Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2019

English Literature

Unit 1

The Study of Prose

GEL11

[GEL11]
MONDAY 20 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 responses.

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** Roger, show how far you agree that he is **evil**.

(b) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** the behaviour of the boys, show how far you agree that rescue is the boys' **main** concern.

stemup.co.uk

2 Hornby: *About a Boy*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** Marcus, show how far you agree that he is **pitiable**.

(b) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** Fiona and Will, show how far you agree that Fiona and Will show **concern** for others.

stemup.co.uk

3 Johnston: *How Many Miles to Babylon?*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Major Glendinning, show how far you agree that he is **dislikeable**.

(b) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** class differences, show how far you agree that class differences make Alexander and Jerry's friendship **difficult**.

stemup.co.uk

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

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** Mayella, show how far you agree that she **deserves** sympathy.

(b) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** events in the novel, show how far you agree that some people in Maycomb are **treated unfairly**.

stemup.co.uk

5 Steinbeck: *Of Mice and Men*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** Lennie, show how far you agree that he is **responsible** for what happens to him.

(b) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** the lives of the ranch workers, show how far you agree that the ranch workers are **unfriendly**.

stemup.co.uk

6 Doyle: *Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Kevin, show how far you agree that he is **not a good friend** to Paddy.

(b) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Paddy's relationships with his parents, show how far you agree that Paddy's home life is **unhappy**.

stemup.co.uk

7 Orwell: *Animal Farm*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** Snowball, show how far you agree that Snowball makes the Rebellion a **success**.

(b) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** life on the farm, show how far you agree that Animalism was **bound to fail**.

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 may wish to consider:

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

Extract from: *Dracula* by **Bram Stoker** (*Dracula* tells the story of Jonathan Harker who travels from London to Transylvania to meet a mysterious nobleman, Count Dracula. Harker keeps a diary where he writes about his journey and the odd behaviour of the Count who only comes out at night. The extract describes a strange meeting in Castle Dracula.)

8 May. – I began to fear as I wrote in this book that I was getting too diffuse. But now I am glad that I went into detail from the first, for there is something so strange about this place and all in it that I cannot but feel uneasy. I wish I were safe out of it, or that I had never come. It may be that this strange night existence is telling on me, but would that that were all! If there were any one to talk to I could bear it, but there is no one. I have only the Count to speak with, and he – I fear I am myself the only living soul within the place. Let me be prosaic so far as facts can be. It will help me to bear up, and imagination must not run riot with me. If it does I am lost. Let me say at once how I stand, or seem to.

I only slept a few hours when I went to bed, and feeling that I could not sleep any more, got up. I had hung my shaving glass by the window, and was just beginning to shave. Suddenly I felt a hand on my shoulder, and heard the Count's voice saying to me, "Good morning." I started, for it amazed me that I had not seen him, since the reflection of the glass covered the whole room behind me. In starting I had cut myself slightly, but did not notice it at the moment. Having answered the Count's salutation, I turned to the glass again to see how I had been mistaken. This time there could be no error, for the man was close to me, and I could see him over my shoulder. But there was no reflection of him in the mirror! The whole room behind me was displayed, but there was no sign of a man in it, except myself.

This was startling, and coming on the top of so many strange things, was beginning to increase that vague feeling of uneasiness which I always have when the Count is near. But at the instant I saw that the cut had bled a little, and the blood was trickling over my chin. I laid down the razor, turning as I did so half round to look for some sticking plaster. When the Count saw my face, his eyes blazed with a sort of demoniac fury, and he suddenly made a grab at my throat. I drew away and his hand touched the string of beads which held the crucifix. It made an instant change in him, for the fury passed so quickly that I could hardly believe that it was ever there.

"Take care," he said, "take care how you cut yourself. It is more dangerous than you think in this country." Then seizing the shaving glass, he went on, "And this is the wretched thing that has done the mischief. It is a foul bauble of man's vanity. Away with it!" And opening the window with one wrench of his terrible hand, he flung out the glass, which was shattered into a thousand pieces on the stones of the courtyard far below. Then he withdrew without a word. It is very annoying, for I do not see how I am to shave, unless in my watch-case or the bottom of the shaving pot, which is fortunately of metal.

stemup.co.uk

When I went into the dining room, breakfast was prepared, but I could not find the Count anywhere. So I breakfasted alone. It is strange that as yet I have not seen the Count eat or drink. He must be a very peculiar man! After breakfast I did a little exploring in the castle. I went out on the stairs, and found a room looking towards the South.

The view was magnificent, and from where I stood there was every opportunity of seeing it. The castle is on the very edge of a terrific precipice. A stone falling from the window would fall a thousand feet without touching anything! As far as the eye can reach is a sea of green tree tops, with occasionally a deep rift where there is a chasm. Here and there are silver threads where the rivers wind in deep gorges through the forests.

But I am not in heart to describe beauty, for when I had seen the view I explored further. Doors, doors, doors everywhere, and all locked and bolted. In no place save from the windows in the castle walls is there an available exit. The castle is a veritable prison, and I am a prisoner!

Source: Dracula by Bram Stoker

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.

239931

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 largely agree that Roger is evil, but Golding presents him less as a monster who arrives on the island fully formed and more as a boy in whom a capacity for cruelty is gradually released. Roger is the novel's clearest proof of Golding's idea that evil lies within human nature itself, held back only by the "taboo of the old life". What makes him so disturbing is not that he is different from the other boys, but that he is simply the one who goes furthest, fastest and with the least regret.

From his very first appearance Golding encourages the reader to distrust Roger. He is described as "a slight furtive boy" who keeps to himself with an "inner intensity of avoidance and secrecy". The adjective "furtive" suggests someone who hides his true nature, and the abstract nouns "avoidance and secrecy" create a sense that something is concealed beneath the surface. At this stage Roger does nothing wrong; indeed, it is Roger who first suggests "Let's have a vote", which seems to show respect for democratic order. However, Golding's narrative method of introducing him through shadowy, withholding language plants an unease that the rest of the novel confirms. The reader is being taught to watch him.

The scene on the beach in Chapter 4 is the turning point in Golding's presentation, and it is also where the question of whether Roger is evil becomes most interesting. Roger kicks over the littluns' sandcastles, then stalks Henry and throws stones at him, but he throws them to miss. Golding explains that round the child lies the invisible protection of "parents and school and policemen and the law". The listing here builds up all the structures of civilised society, and the point is that Roger's cruelty is not absent but restrained. This could suggest that Roger is not

Question number

innately evil, since he cannot bring himself to hit Henry, and when he realises Jack has been watching him a "darker shadow" creeps beneath his skin, as if he feels a flicker of guilt. Yet the same moment can be read more darkly: the desire to hurt is already there, and only the memory of punishment holds it back. Golding seems to suggest that evil is a potential in Roger which waits for the "taboo" to fade.

As Jack's tribe forms, that restraint weakens. In the killing of the sow, Golding presents violence with a horrifying intimacy, and it is Roger who drives his spear into her with his full weight. The hunters' laughter afterwards turns a moment of suffering into a joke, and Roger's eager participation shows a pleasure in cruelty that goes beyond the need for food. Similarly, in the mock hunt where Robert plays the pig, Roger is "fighting to get close", and the verb "fighting" suggests an appetite for violence that he can no longer control. The paint and the group give him anonymity, and Golding shows how Roger thrives once individual responsibility disappears.

