel. Their conversations about horses and the land, and the quiet, private farewell before Alexander leaves for the war, suggest a bond that survives

Question number

despite Alicia. Whether or not he is Alexander's biological father, Frederick behaves as a true father in a way that Alicia never behaves as a loving mother. Johnston may be suggesting that fatherhood lies in care rather than blood.

In conclusion, I agree that life is difficult for Frederick, mainly because of his cold marriage, his exclusion from his son's life and the final cruelty of Alicia's revelation. Yet Johnston also gives him consolations in the land, his routines and his love for Alexander. Through Alexander's restrained, retrospective narration, Frederick emerges as a quietly tragic figure, a decent man whose life is made hard not by hardship but by the people closest to him.

3b

I partly agree that Alexander and Jerry join the army to escape their home lives, and this is truer of Alexander than of Jerry. Johnston presents Alexander's enlistment as a flight from a suffocating household and from a shattering revelation about his identity, whereas Jerry's reasons are more practical, political and bound up with his family. The irony at the heart of the novel is that both boys hope the army will bring freedom of some kind, yet it brings them only a crueller version of the class divisions and control they knew in Ireland.

Johnston presents Alexander's home life as lonely and claustrophobic. He is the only child of a cold and unhappy marriage, raised in the big house and taught at home rather than at school, with no friends of his own class. His mother, Alicia, is presented as manipulative and possessive, and his father, Frederick, as gentle but powerless. Because the novel is narrated by Alexander himself, looking back from a cell as he awaits execution, the reader experiences this childhood through his restrained, detached voice. The very coolness of the narration suggests a boy who has learned to hide his feelings in order to survive in a house where emotion is

Question number

dangerous.

His friendship with Jerry is his one real escape. Jerry is everything Alexander's world is not: Catholic, poor and lively, belonging to the tenant class rather than the landowning Anglo-Irish gentry. Their swimming, riding and racing of horses together are described with a freedom and joy rarely found elsewhere in the novel. Alicia forbids the friendship because Jerry is not a suitable companion for a gentleman, and Johnston uses this to show how class rules imprison Alexander even at home.

The decisive push comes from Alicia. When war breaks out she is keen for Alexander to enlist, while Frederick would rather he stayed to look after the estate. To end the argument, she tells Alexander that Frederick is not his real father, and when he asks about the man, she replies, "Oh, he's dead. Long since". Johnston presents this revelation in a few flat, careless words, which makes it all the more brutal. Alexander's decision to enlist immediately afterwards seems to be a desperate escape, not only from his home but from a family that is no longer what he believed it to be. In this sense I strongly agree that he joins the army to escape. However, it is also an act of obedience to his mother and perhaps a way of avoiding being thought a coward, so his motives are mixed.

Jerry's home life is presented very differently. He comes from a poor family, has gone to an ordinary school and has worked from an early age, so he has none of Alexander's comfort. Yet Johnston suggests that Jerry does not simply want to run away. He is presented as a dreamer who is excited by horses and adventure, but also as someone with clear reasons. He wants money to support his family, and his father has already gone to the war, so Jerry is in a sense following in his footsteps. Most strikingly, he says he wants to learn how to use a gun so that one

Question number

day he can use it in the fight for Irish freedom from what nationalists saw as "slavery". The irony is sharp: Jerry joins the British Army in order to learn skills that he hopes to use against Britain.

Johnston also presents Jerry's enlistment as a trigger for Alexander's. The news that Jerry has joined up gives Alexander another reason to go, suggesting that the friendship is as important a motive as the escape from home. Alexander perhaps imagines that in the army they could finally be together, away from Alicia's disapproval.

The army, however, offers no escape. Johnston structures the second half of the novel to show the same divisions repeated more harshly. Alexander is an officer and Jerry a private, so their friendship is still forbidden, now by Major Glendinning, who represents the cold authority of the British officer class. When Jerry goes missing to search for his father, whom his mother fears is lost, he is arrested and court-martialled as a deserter. The duty he feels to his family, the very thing he never escaped, leads to his death sentence. Alexander's final act, shooting Jerry himself in the cell before the firing squad can, is the tragic climax, an act of love that destroys them both.

In conclusion, I agree to an extent that the boys join the army to escape, but this applies mostly to Alexander, whose home life is cold and whose identity is suddenly shattered. Jerry's reasons are more complex: money, family loyalty, adventure and Irish politics. Johnston's bleak irony is that neither boy escapes anything. The class barriers and family ties they carry with them follow them to the trenches, and the army becomes a more deadly version of the world they left behind.

Question number

4a

Lee presents Maycomb as a town that prides itself on courtesy and Christian decency, yet treats its most vulnerable people with a quiet, habitual cruelty. Boo Radley, Mayella Ewell and Dolphus Raymond all suffer from gossip, prejudice or neglect, but in my opinion Tom Robinson is treated most unfairly, because the injustice done to him is not merely social but legal and fatal, and it is carried out by the whole community rather than by a few individuals.