The climax of Roger's development is Piggy's murder at Castle Rock. Golding writes that Roger, "with a sense of delirious abandonment", leans all his weight on the lever. The word "delirious" suggests a wild, almost ecstatic joy, while "abandonment" implies that he has thrown off every last constraint of the old life. This is the strongest evidence that Roger is evil, because Golding gives him no hesitation, no rage and no fear to explain the act: it is pure release. Structurally, the murder mirrors the stone throwing at Henry. The boy who once threw "to miss" now drops a huge rock deliberately on a defenceless boy, and the parallel allows the reader to measure exactly how far he has fallen.

After Piggy's death, Golding presents Roger as an increasingly sinister figure. He

Question number

edges past Jack "wielding a nameless authority", a phrase which suggests that his power comes not from leadership or charisma but from the fear he inspires, and the word "nameless" links him to something primal that has no place in civilised language. Samneric are tortured offstage, and their broken words to Ralph about Roger show that even the other savages see him as a terror. Golding's metaphor that "the hangman's horror clung round him" casts Roger as an executioner, a figure whose purpose is death. Most chillingly, Roger is said to have sharpened "a stick at both ends", which implies that Ralph's head is to be displayed like the sow's. Here Golding suggests that Roger has gone beyond even Jack: Jack wants power, but Roger seems to want death.

It could be argued that Roger is not uniquely evil but simply a boy shaped by circumstances, since all the boys, including Ralph and Piggy, take part in Simon's killing. Golding's wider message is that the "darkness of man's heart" is universal. However, Roger differs because his violence becomes deliberate, private and enjoyed. Where Ralph is horrified by what he has done, Roger shows no remorse at all. Golding never gives him a moment of regret after Piggy's death, and this silence is itself a narrative choice that condemns him.

Overall, I agree to a great extent that Golding presents Roger as evil. His early restraint and flicker of shame suggest that he is not born a monster, which makes him more frightening, not less: Golding uses Roger to show that the potential for evil exists in an ordinary boy, and that when society's rules fall away, that potential can become an appetite for cruelty that recognises no limit.

1b

I only partly agree that rescue is the boys' main concern. Golding presents rescue as the boys' stated priority at the start and as Ralph's constant preoccupation, but

Question number

through the behaviour of the group he shows that the desire to be rescued is quickly overtaken by more immediate and more primitive desires: fun, meat, power and finally killing. The signal fire becomes the novel's central symbol of this struggle, and its fate tracks how far the boys' concern for rescue survives.

At the beginning, rescue does seem important, though even here Golding suggests it is not urgent. When Ralph reassures the assembly that sooner or later "a ship will put in", the boys are visibly comforted, which shows how much they want to believe in rescue. The boys rush up the mountain to build the first fire, and Ralph's insistence that they need smoke to be seen makes rescue a practical goal. Yet Golding undercuts this enthusiasm. The fire is built in chaos and burns out of control, killing the boy with the mulberry-coloured birthmark, and the boys' excitement is more about adventure than escape. Ralph himself calls it "a good island" and says that until the grown-ups come they will have fun. The word "until" assumes rescue is inevitable, which allows the boys to treat it as something that will simply happen rather than something they must work for.

Golding's presentation of the island also explains why rescue is not the boys' first concern. Early descriptions are full of light, colour and "enchantment", and the boys respond to it with laughter and delight. Most of the littluns play on the beach and seem barely aware of the outside world at all. For many of the boys, Golding suggests, the island is a playground and an escape from adult control, so there is little reason to want to leave it.

Ralph and Piggy are the exception, and Golding uses them to keep the theme of rescue in the reader's mind. Piggy's logical remark that they cannot be rescued without smoke shows his adult, reasoning outlook, while Ralph returns to the fire at almost every assembly. The key moment comes in Chapter 4, when a ship

Question number

passes and the fire has gone out because the hunters have abandoned it to kill a pig. Ralph's frantic cry of "Smoke! Smoke!" and his "Oh God, oh God" show real despair, and Golding presents Jack's return with the dead pig as a clash of values. Jack is "vaguely irritated" by the mention of the fire, which shows that for him rescue has already become an irrelevance compared with the thrill of the hunt. Golding structures the scene so that the hunters come back chanting about blood just after the ship has vanished, a powerful contrast between the civilised world sailing away and the savagery taking root.

As the novel continues, even Ralph's grip on rescue begins to loosen, and this is perhaps Golding's most worrying point. Ralph admits that "things are breaking up", and in later chapters he struggles to remember why the fire matters. His broken sentences, trailing off as he searches for the reason, show the idea of rescue slipping out of his mind like a memory of a former life. Golding describes a curtain flickering in his brain, an image that suggests civilised thought is being blotted out. If the most responsible boy cannot hold on to rescue, the reader understands how weak this concern has become for the others.

For Jack's tribe, rescue disappears almost entirely. The hunters' chant and dance replace the assembly, and the conch, which once gave Ralph the authority to talk about the fire, is ignored and finally shattered. Tellingly, when Jack's tribe steal Piggy's glasses, it is to light their own cooking fire, not a signal. The glasses, which once represented the hope of rescue, now serve only appetite. Their final fire is lit to smoke Ralph out and kill him, and Golding presents the forest burning in a fury that destroys the island's food and shelter. The boys are now concerned only with the hunt, and rescue has been entirely forgotten.

The ending is full of irony. The naval officer arrives because he has seen the

Question number

smoke, but the smoke comes from the fire set to murder Ralph, not from any signal. Golding therefore suggests that the boys are rescued in spite of their behaviour rather than because of it. The officer's remark about "fun and games" shows that he cannot grasp what has happened, and when he says that British boys should have put up "a better show", the reader recognises the gap between his innocent assumptions and the truth. Ralph's weeping for "the end of innocence" and the "darkness of man's heart" shows that rescue, when it finally arrives, brings no real relief. There is a further irony that the officer's cruiser is itself part of an adult war, so the boys are rescued into a world behaving just as savagely.

Overall, I disagree that rescue is the boys' main concern. It is Ralph's and Piggy's concern, and briefly the whole group's, but Golding presents the boys' behaviour as a steady movement away from it. By making the signal fire die and the destructive fire bring the ship, Golding shows that the boys' real priorities were never rescue but their own desires, which is exactly his point about the darkness within human nature.

2a

I agree to a large extent that Marcus is pitiable, particularly in the first half of the novel, where Hornby presents him as a lonely, anxious twelve-year-old let down by almost every adult around him. However, Hornby's purpose is not simply to make the reader feel sorry for Marcus. Through his growing friendship with Will and Ellie, Marcus becomes more resilient, and by the end the reader's pity has largely turned into admiration and relief.

From the novel's opening line Hornby establishes Marcus as an outsider. We are told that people "quite often thought Marcus was being funny when he wasn't. He

Question number

couldn't understand it." The short second sentence captures his bewilderment: he does not know why the world reacts to him as it does, and his innocence is what makes him so pitiable. Hornby's use of a third-person narrative which stays close to Marcus' viewpoint lets the reader see the world through his confused eyes, while also recognising things that Marcus himself cannot, such as how strange his clothes, hair and habits seem to other children.

Hornby presents Marcus' home life as a source of constant worry. His mother's relationships come and go without his having any say; he had "quite liked" Roger, but now apparently he will never see him again. The casual "apparently" reveals how little Marcus is told and how little control he has. More seriously, he is acutely aware of Fiona's depression and feels he must protect her, thinking he "ought to say something optimistic". This role reversal, in which the child comforts the parent, is one of the most pitiable features of his presentation. The repeated negatives in "He didn't know what to say. He didn't understand" convey his sense of helplessness, and his rhetorical question "What else was he supposed to do?" shows a boy struggling to cope with problems far beyond his age.

School offers Marcus no escape. Hornby lists the clock times through a sleepless night, "10.41, 11.19, 11.55", a structural device that makes the reader feel the slow, anxious hours with him. The children at his new school are "harder and meaner and less understanding" than in Cambridge, and the repetition of "and" piles up comparative adjectives so that his new world seems relentlessly hostile. Hornby's extended metaphor that "the koala bears had fallen into the sea and the piranhas were taking an interest" is darkly comic but also deeply sad: Marcus sees himself as soft, slow prey. His coping strategy of standing there and taking it, making lists in his head to distract himself, suggests a child who has accepted bullying as normal. Even his only friends tell him they do not want him "hanging around" with

Question number

them any more, which leaves him entirely alone.

The most pitiable moment is Dead Duck Day, when Marcus returns home to find that his mother has tried to kill herself. Hornby uses hyperbole and superlatives to show its impact: it is the "scariest thing he'd ever seen, by a million miles". The childlike exaggeration of "a million miles" reminds the reader how young he is. Afterwards the repetition of "All the time, all the time, all the time" shows that the fear never leaves him. Hornby uses anaphora to convey his isolation: he cannot say it to his mum, to his dad, or to Suzie. Worse still, Fiona's letter suggests that being his mother "isn't enough" for her, a phrase that must wound a child who has given her so much care. It is little wonder he begins visiting Will's flat to put off going home.

Yet Hornby also complicates our pity. Marcus is not merely a victim; he is stubborn, honest and surprisingly brave. He discovers Will's lie about having a son and confronts him with it, and he persists in visiting Will despite Will's reluctance. He challenges his mother "roughly" about her behaviour, showing that he is capable of anger as well as fear. His friendship with Ellie, whom he admires for her style, her beauty and "her ability to beat people up", is presented with affectionate humour, and through her he learns to care less about what others think. Will's metaphor that Marcus' glass is "full to overflowing" suggests that his optimism is a real strength, and perhaps the reason he survives.

The ending further reduces the reader's pity. After the trip to Cambridge, Marcus is reconciled with his father, Fiona admits she has not been a good mother, and Marcus himself says he feels safer than before. Hornby structures the final chapters so that Marcus has gained a network of people, Will, Ellie, his parents and even Will's girlfriend Rachel, who look out for him. Will's final thought, that

Question number

"beyond any shadow of a doubt" Marcus would be OK, ends the novel on a confident, hopeful note.

In conclusion, I agree that Marcus is pitiable for much of the novel, as Hornby uses his viewpoint, his listing, repetition and childlike exaggeration to make the reader feel his loneliness and fear. However, Hornby does not leave him as an object of pity. By showing Marcus growing up and finding support, the novel suggests that what makes him pitiable at the start, his innocence and his refusal to be anyone but himself, is also what allows him to change the lives of those around him, including Will's.

2b

I agree that both Fiona and Will come to show concern for others, but Hornby presents their concern very differently and tracks it changing across the novel. Fiona genuinely loves Marcus but is often too absorbed in her own unhappiness and principles to see what he needs, while Will begins as a man who cares for nobody and gradually, almost against his will, learns concern. Hornby uses the two adults as contrasting halves of a parent: Fiona has the love but not the awareness, Will has the awareness but at first no love.

Hornby presents Fiona's concern for Marcus as sincere. She thanks him, telling him "You've been really good about everything", which shows that she notices the burden he carries. She has tried to give him rich experiences, such as the trip to Glastonbury where they had "a brilliant time", and after her depression she makes visible efforts: the narrator notes that the duvet has been put away, a small domestic detail that shows her trying to function for her son's sake. She wants him to escape the gloom of their flat, urging him to "Do something normal", and she makes a complaint to the school when she learns of the bullying. Her anxiety

Question number

about the lack of a father figure in his life also reveals concern, as does her furious reaction when she finds out about his visits to Will's flat. Hornby uses capital letters, "YOU GO ROUND HIS FLAT AFTER SCHOOL?", so that the reader hears her shock and protectiveness.

However, Hornby also suggests that Fiona's concern is limited by her self-absorption. Her sarcastic retort "what does it look like to you?" shuts down conversation, and she imposes her own tastes on Marcus, her vegetarianism and her music, without seeing how these mark him out at school. The narrator's comment that she "just didn't get" his situation shows the gap between her love and her understanding. Most significantly, her suicide attempt, which she herself later calls "selfish" and "unkind", leaves Marcus terrified, and her letter, which says that being his mother "isn't enough", seems to place her pain above his welfare. Hornby is careful not to condemn her, since depression is presented as an illness she cannot simply choose to escape, but the reader can see that her concern for Marcus is often overwhelmed. It is Will, an outsider, who tells her she hasn't "got a clue" about the bullying, a blunt line that exposes her blind spot.

Will, by contrast, begins the novel showing no concern for anyone. Hornby's narrator presents him with irony as a man who measures his life in units of time and is proud of his own cool. His approach to single mothers is cynical: he invents a son, Ned, to join a single parents' group, and treats his relationship with Fiona and Marcus as a kind of "good works" that will replace soup kitchens. The comic comparison shows that, for Will, concern for others is a hobby and a performance. After his first encounters with them he resolves not to repeat the experience, dismissing Fiona and Marcus as "just too weird". At this stage his concern is entirely for himself.

Question number

Hornby shows Will's concern growing gradually and reluctantly. When Marcus is bullied, Will buys him new trainers, a gesture that is superficial, since Will's answer to everything is to buy something, but it is still a sign that he notices Marcus' suffering. When Will "wrestled with his conscience", Hornby's verb presents concern as a struggle against his natural selfishness. He confronts Marcus about skiving, a surprisingly parental act, and the presents he buys at Christmas show that he has actually listened to both Fiona and Marcus. Hornby marks the change in Will's thinking when he realises he has never properly given Marcus credit for being a good kid, and later that he has somehow managed to turn himself into a single parent. The irony is gentle: the man who lied about having a son has become a father figure in reality.

By the climax, Will's concern is unmistakable. When Kurt Cobain dies and Marcus goes missing with Ellie, Will is "fearful" and says he just wants to hear that Marcus is OK. He drives to the police station with the mothers, and Hornby notes that the neutrality has gone, suggesting that Will can no longer pretend to be uninvolved. Even after Marcus' life becomes more settled, Will continues to see him as a regular thing. His final confident thought that Marcus would be OK "beyond any shadow of a doubt" shows that his happiness is now bound up with someone else's.