Boo Radley is the first victim Lee introduces, and his treatment is presented through the distorting lens of childhood imagination. Scout's narrative voice, looking back as an adult, reports that he was a "malevolent phantom", a phrase that turns a real, damaged man into a ghost story. Lee's comic list of the crimes blamed on him, from frozen azaleas to mysterious nocturnal events, shows how the town uses Boo as a scapegoat for anything it cannot explain. The children's games, in which they act out his life and try to make him come out, are funny on the surface, but Lee invites the reader to feel their unkindness once Boo's gifts in the knot-hole reveal his gentleness. When Nathan Radley fills the hole with cement, claiming the tree is dying, Jem's tears suggest that even a child understands a lifeline has been cut. Boo is treated unfairly by his own family as well as by the town, kept hidden for years as though he were a source of shame.

Mayella Ewell is presented as a victim in a different way. As a member of a family described as the "disgrace of Maycomb", she is despised by white society and feared or pitied by the black community, so she belongs nowhere. Lee uses the detail of the red geraniums in slop jars in the Ewell yard, tended as carefully as Miss Maudie's flowers, to suggest a buried longing for beauty and dignity in a girl who has been given neither. In court, she believes Atticus is mocking her when he calls her "Miss Mayella", which shows that she has never been treated with ordinary respect. Scout's reflection that she must be the loneliest person in the

Question number

world, lonelier even than Boo, links the two characters and shows how Maycomb's rigid hierarchy isolates people at both ends of the social scale. However, Mayella is not purely a victim: her false accusation destroys an innocent man, and Lee makes the reader hold sympathy and condemnation together.

Dolphus Raymond, who chooses to live among the black community, reveals how Maycomb punishes anyone who crosses its boundaries. He pretends to be a drunk, sipping Coca-Cola from a paper bag, so that the town has an explanation it can accept for his way of life. Lee uses this deception to expose the absurdity of a society that would rather believe a man is a drunkard than accept that he simply prefers the company of black people.

Nevertheless, Tom Robinson's treatment is the most unjust, and Lee structures the novel to make this clear. The trial is placed at the centre of the book, and its long, detailed courtroom scenes slow the narrative so the reader cannot escape the evidence. Atticus shows that Mayella's injuries were inflicted by a left-handed man and that Tom's left arm is useless, crippled in a cotton gin accident. The physical fact of the damaged arm becomes a powerful symbol: Tom is literally incapable of the crime, yet the jury convicts him. His innocence is also revealed through his own words. When he admits that he felt "right sorry" for Mayella, the courtroom turns against him, because a black man pitying a white woman upsets the town's sense of order. Lee's irony here is sharp: Tom's kindness is the very thing that condemns him.

Lee also presents the unfairness of Tom's treatment through the reactions of the children. Jem is certain the verdict will be not guilty, and the repeated word "guilty" as each juror is polled falls on him like a series of blows. Atticus's explanation that in Maycomb's courts the white man always wins against the

Question number

black man's word, however ugly that fact may be, shows that the injustice is systemic rather than accidental. The jury's long deliberation might suggest a small shift in attitudes, but it does not save Tom.

The ending of Tom's story makes his treatment worse still. He is shot many times while trying to escape from prison, and the town's response is dismissive, treating his death as typical behaviour rather than as the act of a desperate man who had lost faith in white justice. Mr Underwood's editorial compares his death to the senseless killing of songbirds, which connects Tom directly to the novel's central symbol. Atticus tells the children it is a sin to kill a mockingbird, because mockingbirds do nothing but make music for others, and Tom, who helped Mayella with her chores for nothing, is clearly one of the novel's mockingbirds.

Boo, too, is presented as a mockingbird, and when Scout agrees that exposing him would be like shooting one, Lee shows that he at least is protected in the end. Scout stands on the Radley porch and sees the street from his point of view, fulfilling Atticus's advice to climb into another person's skin. Tom is given no such protection. For this reason I believe Lee presents him as the person treated most unfairly in Maycomb: he is innocent, kind and powerless, and the whole town, through its courts, its jury and its silence, allows him to be destroyed.

4b

At first Lee presents Aunt Alexandra as a thoroughly dislikeable figure: snobbish, rigid and cold towards the children. However, because she is seen entirely through Scout's eyes, the reader gradually realises that this portrait is biased, and by the end of the novel Lee reveals a loyal, brave and even tender woman. I agree that she is dislikeable for much of the novel, but I think Lee deliberately complicates that judgement so that the reader, like Scout, learns to see her more fairly.

Question number

Lee's first descriptions are memorably hostile. Scout compares her aunt to Mount Everest, saying she was "cold and there". The simile is comic, but it captures how distant and immovable Alexandra seems to a child: she is a huge, unavoidable presence who offers no warmth. The adult narrator also tells us that Alexandra fitted into Maycomb's world like a hand into a glove, but never into the world of Jem and Scout. This contrast is important because it links her with the town's values rather than with the children's innocence, so from the outset the reader is positioned against her.

Her dislikeable qualities are shown most clearly in her obsession with heredity. Scout explains, with gentle mockery, that Aunt Alexandra believed every family had a "Streak", and she judges people by their ancestors rather than by their actions. Lee uses Jem's ironic definition of "fine folks", that the longer a family has squatted on one piece of land the finer it is, to expose how foolish these standards are. When Alexandra persuades Atticus to lecture the children on their gentle breeding, the scene collapses: Scout cries, and Atticus himself tells them to forget it. Lee's structure here undermines Alexandra's beliefs by showing that even her brother cannot take them seriously.