Hornby also suggests that Fiona and Will learn concern from each other. Their arguments are harsh, and Will's confrontation with Fiona is tactless, but it forces her to see Marcus more clearly. In turn, Fiona's honesty and her demand that Will take Marcus' needs seriously push him towards responsibility. Fiona's admission at the police station that she has not been a good mother is described by Will as a turning point, showing that her concern finally becomes clear-sighted.

Question number

Overall, I agree that Fiona and Will show concern for others, but to differing degrees and in different ways. Fiona's concern is always present but clouded by her own struggles, while Will's is absent at first and slowly earned. Through their development, Hornby suggests that real concern means not only feeling for someone but actually paying attention to them, a lesson both adults learn through Marcus.

3a

I largely agree that Major Glendinning is dislikeable. Johnston presents him as a cold, contemptuous disciplinarian who sees men as tools rather than human beings, and his final order that Alexander should command the firing squad makes him the novel's most chilling figure. However, Johnston does not make him a simple villain. Because the story is told by Alec, who is himself confused about his feelings, Glendinning emerges as a complex, at times almost pitiable man, whose harshness is bound up with a soldier's sense of duty.

Johnston shapes our response to Glendinning from the very beginning through Alec's first-person narration. Writing from his cell, Alec remarks that the Major "has not been near me, a blessing for which I am duly grateful". The ironic formality of "duly grateful" suggests weary dislike, and because this comes before we have met Glendinning in the story, the reader is already inclined to distrust him. Johnston's retrospective structure means that every scene with the Major is coloured by what we know he will eventually do.

Glendinning's contempt for the men under his command is one of his most dislikeable qualities. He complains that he has been landed with the biggest bunch of "incompetents" he has come across in his life, and dismisses them as "illiterate peasants", "squalid" and "non-starters". The accumulation of insults shows a man

Question number

who sees the Irish recruits as beneath him, and his outburst about "damn bog Irish" makes his prejudice explicit. Johnston presents him as an English officer who regards the soldiers he leads as raw material to be shaped and spent, and later he does not even view them as men. For a reader who has come to care for Jerry, this attitude is deeply unsettling.

Johnston uses Glendinning's manner of speaking and his physical presence to make him intimidating. He has a habit of "biting off the end of each word", and his clipped, abrupt sentences, such as the advice to Alec to "pull yourself together and mix", leave no room for discussion. Alec compares his voice to a "sharp metal probe", a simile that suggests something cold, clinical and painful. The cane he carries, which he is "very quick to use", becomes a symbol of his authority, and Johnston repeatedly draws attention to it "twitching in his hand", as if it has a life and threat of its own. Although he claims to dislike physical violence, he strikes Alec with it, a hypocrisy that deepens the reader's dislike.

Glendinning is also presented as the main obstacle to the friendship between Alec and Jerry. He insists that there will be "no talking" between the men and the officers, and he crushes Jerry's request to join the horse lines with the dismissive "Crowe, or whatever your damn name is". His refusal to remember Jerry's name shows that, to him, Jerry has no individual identity. When Alec asks for leave on Jerry's behalf so that he can search for his missing father, the reply is the curt "The answer is no". Johnston presents Glendinning's suspicion that Jerry might be a traitor as a further sign of his prejudice against the Irish, and when Jerry returns, the Major states coldly that there is nothing Alec can do.

The climax of his dislikeable presentation is his decision that Alec will command the firing squad that executes Jerry. Glendinning presents this as a lesson in duty

Question number

and manhood, consistent with his earlier lecture that school is where we are taught to accept the burdens of manhood, but to the reader it seems a deliberately cruel act aimed at breaking Alec. Alec's question, "Where did you learn to be so evil?", is the novel's harshest judgement on him, and it is hard not to share it.

However, Johnston gives Glendinning moments that complicate this view. He offers Alec a couple of hours off to see his family on the way to the front, and he does not follow up the angry complaint of another major, warning only that there must be no next time. Most strikingly, when a wounded soldier is screaming in no man's land, Glendinning acts calmly and decisively while Alec is frozen. He takes responsibility himself, saying "I must be sure", and his exclamation "Oh, Jesus Christ" and "long sad sigh" reveal real feeling beneath the hard exterior. Afterwards he shows Alec a rough kind of care, telling him to get out of his filthy clothes before he comes down with pneumonia. In these moments Johnston suggests that Glendinning's harshness may be a necessary armour for a man who must keep order in the horror of the trenches. His efficiency is also real: under his command the men's equipment and uniforms are "transformed".

Alec himself admits that he could never work out whether he hated Glendinning or not, and this ambiguity is important. Johnston seems to suggest that Glendinning is not evil by nature but is the product of an army system which values discipline above humanity. He believes he is doing his duty, and in his own terms perhaps he is.

Overall, I agree to a great extent that Glendinning is dislikeable. His contempt for the men, his prejudice, his cane and, above all, his use of Alec to execute Jerry make him repellent. Yet Johnston's careful glimpses of his calm courage and buried

Question number

feeling make him more than a stereotype, and perhaps more disturbing, because he shows how an ordinary, competent man can become an instrument of cruelty in the name of duty.

3b

I agree that class differences make Alexander and Jerry's friendship difficult, but I would argue that Johnston presents class as an external pressure rather than something the boys themselves feel. The obstacles come from Alec's mother, from the army and from a rigid social order; the friendship itself crosses those barriers with surprising ease. In fact, Johnston seems to suggest that the friendship's strength lies in its defiance of class, and that its tragedy is caused by a world that will not allow it to exist.

Johnston establishes the gulf between the boys at the start. Alec grows up in a "big house" in Wicklow, the only child of wealthy, distant parents, while Jerry comes from a poor Catholic family in the village and has to leave school early to work. Alec, educated at home, explains that he was isolated from the children of his own age "by the traditional barriers of class and education". The word "traditional" suggests these barriers are inherited and unquestioned, built up over generations rather than chosen. Johnston's use of Alec's first-person narrative means we feel his loneliness directly; for him the barriers of class are not a privilege but a prison.

Because of these barriers, the friendship must be hidden. Alec describes having "a friend. A private and secret friend." The short, fragmented sentence and the repetition of the idea of secrecy show how precious and how fragile the relationship is. Johnston presents their meetings at the lake, swimming and riding horses together, as moments of freedom, and Alec notes simply that it was more

Question number

fun swimming with someone else. These scenes are among the warmest in the novel, and the natural setting suggests that, away from the house and its rules, class has no meaning.

The greatest obstacle at home is Alec's mother, Alicia, and Johnston uses her clipped imperatives to show the force of class prejudice. When she discovers the friendship she says "It just won't do. I forbid it. Absolutely." The sequence of short sentences, ending in the single-word "Absolutely", leaves no space for argument and shows how class is enforced through authority. Her contemptuous remark about "those sort of people" reduces Jerry to a social category rather than an individual. Yet Alec defends him, insisting that Jerry is not stupid and not a criminal, which shows that the friendship has given Alec the courage to challenge her. Johnston even suggests that the boys' reasons for joining the army reflect their classes: Alec is pressed by his mother to do his "duty", while Jerry joins up for the "cash" his family needs. Interestingly, though, Alec is influenced by Jerry's decision to enlist, so the friendship, not class, seems to shape his choice.