Her snobbery becomes crueller when it affects other people. She forbids Scout to invite Walter Cunningham home, calling him "trash", which is especially harsh because the reader knows the Cunninghams are poor but honest, and that Walter's father turned away the lynch mob after Scout spoke to him. Alexandra also wants Atticus to dismiss Calpurnia, the woman who has effectively raised the children, and refuses to let her bake for the Missionary Society. Lee contrasts Alexandra's coldness with Calpurnia's warmth and with Miss Maudie's humour and understanding, and these contrasts make Alexandra seem narrow and unkind.

Question number

She is equally dislikeable in her attempts to control Scout's identity. Scout says her aunt was "fanatical" about her clothes and believed she could not be a lady in breeches. For a reader who has enjoyed Scout's freedom and energy, these demands feel like an attempt to squeeze her into a shape that does not fit her. Alexandra's membership of the Missionary Society adds to this impression, because Lee uses the ladies' tea party to satirise their hypocrisy: they weep over the Mrunas in Africa while sneering at the black people in their own kitchens. As hostess, Alexandra is part of this hypocrisy.

However, Lee begins to shift the reader's view after the trial. When the verdict is announced, Alexandra is clearly moved, and she speaks gently to Atticus, calling him "brother". The single word suggests a family loyalty deeper than her opinions. The turning point is the Missionary tea, when Atticus brings news of Tom Robinson's death. Alexandra is shaken and admits to Miss Maudie that although she does not approve of everything Atticus does, he is her brother, and she wants to know when it will ever end, because it is tearing him to pieces. Lee here allows us to see her fear for Atticus, which reframes her earlier disapproval of the case as protectiveness rather than mere prejudice. When she steadies herself and returns to the ladies, Scout realises that if Aunty could be a lady at a time like this, so could she. This is a moment of real admiration: Alexandra's composure becomes a form of courage, and Scout for the first time sees that being a lady can involve strength.

The final scenes complete this change. After Bob Ewell's attack, Alexandra brings Scout her overalls, the very clothes she has always despised, and calls her "darling". The gesture is small but significant: in a moment of crisis she puts the child's comfort above her rules. Lee also shows her guilt at having ignored a feeling

Question number

that something was wrong before the pageant, which reveals a sensitivity the children had never suspected.

In conclusion, I agree that Lee presents Aunt Alexandra as dislikeable for much of the novel, particularly through her snobbery, her treatment of Calpurnia and the Cunninghams, and her attempts to make Scout conform. Yet Lee's choice of a child narrator means that our early judgement is shaped by Scout's resentment, and as Scout matures, so does our view. By the end Alexandra is shown to be loyal, brave and capable of love, which fits the novel's central lesson that you never really understand a person until you consider things from their point of view. She is not entirely likeable, but she is far more than the cold mountain Scout first describes.

Sa

Steinbeck presents Crooks as the most obviously victimised man on the ranch: disabled, racially excluded and threatened with death by a single sentence from Curley's wife. To a large extent I agree that he is a powerless victim. However, Steinbeck also gives him intelligence, pride and moments of control, so he is not simply passive. His tragedy is that the small power he does have is confined to one tiny room and can be taken from him in an instant.

Before we meet Crooks, Steinbeck presents him through the voices of other men, which immediately shows his low status. Candy calls him the "stable buck" and uses a racist slur, and tells George that the boss "gives the stable buck hell when he's mad". The casualness of this language shows that his mistreatment is normal on the ranch, something no one questions. Candy even describes the Christmas when Crooks was allowed into the bunkhouse and a skinner called Smitty fought him, an anecdote told as entertainment. Steinbeck's choice to introduce Crooks

Question number

indirectly, as a name and a joke, mirrors the way the men refuse to see him as a full person.

His physical setting reinforces his victimhood. Crooks lives in a small shed off the barn, and Steinbeck's detailed description at the start of section four lingers on the harness, the tools and the "box" of straw that serves as his bed. He is surrounded by the equipment of horses, as though he is treated as little better than an animal. His body is marked by his work: his spine is bent by a horse's kick, and he rubs liniment into his back. The name "Crooks", which describes his deformity rather than his identity, suggests that the ranch has defined him by his injury.

Yet Steinbeck also gives Crooks a kind of fierce dignity, which complicates the idea that he is powerless. When Lennie enters his room, Crooks speaks sharply, insisting that it is his room and that nobody has a right in it but him. The repetition of possessive language shows how tightly he clings to the one space he controls. He owns books and a battered copy of the California civil code, which suggests that he understands the law even though it offers him no protection. Steinbeck describes him as a "proud, aloof man" who keeps his distance and demands that others keep theirs. His isolation is forced on him, but his pride is his own.

The conversation with Lennie shows Crooks exercising power, and Steinbeck makes the reader uncomfortable with it. Crooks torments Lennie with the idea that George might not come back, pressing the point until Lennie becomes frightened and aggressive. Steinbeck suggests that Crooks does this because, for once, he has someone weaker than himself, and the cruelty is a way of making Lennie feel what Crooks feels every day. The moment turns when Crooks explains himself: a

Question number

guy needs somebody to be near him, and a guy goes nuts if he ain't got nobody. The repetition and the simple dialect make his loneliness painfully clear, and his memory of his father's chicken ranch, where white children came to play, shows how much he has lost. In this scene, Crooks's power is real but small, and it rests on his own suffering.