Once they join the army, class differences become official and far harder to overcome. Alec is an officer and Jerry a private, and Johnston shows how the military hierarchy reproduces the social one. A small, irate major demands to know what "this man" is doing with Alec and Bennett, and the impersonal phrase shows how Jerry is seen only as a rank. Major Glendinning forbids any talking between men and officers, and his dismissal of Jerry as "Crowe, or whatever your damn name is" reveals how little the army values a private's individuality. The boys now have to take risks to meet, and Johnston's detail that Jerry "slithered round the door" suggests something furtive, almost criminal, about their contact. Sergeant Barry's knowing looks and his smile of "almost sweet triumph" show that their friendship is constantly watched and resented. At the same time, Alec makes a

Question number

friend of his own class in Bennett, which shows how the army expects him to belong.

Despite all this, Johnston presents the friendship as enduring. The boys have their first drink together, share their lack of experience with girls, and make plans for a future with horses together, imagining that they will start "in a very small way" and grow from there. The pronoun "we" in their plans shows that they imagine a future as equals, free of class. When Jerry asks for Alec's help to get leave to look for his missing father, Alec asks Glendinning even though he knows he will be refused, and when Jerry deserts and returns, Alec tries to cover for him and argues his case. Their singing of the rhyme that gives the novel its title also suggests a shared childhood innocence that class cannot touch.

The ending is where class and the army finally destroy the friendship, but also where Alec proves its strength. When Jerry is sentenced to death and Alec is ordered to command the firing squad, Alec shoots Jerry himself in his cell, sparing him the ordeal and ensuring he does not face the squad, knowing that he will be executed in turn. This act is shocking, but Johnston presents it as an act of love and loyalty that rejects everything his class and rank expect of him.

Overall, I agree that class differences make the friendship difficult, as Johnston shows them operating through Alec's mother, the army's hierarchy and figures such as Glendinning and Barry. However, the boys themselves never treat each other as unequal. Johnston's tragic structure suggests that it is not the friendship that fails but the society around it, which cannot accept a bond between a gentleman and a village boy, and destroys them both.

Question number	
4a	I largely agree that Mayella deserves sympathy, although Lee makes that sympathy uncomfortable. Mayella is responsible for a terrible lie that costs an innocent man his life, and Lee never excuses that. Yet through Scout's observant narration and Atticus's measured judgement, Lee presents Mayella as a victim long before she becomes an accuser: a young woman trapped by poverty, abuse and isolation who reaches out for kindness in the only place she finds it and is then destroyed by the rules of the society that has failed her. Lee first builds sympathy through setting. The Ewells live behind the town dump, in a cabin that was once lived in by black people, and their yard is strewn with rubbish the children have scavenged. Against this squalor Lee places one striking detail: a row of red geraniums growing in chipped slop jars, tended as carefully as if they belonged to Miss Maudie herself. The geraniums are a quiet symbol of Mayella herself, something delicate and hopeful struggling to survive in ugly surroundings, and everyone in Maycomb says they are Mayella's. Before she ever speaks in court, the reader has seen her small, doomed attempt at beauty and dignity. When Mayella takes the stand, Scout's description is double-edged. She seems "somehow fragile-looking", yet she is a heavy girl "accustomed to strenuous labour". The contradiction captures her situation: she is physically strong because she has to do the work of a mother to seven siblings, but emotionally she is as breakable as a child. Her insistence that she is "nineteen and a half" sounds like the way a small child counts her age, and Judge Taylor's patient manner towards her reinforces the sense that she is immature and out of her depth. Lee uses Scout's innocent perspective to let the reader see more than Scout fully understands. The cross-examination is the heart of Lee's presentation, and its method is

Question number

revealing. Atticus asks simple questions about her life, and her answers expose a hidden world of neglect. Her father spends the relief cheques on drink; she left school because her family needed her at home; and when asked whether her father is good to her, she answers that he does "tollable" except when he has been drinking, before breaking off. The broken sentence is powerful because what she cannot say is left for the reader to supply. Lee later strengthens the implication of sexual abuse through Tom's account of what Mayella told him, and through Atticus's evidence that her injuries were inflicted by someone who led with his left hand, as Bob Ewell does. When Atticus asks about friends, she "frowned as if puzzled": the very idea seems foreign to her. Scout's realisation that Mayella "must have been the loneliest person in the world" is one of the most significant moments in the novel, because Scout compares her with Boo Radley and decides that Mayella is worse off. The superlative is deliberately extreme. Mayella belongs nowhere: white people despise her as trash, and black people avoid her because she is white.

However, Lee does not let the reader forget the damage Mayella does. In court she becomes hostile and erratic. She accuses Atticus of mocking her when he calls her "ma'am" and "Miss Mayella", and Scout compares her to "a steady-eyed cat with a twitchy tail", an image that suggests watchfulness and the possibility of a sudden, vicious strike. Her final outburst, in which she calls the men of the court "yellow stinkin' cowards" and declares "I ain't gonna say no more", reveals fury and a sense that, as a white woman, she can rely on the jury to believe her. Her tears are presented ambiguously too: some seem to be tears of fear, others tears of rage at being exposed. Most damningly, the story that emerges is one of calculation. Mayella saved her money for a long time to send the children into town for ice cream so that she could be alone with Tom, which suggests planning rather than impulse. When she is caught, she chooses to accuse an innocent man to protect

Question number

herself.

It is Atticus's closing speech, though, that guides the reader's final judgement, and he holds both truths at once. He insists that Mayella is a victim of "cruel poverty and ignorance" and says he has "nothing but pity in my heart" for her, yet he will not let pity become an excuse. In his view she has broken a rigid code by tempting a black man, and having done so she must "destroy the evidence" of her offence: Tom himself. Lee's choice of such a cold phrase makes clear how monstrous the consequence of her lie is. Atticus's pity, then, is not forgiveness, but understanding.

Tom's testimony adds a final, painful irony. He helped Mayella because he "felt right sorry for her", and Lee shows that he may be the only person who has ever been decent to her. The courtroom's shocked reaction to a black man pitying a white woman exposes the racism that makes her loneliness inescapable. Mayella's tragedy is that the one act of kindness in her life is the thing she destroys.

Overall, I agree that Mayella deserves sympathy, though not sympathy without judgement. Lee presents her as both a victim and a perpetrator, and the reader's response is meant to be as divided as Atticus's. She is a mockingbird of sorts who has been harmed by her father and her town, yet she also takes part in killing the novel's true mockingbird, Tom Robinson. By making us pity a character whose lie is so destructive, Lee shows how prejudice and poverty corrupt even those they most damage.

4b

I strongly agree that some people in Maycomb are treated unfairly; in fact, unfairness is the moral centre of the novel. Lee structures the book around two

Question number

"mockingbirds", Tom Robinson and Boo Radley, innocent people who harm no one yet suffer because of prejudice, gossip and fear. However, Lee does not present Maycomb as wholly unjust. Through Atticus, Miss Maudie, Heck Tate and others she shows that fairness exists, even if it moves only in small steps, as Miss Maudie recognises. Seen through the eyes of Scout, a child who instinctively expects life to be fair, these events become all the more shocking.

The clearest victim is Tom Robinson. Lee builds the injustice of his situation gradually. Before the trial, a group of men arrives at the jail at night intending to lynch him, and the threat is only defused when Scout innocently talks to Mr Cunningham about his son Walter and his "entailment". The scene is unsettling because these are not monsters but ordinary townspeople, and Lee implies that Tom's life depends on the accident of a child shaming a mob. The atmosphere of the trial is equally telling. Crowds pour into town as if it is a holiday, picnicking and treating a man's life as entertainment. The black spectators are made to sit in the balcony, a visual image of segregation that Lee places above the courtroom where Atticus will argue that all men are equal.

In court, Lee uses Mr Gilmer's manner to expose unfair treatment. He repeatedly calls Tom "boy", a word that strips a grown man of dignity, and he sneers at Tom's claim that he helped Mayella for nothing. The decisive moment comes when Tom admits he "felt right sorry for her". To the white jury this is an unforgivable presumption, because a black man has dared to pity a white woman. Dill's tears, and his complaint about the way Mr Gilmer talks to Tom, allow Lee to voice the reader's own disgust through the uncorrupted reaction of a child. Atticus has proved that Tom's left arm is crippled after an accident with a cotton gin, and that Mayella's injuries were inflicted by a left-handed man, yet the verdict is still guilty. Jem's disbelief, and his insistence that it is not right, mark his painful loss

Question number

of innocence. Atticus's argument that a courtroom is the one place where a man ought to get a square deal, whatever his colour, makes the failure of the jury all the more damning.

The injustice is completed off stage. Tom, losing hope, tries to escape from the prison farm and is shot with seventeen bullets. Lee reports his death indirectly and almost flatly, which makes it more shocking, and Mr Underwood's editorial compares it to the senseless slaughter of songbirds by hunters, linking the death directly to the novel's title. Atticus's earlier warning that it is "a sin to kill a mockingbird" is now fulfilled in the most literal way. Maycomb's response, that it is typical of a black man to run, shows how prejudice turns even death into further insult.

The second mockingbird is Boo Radley, whose unfair treatment is more subtle because it is partly carried out by the narrator herself. In the early chapters, the children see him through gossip and legend. Scout describes him as a "malevolent phantom", and Jem imagines him as a creature who "dined on raw squirrels". Lee's comic, gothic language makes the children's games entertaining, but it also shows how rumour turns a damaged, reclusive man into a monster. In reality Boo has been confined by a harsh, proud father and then by his brother Nathan, who cements up the knot-hole in the tree and cuts off Boo's gentle attempts to communicate with the children through gifts. That act, which Jem understands and cries over, is one of the cruellest in the book precisely because it is so small and quiet.

However, Lee balances these injustices with signs of fairness and decency. Atticus defends Tom properly, sits outside the jail to protect him and treats him with courtesy. Miss Maudie points out that the jury stayed out for hours, which she

Question number

sees as progress, and Atticus later reveals that one juror, a Cunningham, wanted to acquit. Link Deas stands up in court to defend Tom's character. Boo, too, is finally treated with fairness. After he saves Jem and Scout from Bob Ewell, Heck Tate refuses to drag him into the spotlight, insisting that the dead should bury the dead. Scout's realisation that exposing Boo would be "sort of like shootin' a mockingbird" shows that she has learned Atticus's lesson of climbing into another person's skin and walking around in it. The novel ends with Scout standing on the Radley porch and seeing the street from Boo's point of view.

Lee also hints that unfairness reaches further than these two men. Walter Cunningham is humiliated by Miss Caroline for his poverty, Calpurnia's community is shut out of white Maycomb, and even Mayella, though she causes Tom's death, is a victim of her father and of a town that despises her. Unfairness, Lee suggests, is woven into the class and race structure of Maycomb itself.

In conclusion, I agree that some people in Maycomb are treated unfairly, and Lee presents this as the defining truth of the town. Yet she also shows individuals resisting it, and the novel's structure, moving from childish rumour to adult understanding, suggests that fairness begins when people learn to see others clearly. The tragedy is that this understanding comes too late for Tom.

Sa

I only partly agree that Lennie is responsible for what happens to him. Steinbeck shows that Lennie often knows he is doing wrong and repeatedly disobeys George, so he cannot be seen as completely blameless. However, Steinbeck also presents him as a man with the mind of a child, unable to control his own strength or foresee consequences, who is manipulated, provoked and finally trapped by the people and the harsh world around him. His death feels less like a punishment he

Question number

has earned than a tragedy that the novella has been preparing from its first page.

Steinbeck establishes Lennie's nature through animal imagery in the opening chapter. He walks "the way a bear drags his paws" and drinks from the pool like a horse, which suggests strength without understanding. His delight in the water, and his childlike wish to stroke soft things, make him seem innocent, almost pure. Yet even here Steinbeck shows some awareness of wrongdoing. Lennie hides the dead mouse in his pocket and, when George challenges him, insists it is "jus' a dead mouse", as if trying to minimise what he has done. He hands it over reluctantly and then cries. This suggests that Lennie understands rules, even if he does not understand why they matter.

The reference to Weed deepens the question of responsibility. George explains that Lennie grabbed a girl's dress because he wanted to feel it, and would not let go, so the two men had to hide in an irrigation ditch to escape a lynch mob. Lennie remembers little of this, which suggests he does not grasp how serious it was. Structurally, though, Steinbeck uses Weed as foreshadowing: the pattern of a soft thing, a panicked grip and a violent outcome will be repeated with tragic consequences. When George tells him to return to the brush by the river if he gets into trouble, Steinbeck makes it clear that trouble is expected. Lennie's attempts to make George feel guilty, offering to go and live alone in a cave, show that he can be emotionally manipulative too, although he may simply be repeating a pattern that has worked before.

On the ranch, Lennie's disobedience grows. Despite George's warnings he speaks to the boss, he brings the puppy into the bunkhouse, and he goes into Crooks's room, staying even after Crooks tells him he has no right to be there. Most importantly, he talks to Curley's wife after George has told him to stay away from her. In each

Question number

case Lennie knows the rule and breaks it, which supports the view that he shares some responsibility for his fate.

However, Steinbeck carefully shows that Lennie's actions are often caused by others. In the fight with Curley, Lennie does nothing to defend himself until George shouts at him to fight back, and even then he only grips Curley's hand and cannot let go. His cry that he "didn't wanta hurt him" is clearly sincere. Curley, not Lennie, starts the violence, and Slim covers for Lennie afterwards. Similarly, in Crooks's room, Crooks deliberately torments Lennie by suggesting that George might not come back, and Lennie becomes frightened and threatening. Steinbeck shows that Lennie is easy prey for other people's loneliness and cruelty.