He also shows independence of mind. He scoffs at George and Lennie's dream, saying he has seen hundreds of men with land in their heads and none of them ever get it. Steinbeck uses Crooks as the voice of bitter realism, and his cynicism is a kind of strength: he has seen through the myth that sustains the other men. However, when Candy describes the money they have saved, Crooks's defences slip, and he tentatively offers to work for nothing if he can join them. This is one of the most hopeful moments in the novel, because Steinbeck shows that even Crooks can be drawn into the dream.

That hope is destroyed by Curley's wife, and this is the scene that proves him most powerless. When Crooks tells her to leave his room, she reminds him of his place and threatens that she could have him "strung up on a tree" so easily it is not even funny. The image refers to lynching, and the casual tone makes it more chilling. Steinbeck then shows Crooks withdrawing completely: he reduces himself to nothing, with no personality and no ego left. The narrative voice suggests that his only defence is to erase himself. Immediately afterwards he withdraws his offer to join the dream, claiming he was only fooling and would not want to go anywhere like that. Structurally, the scene builds Crooks up only to cut him down, showing how fragile his confidence is.

In conclusion, I largely agree that Steinbeck presents Crooks as a powerless victim. He has a voice, a room and an intelligence that the other men lack, and he even

Question number

uses a little power over Lennie, but every one of these is limited. The moment a white woman threatens him, his pride, his hope and his sense of self collapse. Steinbeck uses Crooks to show that the loneliness of the ranch falls hardest on those already excluded, and that his small acts of resistance only make his powerlessness more painful to watch.

5b

Steinbeck presents life on the ranch as difficult in almost every sense: the work is exhausting and dangerous, the living conditions are bare, and the men are trapped in loneliness and suspicion. There are glimpses of comfort and companionship, especially through Slim, but I agree that life on the ranch is difficult, because Steinbeck shows that its hardships are not only physical but emotional, and that they ultimately destroy the hopes of nearly everyone who lives there.

Even before George and Lennie arrive, Steinbeck hints at the hardship of their working life. George's speech by the river, that guys like them who work on ranches are the loneliest guys in the world, with no family and no place to belong, establishes the theme. The men drift from job to job, as George says they come, work, and then quit and move on. Steinbeck uses this description of migrant labour to present ranch life as rootless, a cycle of work and wandering with no future.

The bunkhouse itself reflects this emptiness. Steinbeck opens section two with a precise, almost stage-like description: whitewashed walls, an unpainted floor, small square windows and burlap ticking on the bunks. Each man keeps his few possessions in an apple box nailed above his bed. The sparseness of the room shows how little the men own, and the identical bunks suggest a life without individuality or privacy. Candy's warning about the previous occupant, and the tin of insect powder George finds, add to the sense of grimness and impermanence.

Question number

The work is also physically punishing and dangerous. Candy, the old swamper, has lost his hand in an accident, and he knows that his value is shrinking with his strength. The dog is a symbol of this: once a great sheep dog, it is now old and smelly, and Carlson insists on shooting it. Candy's quiet acceptance, followed by his admission that he should have shot it himself rather than let a stranger do it, makes the reader realise he fears the same fate. He says that when they can him he wishes someone would shoot him, a bleak line that reveals how little mercy the ranch has for the old and the weak.

Steinbeck presents the atmosphere among the men as tense and threatening. Curley's first appearance is structured to create unease: he glances coldly at the newcomers, his hands close into fists and he crouches like a fighter. His questioning of Lennie is aggressive, and George's stillness shows that he immediately recognises danger. Candy's explanation that Curley picks fights with big men because he is small foreshadows the violence of section three, when Curley attacks Lennie and has his hand crushed. Life on the ranch is presented as a place where power is unstable and violence is always close.

Loneliness is perhaps the greatest difficulty. The men rarely talk openly, and as George tells Slim, a guy on a ranch never listens and never asks questions. Crooks is excluded from the bunkhouse because he is black, and his outburst that a guy goes nuts if he ain't got nobody is the clearest expression of ranch isolation. Curley's wife, the only woman, has no name and no friends, and she complains that she is left to talk to the men she despises. Even she, who seems to have more power than the workers, is trapped. Steinbeck shows that loneliness affects everyone, regardless of race, age or sex.

Question number

However, Steinbeck does show that ranch life offers some compensations. The men have shelter, regular meals and wages that allow them a night out in town on Saturdays. There are games of horseshoes and cards, and the friendly banter around the table suggests a rough companionship. Above all, Slim provides a model of dignity. Steinbeck describes him in almost godlike terms, as the prince of the ranch, whose authority is so great that his word is taken on any subject. His understanding of George and Lennie's friendship, and his comment that perhaps everybody in the whole world is scared of each other, show compassion rare on the ranch. Through Slim, Steinbeck suggests that kindness is possible even in harsh conditions.

The dream of the farm also shows that the men can imagine something better. When Candy offers his savings and Crooks briefly asks to join, the reader sees a community forming around hope. Yet the structure of the novel undermines this. Each time the dream grows stronger, something crushes it: Curley's wife's threat to Crooks in section four, and then Lennie's accidental killing of her in the barn. Candy's bitter words over her body, blaming her for ruining everything, show that the ranch's harshness has reclaimed him.