The death of the puppy is crucial. Lennie kills it by accident and then tries to reason with it, asking why it had to get killed when it was not as little as a mouse. His logic is pitiful because he genuinely does not understand his own strength. His main fear is that George will not let him tend the rabbits, which shows that his moral sense is tied entirely to George's approval. Steinbeck uses this scene as a direct prelude to the death of Curley's wife.

In that scene, Curley's wife invites Lennie to stroke her hair, telling him to "feel right aroun' there". When she panics and screams, Lennie, terrified, covers her mouth and shakes her until her neck breaks. Steinbeck's language is brutally simple: "her body flopped like a fish". Afterwards Lennie says, "I done a bad thing", and covers her with hay, which shows awareness of guilt. Yet his first concern, again, is that George will be angry and that he will lose the rabbits. He knows he has done wrong, but not, it seems, what death means.

The ending shows how little control Lennie has over his fate. He returns to the

Question number

pool, as George told him, and hallucinates Aunt Clara and a giant rabbit, who scold him in his own anxious voice. George shoots him while describing the dream farm, and the parallel with Candy's dog is unmistakable. Candy regretted letting a stranger shoot his dog, and George takes the same decision upon himself out of love. Steinbeck implies that a world as hard as the ranch has no place for someone like Lennie, and that his death was inevitable.

Overall, I agree only to a limited extent. Lennie does make choices, and he often knows when he has done wrong, so he bears some responsibility. But Steinbeck presents him as fundamentally innocent: a strong body with a child's mind, provoked by Curley, tempted by Curley's wife, unsettled by Crooks and failed by a society that offers no protection to the vulnerable. His surname, Small, is an irony that sums up his tragedy. Lennie is less the cause of what happens to him than its victim.

Sb

I agree to a large extent that the ranch workers are unfriendly, but I think Steinbeck presents their coldness as a product of their lives rather than their natures. The men are itinerant labourers who drift from job to job with no family and no security, and Steinbeck shows that this way of life breeds suspicion, loneliness and self-protection. Yet he also gives glimpses of warmth: Slim's kindness, the shared dream of George, Lennie and Candy, and moments of conversation in Crooks's room. The ranch is not a place without friendship so much as a place where friendship is fragile and easily destroyed.

From the start, Steinbeck makes loneliness the defining feature of the ranch workers' lives. Beside the pool, George tells Lennie that guys like them, who work on ranches, are "the loneliest guys in the world. They got no family. They don't

Question number

belong no place." The blunt, repetitive sentences, in George's colloquial voice, sound like a truth he has learned through experience. By contrast, George and Lennie have "somebody to talk to", which immediately marks them as unusual. Steinbeck sets up the expectation that the ranch will be a cold place.

This expectation is confirmed by the bunkhouse. Its bare walls, burlap ticking and apple-box shelves suggest impermanence: each man's possessions fit in a box, as if he is ready to leave at any moment. Candy, the first man they meet, is cautious, and when the boss arrives he is suspicious of George for speaking on Lennie's behalf, asking what George is trying to put over. Curley is openly hostile. He glances at them "coldly", his hands close into fists and he adopts a fighter's stance, so that Lennie squirms with discomfort. Steinbeck presents Curley as a man who treats every newcomer, especially a big one, as a threat. Later his aggression explodes into the attack on Lennie.

Steinbeck also presents unfriendliness as a quieter, more casual cruelty. Carlson's complaint that Candy's old dog stinks, and his relentless pressure to shoot it, shows a total lack of sympathy for Candy's only companion. The other men say nothing to support Candy, and the silence in the bunkhouse while they wait for the shot is one of the most uncomfortable moments in the novella. Candy's later regret that he let a stranger shoot his dog shows how alone he felt. Slim does agree with Carlson, but his reasoning is practical rather than cruel, and he offers Candy a puppy, which hints at kindness within the harshness.

The most extreme example of isolation is Crooks. Because he is black, he is not allowed in the bunkhouse and lives alone in the harness room by the stable. He explains to Lennie that he cannot play cards with the others because he is black and they say he stinks. His bitterness makes him unfriendly in turn: he tells

Question number

Lennie he has no right to be in his room and torments him with the idea that George might never come back. Yet Steinbeck shows that this hostility is a defence. Crooks's statement that "a guy goes nuts if he ain't got nobody" reveals how desperately he wants company, and he briefly asks to join the dream farm. When Curley's wife threatens him with lynching, he retreats into himself, "reduced" to nothing. Racism has made him unfriendly, rather than the reverse.

However, there is evidence that the ranch workers can be friendly. Slim is presented almost as an ideal, the "prince of the ranch", whose quiet gravity silences the bunkhouse and invites trust. He listens to George's story about Lennie without judgement and comments that not many men travel together, wondering whether everybody in the world is scared of each other. His remark suggests that unfriendliness is caused by fear, not malice. Whit shows enthusiasm when he shares a magazine letter by a former ranch hand, and the men play cards, pitch horseshoes and go into town together on Saturday nights. Candy, once he hears about the dream, becomes a genuine friend, offering his savings to share the farm.

Curley's wife's experience complicates the picture. She complains that the men will not talk to her, but she also notes that if she catches one man alone, he gets along with her fine. Steinbeck suggests that the men are not necessarily unfriendly as individuals: they are afraid of Curley and of how they will be seen by the others. The group creates the coldness.

The ending, I think, sums up Steinbeck's view. After George shoots Lennie, Slim leads him away gently, telling him that he had to do it. It is a moment of real tenderness. Yet Carlson's response, wondering what is eating the two of them, shows how incapable most of the men are of understanding friendship. Steinbeck ends the novella with this contrast between a rare moment of human feeling and

Question number

the insensitivity that surrounds it.

Overall, I agree that the ranch workers are largely unfriendly, but Steinbeck makes clear why. Their transient, competitive lives, the racism and fear that divide them, and the absence of family or home make friendship a luxury few can afford. Moments of warmth, especially from Slim, show what is possible, which makes the general loneliness all the more painful.

6a

I largely agree that Kevin is not a good friend to Paddy, although Doyle presents their friendship as more complicated than simple cruelty. For much of the novel Kevin is Paddy's closest companion, the leader of the gang whose approval Paddy craves. Yet through Paddy's first-person narration Doyle gradually reveals Kevin as dominant, unpredictable and ultimately vindictive. Because the narrator is a ten-year-old who does not always recognise what is happening to him, the reader often sees Kevin's unkindness more clearly than Paddy does, and this gap is one of Doyle's key methods.

At the start, Kevin and Paddy seem inseparable. The novel opens with the gang wandering their estate, and Kevin's casual agreement, "Cool", suggests easy companionship. Doyle repeatedly uses the phrase "me and Kevin", and the repetition makes them sound like a unit. They plan their adventures together, deciding without the others that they will get Liam to light a fire, and Paddy relishes the sense of a private alliance: "this was me and Kevin together". Physical closeness is important too. Paddy describes how they made sure they were "touching, right beside each other", and when Paddy is injured by a nail, he leans on Kevin all the way home. These moments show genuine loyalty and suggest that, at least early on, Kevin is a real friend.