The ending confirms how difficult life on the ranch has been. George's shooting of Lennie by the river echoes Carlson's shooting of Candy's dog, and the circular structure brings us back to the peaceful clearing where the novel began, now the scene of a mercy killing. Carlson's final question about what is eating George and Slim shows that some men on the ranch remain completely unable to understand another person's grief.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that Steinbeck presents life on the ranch as difficult. Its moments of comfort, such as Slim's kindness and the shared dream,

Question number

only highlight how rare such things are. The bare bunkhouse, the dangerous work, the cruelty to the old and the excluded, and the constant loneliness combine to create a world in which, as the title suggests, even the best laid plans go wrong.

6a Doyle fills Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha with people who matter to Paddy: his friends, his brother Sinbad, his teacher and, above all, his parents. For much of the novel his mother seems to sit quietly in the background while the gang, the games and his admiration for his father take centre stage. However, as the marriage collapses, Doyle gradually reveals that Ma is the emotional anchor of Paddy's life. I largely agree that she is the most important person to him, although Doyle suggests that Paddy only fully understands this as he loses his father.

The novel's form makes it difficult at first to see Ma's importance. Doyle writes in Paddy's ten-year-old voice, in a series of loosely connected episodes with no chapters, so the narrative jumps from a fire on a building site to a fact he has read to a fight in the schoolyard. Paddy's attention moves restlessly, and his mother often appears only in passing: calling him in, feeding the family, settling arguments between the children. This fragmentary structure mirrors a child's view of the world, in which a loving parent is so constant that she is almost invisible. Doyle invites the reader to notice what Paddy does not yet notice himself.

In the early part of the novel, Paddy's friends seem more important than his family. Kevin is the leader of the gang, and Paddy follows him eagerly, joining in games, dares and small acts of cruelty. Doyle's lively, breathless sentences capture the excitement of belonging to a group, and the reader feels how much Paddy needs Kevin's approval. His relationship with Sinbad is also prominent, but it is frequently harsh: Paddy bullies his younger brother, and Doyle presents these

Question number

moments without comment, leaving the reader to recognise their cruelty. These relationships are important to Paddy's daily life, yet they are unstable and often unkind.

Paddy's father is a more serious rival to Ma's importance. Paddy admires him, wants his attention and seems to take pleasure in sharing facts and conversations with him. When Da is in a good mood, the household feels safe. However, Doyle increasingly presents Da through silence and tension. Paddy studies his parents' faces and voices, listening for the warning signs of an argument, and the reader realises that the father who once seemed a hero is becoming a source of fear. The moment when Paddy sees his father hit his mother is a turning point. Doyle's plain, shocked narration, without elaborate description, conveys how deeply it disturbs him, and from this point Paddy's sympathy shifts firmly towards Ma.

As the marriage breaks down, Doyle shows how Paddy tries to protect his mother. He stays awake at night, listening to the fighting downstairs, half believing that if he keeps watch he can stop it happening. This is a heartbreaking detail because it reveals a child taking on an adult's responsibility, and it shows that Ma's safety has become the centre of his anxious thoughts. He notices when she has been crying and when she is tired, and his love for her becomes watchful and protective. The child who once barely noticed his mother now cannot stop thinking about her.

Doyle also presents Ma as patient, gentle and determined to keep life normal for her children. She looks after the younger ones, calms their fears and continues with the ordinary routines of meals and bedtime even as her marriage falls apart. Her steadiness is presented quietly, through small domestic actions rather than speeches, which fits her character: she does not demand attention, but she holds

Question number

the family together. Paddy's guilt when he lets her down, for example when he is caught misbehaving, shows how much her opinion matters to him.

Nevertheless, it could be argued that the most important person in the novel is not Ma but Da, because it is his departure that drives the story to its climax. When he leaves, Paddy's world falls apart, and his friends turn on him with the chant that gives the novel its title, mocking him for having no father. The title itself suggests that Paddy's identity is shaped by this loss. In the final scene, when Da returns briefly and Paddy greets him with stiff, polite formality, the reader senses how much he has been hurt. Da's absence is the wound at the centre of the novel.

However, I think Doyle's ending finally confirms Ma's importance. The father has gone, the gang has rejected him and Kevin is no longer his friend, but Ma remains. Paddy's formal coldness towards his father suggests that he has chosen his side, and his loyalty now lies with his mother and the family she keeps together. The changing relationships around Paddy fall away one by one, revealing what was always there underneath.

In conclusion, I agree to a large extent that Ma is the most important person in Paddy's life. Doyle's child narrator, absorbed in friends, games and his father, at first overlooks her, and the episodic form reflects that distraction. Yet as the family breaks down, Paddy's protectiveness, his watchfulness and his loyalty reveal that she is the one stable and loving presence he has. His father's departure may cause the greatest pain, but it is his mother who gives him the security to survive it.

Question number

6b

School occupies a large part of Paddy Clarke's world, and Doyle presents it vividly: the strict teacher, the rivalries, the lessons and the boys who shape Paddy's sense of who he wants to be. I agree that school is a powerful influence, but I do not think it is the main one. Doyle suggests that the deepest influence on Paddy is his home, and in particular the slow collapse of his parents' marriage, which colours everything he experiences at school and outside it.

Doyle presents school through the eyes of a ten-year-old, in short episodes that sit alongside games, fights and family scenes without chapter breaks. This structure is important, because it shows that school is woven into the rest of Paddy's life rather than separate from it. The same boys he plays with on the streets of Barrytown are in his class, so school friendships and street friendships are one and the same. Kevin, the leader of the gang, is also a classmate, and his influence on Paddy is enormous in both places.

The most memorable figure at school is Mr Hennessey, known to the boys as Henno. Doyle presents him as strict and sometimes frightening, a teacher who uses physical punishment and keeps the class under firm control. Yet Paddy's narration is not simply hostile. There is a grudging admiration in the way the boys describe Henno's ability to catch them out and keep order, and Paddy seems to respond to his demanding standards. Henno's emphasis on tests and corrections feeds Paddy's competitive nature and his love of getting things right. Doyle contrasts him with Miss Watkins, Paddy's earlier teacher, who was easier to fool, and this contrast suggests that Paddy respects authority that is firm and consistent. In this sense school gives him a structure that his home life is beginning to lose.

School also shapes Paddy's intellectual life. He is a bright, curious boy who loves

Question number

facts, words and stories, and Doyle fills his narration with things he has learned, often repeated with a child's delight in their strangeness. The Catholic ethos of the school adds another layer: religious lessons, the priest's visits and stories of saints and missionaries feed Paddy's imagination. His fascination with Father Damien and the lepers, for example, suggests he is drawn to ideas of heroism and sacrifice. However, much of Paddy's learning happens on his own, through reading at home, which suggests that his curiosity belongs to him rather than to the school.

The boys at school influence him perhaps more than the teachers. Paddy follows Kevin and joins in the casual cruelty of the group, picking on weaker boys and showing off. Doyle presents these episodes without moral comment, allowing the reader to see how easily Paddy is led. Later, Paddy becomes fascinated by Charles Leavy, a tough, silent boy from the Corporation houses. Paddy watches and studies him, wanting to be as hard and self-contained as he is. This attraction is revealing: as his home becomes more painful, Paddy is drawn to a boy who seems unable to be hurt. The influence of school friends therefore changes with Paddy's emotional needs, which suggests that school responds to the pressures of home rather than causing them.

Doyle makes clear that the central influence on Paddy is his family. Throughout the novel he listens to his parents arguing, watches their faces for signs of trouble and lies awake at night trying to keep the peace by staying alert. When he sees his father hit his mother, his attitude to Da changes, and his worry for Ma becomes his main preoccupation. These scenes have an intensity that the school episodes lack: Doyle's sentences become shorter and the narrative voice more anxious and confused. The school day may fill the hours, but home fills his thoughts.

Question number

The effect of home on school life becomes clearest near the end. As Paddy becomes more troubled, he grows distant from Kevin and the gang, fights with Kevin and is rejected. The boys turn on him with the chant that gives the novel its title, mocking him because his father has left. This moment shows school and the playground taking on the pain of home and turning it into public humiliation. Paddy's growing view of the others as childish suggests that his experiences at home have forced him to grow up faster than his classmates. School is the place where the effects of the family breakdown become visible, but it is not the source of them.

In conclusion, I agree only partly that school is the main influence in Paddy's life. Doyle presents school as a vivid and important world, shaping Paddy's friendships, his competitiveness and his curiosity, and Henno's discipline offers him a kind of order. However, the most powerful influence is his family, and especially the breakdown of his parents' marriage. It changes how he sees his friends, his teacher and himself, and by the end of the novel it is the absence of his father, not anything learned at school, that defines him.

7a

Whether Napoleon is a "strong" leader depends on what we mean by strength. If strength means the ability to seize power, keep it and bend others to his will, then Orwell presents Napoleon as overwhelmingly strong: he outmanoeuvres Snowball, silences debate and ends the novel as the unchallenged master of the farm. However, if a strong leader is one who has courage, wisdom and the welfare of his followers at heart, Napoleon is a failure, and Orwell's narrative exposes his strength as nothing more than cunning, fear and propaganda. I would argue that Orwell deliberately makes Napoleon strong as a ruler but weak as a leader, and

Question number

that this gap is the source of the novel's tragedy.

From his first appearance Orwell hints at a quiet, calculating kind of power. Napoleon is introduced as "a large, rather fierce-looking Berkshire boar", "not much of a talker, but with a reputation for getting his own way". "Fierce-looking" suggests intimidation rather than inspiration, and "getting his own way" implies a selfish strength rooted in personal will. The contrast with Snowball, who is lively and inventive, is structurally important. While Snowball organises committees and plans for the future of all the animals, Napoleon seems uninterested, yet he quietly takes Jessie and Bluebell's puppies, making himself "responsible for their education". The innocent word "education" is darkly ironic, because he is in fact raising a private army. Orwell shows that Napoleon's strength lies in patience and secrecy: he plans long before he acts.

The windmill debates reveal how this strength works. Napoleon cannot match Snowball in argument, so he refuses to argue at all. He trains the sheep to bleat "Four legs good, two legs bad" at crucial moments, drowning out Snowball's speeches, and in a moment of crude contempt he urinates over Snowball's plans and walks out without a word. A strong leader might be expected to win the animals over; Napoleon simply makes reasoned discussion impossible. When the vote is about to go against him, he releases "nine enormous dogs wearing brass-studded collars", who chase Snowball off the farm. The sudden violence of this scene, after chapters of debate, marks a structural turning point: from now on, power on Animal Farm rests on force. Napoleon wins total control in a single moment, yet this also shows he has no confidence in leading by persuasion.

Once in power, Napoleon consolidates his position ruthlessly. He abolishes the Sunday meetings and debates, so that the animals simply receive their orders. He

Question number

relies on Squealer, who the narrator says "could turn black into white", to explain away every betrayal of Animalism, from the pigs keeping the milk and apples to their moving into the farmhouse. The gradual rewriting of the commandments, such as "No animal shall sleep in a bed with sheets", shows how skilfully Napoleon manipulates memory and truth. Orwell's simple, fable-like narrative voice, limited to the animals' point of view, lets the reader recognise the manipulation even as they accept it. Napoleon's strength, then, is really the strength of a manipulator who exploits the trust and ignorance of others, especially the loyal Boxer, whose motto "Napoleon is always right" shows how completely he has been won over.

The most chilling demonstration of Napoleon's power comes with the forced confessions and executions. After the hens' protest is starved into submission, the animals who "confess" to plotting with Snowball are torn apart by the dogs until there is a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet. The commandment is quietly altered to "No animal shall kill any other animal without cause", and the added words show how easily Napoleon's strength corrupts the ideals of the Revolution. It is hard to call this strong leadership in any admirable sense: a leader who must terrify his followers into obedience is revealing his insecurity, not his strength.

Orwell also undermines Napoleon's strength through moments of cowardice and folly. He plays no heroic part in the Battle of the Cowshed, where it is Snowball who leads the defence, and later he claims the windmill was his idea all along, an absurd lie that exposes his vanity. He is cheated by Frederick, who pays for the timber with forged banknotes, a humiliating sign that Napoleon is not as shrewd as his propaganda claims. When he gets drunk on whisky, the pigs announce that he is dying, and the commandment becomes "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess". Orwell's irony invites the reader to laugh at the grand titles heaped on him, such as "Father of All Animals" and "Terror of Mankind", and at the poem in

Question number

which he is called "Fountain of happiness!" The gap between the cult of personality and the real, greedy, foolish pig makes his strength seem hollow.

Finally, Orwell's circular structure delivers the clearest verdict. By the end, Napoleon walks on two legs, the farm is renamed Manor Farm and the animals "fed no better than they had done in Jones's day". In the final scene the animals look "from pig to man, and from man to pig", and find it impossible to tell the difference. Napoleon has been strong enough to keep power for years, but he has used that strength to recreate the very tyranny the Revolution was meant to destroy.

In conclusion, I agree that Napoleon is strong only in the narrowest sense: he is a skilful, ruthless survivor who never loses control of the farm. Yet Orwell presents him as a weak leader because his strength serves only himself and depends entirely on dogs, lies and fear. Perhaps Orwell's point is that the most dangerous rulers are exactly those who are strong in this way and weak in every way that matters.

7b

Orwell presents the animals' belief in the Revolution as remarkably long-lasting, but he also shows it slowly changing its nature. At first it is a living belief rooted in shared hope and real achievement; by the end it has become a habit, a set of rituals and slogans that the animals cling to even as their lives become as hard as they were under Jones. I largely agree that the animals continue to believe, but Orwell suggests that what they come to believe in is no longer the Revolution itself, only the memory and the language of it.

The novel begins with belief at its purest. Old Major's dream of a world without

Question number

humans fills the animals with joy, and "Beasts of England" spreads through the farm like wildfire. When the Rebellion succeeds almost by accident, the animals race around the farm in delight, and Orwell's narrative voice captures their wonder at "the glorious thing that has happened". The first harvest reinforces this faith: the animals feel that "the work they did was for their own benefit", and the simple, fable-like style reflects their uncomplicated happiness. Their victory over Jones in the Battle of the Cowshed gives them a shared story of courage. However, Orwell plants doubt almost immediately. When the milk disappears and the pigs claim the apples, Squealer explains that pigs are "brainworkers" who need them, and the animals accept this. Orwell's narration often reports that the animals "remembered" or "thought they remembered", and this repeated uncertainty shows that their belief survives only because their memory can be manipulated. When Snowball is driven out by the dogs, some animals are disturbed, and a few young pigs try to protest, but the sheep drown them out with "Four legs good, two legs bad". Orwell shows that belief is being protected not by reason but by noise and fear.

Boxer is the clearest example of continuing belief. His mottoes, "I will work harder" and "Napoleon is always right", are short, repetitive and childlike, and their simplicity suggests faith that has stopped asking questions. His loyalty is tragic, because he gives his strength to a Revolution the pigs have already betrayed. It is significant that Orwell notes that "Even Boxer was vaguely troubled" when Snowball is declared a traitor: the adverb "vaguely" captures how doubt flickers and then fades in the minds of animals who cannot put their unease into words. His death, when he is driven away in the van marked "Horse Slaughterer", is the moment the reader sees most clearly what the animals' faith has cost them, and his feeble attempt to kick his way out suggests a realisation that comes far too late.

Question number

The executions in the middle of the novel test the animals' belief most severely. Afterwards, the shaken animals gather on the knoll and Clover reflects that this terror and slaughter was not what they had hoped for on the night of Major's speech. They sing "Beasts of England" slowly and mournfully, as if grieving for something lost. Orwell's structure is deliberate here: the song is then abolished and replaced by "Animal Farm, Animal Farm, / Never through me shalt thou come to harm", a hymn to the state rather than to freedom. Clover's inability to express her doubts, and her decision to keep working and accept Napoleon's orders, shows belief turning into resignation.

In the later chapters, the pigs keep belief alive through spectacle. The "Spontaneous Demonstrations", with marching, poems and the firing of the gun, make the animals feel that "they were truly their own masters". The irony of "Spontaneous", when the demonstrations are ordered by Napoleon, reveals that this enthusiasm is manufactured. Orwell admits the trick works: the celebrations mean "they were able to forget that their bellies were empty", even though a few animals complain that it is just "a lot of standing about in the cold". Squealer's endless statistics prove that life is better, and the animals, unable to remember Jones's time clearly, have no way to argue. Even in their old age, Orwell tells us, the animals still feel proud to belong to a farm run by animals, and they never give up hope that Major's vision might one day come true. This suggests a residual belief, though it is now a dream deferred rather than a reality.

Benjamin offers a contrasting view. He never shares the general enthusiasm, insisting that life will go on as it always has, badly. He can read but chooses not to, and his cynicism suggests that the Revolution was doomed from the start. Yet even he breaks his silence when Boxer is taken away, and he is the one who reads

Question number

Clover the single commandment, "ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS". The capitals mock the original commandments, and the contradiction in "more equal" shows how the language of the Revolution has been emptied of meaning.

The ending forces the animals, and the reader, to confront the truth. Watching through the farmhouse window, the animals sense that "some strange thing was happening" as they look from pig to man and from man to pig. The vague word "strange" suggests confusion rather than full understanding, but the repeated looking implies that belief is finally breaking down. Orwell's circular structure, returning the farm to its old name of Manor Farm, gives "Revolution" a double meaning: it has turned full circle.

In conclusion, I agree that the animals continue to believe in the Revolution for most of the novel, but Orwell presents this belief as increasingly blind, sustained by propaganda, ritual and fear. The most heartbreaking aspect of the novel is that their faith is genuine while the Revolution itself has died.

8

Twain engages the reader by turning an ordinary domestic battle between a mischievous boy and his aunt into a lively, comic contest of wits. The reader is invited to enjoy Tom's cunning while also feeling real affection for Aunt Polly, whose sternness hides a soft heart.

The extract opens in the middle of the action, with Aunt Polly searching and finding "No Tom." This short, blunt sentence creates immediate curiosity, and her shout "Y-o-u-u TOM!", with its stretched letters and capitals, makes her voice almost audible. The pace quickens as she seizes Tom "by the slack of his

Question number

roundabout", and the clipped exchange of "Nothing" and "I don't know, aunt" shows his feeble attempts to deny the obvious. Twain then builds suspense with the mock-heroic line "the peril was desperate", where grand language is applied to a boy about to be smacked with a switch. Tom's trick, "Look behind you, aunt!", and his escape over the fence happen in a rush of verbs, "fled", "scrambled", "disappeared", which leaves the reader delighted at his nerve.

Twain then slows the pace with Aunt Polly's long monologue, which reveals her thoughts and feelings. Her colloquial speech, full of "ain't" and sayings such as "Can't learn an old dog new tricks", makes her warm and believable. She mixes folk wisdom with Scripture, "Spare the rod and spile the child", which shows her sense of duty, yet she admits she "ain't got the heart to lash him". The touching reminder that Tom is "my own dead sister's boy, poor thing" adds unexpected tenderness, and her confession that "every time I hit him my old heart most breaks" makes the reader sympathise with her dilemma.

The supper scene engages the reader through dramatic irony and an amused, omniscient narrator. We are told that Aunt Polly's questions are "full of guile, and very deep", but the narrator gently mocks her "pet vanity" and her "most transparent devices". The elevated phrase "marvels of low cunning" is comic because it is so out of proportion to her simple questions. The repeated "Yes'm" builds tension, and Twain lets us see inside Tom's mind as "A bit of a scare shot through Tom". The metaphor "Tom knew where the wind lay" shows his sharpness, and the reader enjoys watching him outplay her, first with the pumped water and then with the sewn collar.

The structure saves a final twist for the end. Just as Aunt Polly is "half sorry" and "half glad", Sid's quiet observation about the "white thread" and the "black" one

Question number

destroys Tom's defence. The contrast between the "quiet boy" Sid and the "adventurous, troublesome" Tom makes this betrayal satisfying and funny. The extract ends abruptly with Tom's threat, "Siddy, I'll lick you for that", a punchy line that leaves the reader smiling and eager to see what mischief comes next.

Overall, Twain engages the reader through fast, comic action, authentic dialogue and a knowing narrator who lets us laugh at both characters while caring about them.