Question number

However, Doyle undercuts this affection from the beginning. Kevin's friendship always comes with a sense of hierarchy. In one game, the boys stand in a circle while Kevin stays outside it and will not take his turn, an image that places him above the rules that bind the others. Paddy learns to predict his moods with unsettling accuracy: he knows when Kevin is "going to take it out on me". The fact that Paddy can anticipate this shows how regular Kevin's aggression is. Doyle's flat, matter-of-fact narration of incidents such as Kevin kicking the fire at him or poking his eyes makes the violence seem normal, part of the rough texture of childhood, but the reader recognises a pattern of bullying.

Kevin also manipulates and betrays Paddy. He persuades Paddy to touch a heater, and Paddy burns himself simply "because Kevin told me to". He lies about what he has done, and in school he gets Paddy into trouble by reporting to the teacher Paddy's boast that his grandfather was Thomas Clarke, one of the leaders of 1916. Here Doyle shows Kevin exploiting a moment of childish pride to humiliate his friend in front of authority. He mocks Paddy's singing as "stupid", and Paddy's quiet comment that he did not think it was stupid at all reveals how much Kevin's judgements hurt. Doyle's use of short, simple sentences conveys Paddy's hurt without self-pity, which makes it more affecting.

As Paddy's home life collapses, Kevin's treatment of him becomes harsher, and the friendship begins to break. Paddy notices that he is kinder to the other boys when Kevin is not around, suggesting that Kevin has been a negative influence on him all along. When Paddy starts to spend time with the hard, isolated Charles Leavy, Kevin seems to feel threatened and turns against him, warning him "I'm going to get you, Clarke". The use of Paddy's surname is significant: Kevin is no longer speaking as a friend, but as an enemy.

Question number

The fight between them is the climax of their relationship. Kevin starts it, pushing Paddy again and again until Paddy is forced to respond. Paddy wins, but he lets go to allow Kevin to keep his dignity, a moment of maturity and mercy that Kevin does not return. Instead he threatens that Paddy is "dead" and leads the gang in a boycott. Doyle presents the chant of "Boycott!" in Kevin's voice, so that the betrayal is personal. Worse still, he pushes David Geraghty, Paddy's last friend, into whipping him; the fact that David is crying as he does it shows how far Kevin's power over the group extends. The taunting rhyme that gives the novel its title, mocking Paddy for having no da, becomes the gang's weapon at the very moment Paddy is most vulnerable.

Structurally, Kevin's disappearance from the end of the novel is telling. Paddy does not mention him again, which implies that the friendship is finished for good. Doyle suggests that Paddy has grown beyond the gang, and that his loneliness, though painful, is also a sign of growing up.

On the other hand, it could be argued that Kevin is simply a typical boy and that the cruelty runs both ways. Paddy himself joins in bullying, particularly of his brother Sinbad, and Kevin even looks to Paddy for approval before tormenting Sinbad, which suggests a shared culture of casual violence rather than Kevin's personal malice. Their friendship reflects the rough world they live in.

Overall, I agree that Kevin is not a good friend to Paddy. Although Doyle shows moments of loyalty and fun, Kevin's dominance, manipulation and final vindictiveness reveal a friendship based on power rather than care. Most damningly, when Paddy most needs support, Kevin turns the gang against him. Doyle uses their relationship to show Paddy's painful discovery that friendship, like

Question number

his parents' marriage, can break.

6b

I agree that Paddy's home life becomes deeply unhappy, but I do not think it begins that way. Doyle presents a family that contains real love, especially from Paddy's mother, and moments of warmth with his father. What makes the novel so moving is the way this happiness is gradually eroded by his parents' arguments, which escalate into violence and end with his father leaving. Because the story is told by a ten-year-old who only half understands what he sees, Doyle allows the reader to sense the unhappiness long before Paddy can name it.

Paddy's relationship with his mother is the most secure part of his home life. Her first appearance shows both discipline and tenderness: she smacks a crying child on the back of the legs but then pushes his tears away with her knuckle. Doyle presents her as patient and attentive. Paddy notes that she "didn't lose her temper", and she asks him a string of questions about what animals he likes and whether he would like to be a vet, the quick sequence of questions showing her genuine interest in him. Her small indulgences, such as letting the children splash in the bath for five minutes, create a sense of comfort. Paddy's simple, almost list-like praise of her cooking, her clean house and her calmness ends with the judgement that she was "the best ma". Through the child's voice, Doyle makes her goodness feel uncomplicated and true.

His father is more complex. At times he is playful and kind. He shows Paddy how fingerprints work, holding him so he does not fall off the chair, and he puts on a deep voice pretending to be Santy. He reads the newspaper and discusses the news with Paddy, and praises him with "Good man". These moments show a father who enjoys his son's company. However, Doyle quickly hints at instability. Paddy

Question number

observes that his father sometimes liked his questions "and sometimes he didn't", and that he could be "really mean for no reason". The contrast reveals how wary Paddy must be. When teaching Paddy a song, Da becomes impatient and hits him when he cannot manage it, so even a happy memory turns sour. Most painfully, when Paddy goes to him first, eager for praise, he is dismissed with a curt order to get out, and he shows little interest when Paddy wins a sports medal. Doyle's restrained narration, which reports this without comment, makes the rejection hurt more.

The parents' arguments are the main source of unhappiness, and Doyle structures the novel so that they intensify. Early references to "another of their fights" suggest they are already familiar, and Paddy can almost "feel" his father's voice through the house, a sensory verb that conveys volume and menace. Paddy describes the waiting as "agony", a word that turns emotional tension into physical pain. As the novel progresses, the fights become constant, and Paddy's attempts to analyse them, noting how much each parent speaks and how long their answers are, show a child desperately trying to find order in chaos. His obsessive attention reveals how completely the arguments dominate his world.

Doyle uses short, simple sentences to create tension during these episodes. When his father's mood changes, Paddy records each action separately, as he stops, breathes and sits down, so that the reader shares the sense of waiting for an explosion. Eventually it comes. The bare statement "I heard the smack" is shocking in its simplicity, and later Paddy sees his father hit his mother. His response is to become her protector: "I watched. I listened. I stayed in. I guarded her." The repetitive structure of these short sentences shows a child taking on an adult burden, staying awake at night as if his vigilance could hold the family together.

Question number

The unhappiness spreads to the other children. Sinbad tells himself it is "only talking", a coping mechanism that Paddy cannot share, and later withdraws so completely that hugging him is like "hugging a statue". Their relationship, already marked by Paddy's bullying, becomes another loss. Paddy himself grows isolated from his friends, telling himself he has no one, "the way I wanted it", which reads as a brave front over loneliness. His plan to run away, in the hope that it will force his parents to make up, shows the desperate logic of a child who believes he can mend what is broken.

On the other hand, it could be argued that Paddy's home life is not wholly unhappy even at its worst. His mother tries to keep up a sense of normality to protect him, and much of the novel is filled with ordinary pleasures. Doyle's fragmented, episodic structure places memories of fun beside memories of fear, suggesting that childhood happiness and sadness exist side by side.

Overall, I agree that Paddy's home life becomes unhappy, and by the end it is devastating. His father leaves, and when he visits at Christmas he greets Paddy with a handshake, as if they were strangers. Doyle presents the breakdown of the marriage as the event that ends Paddy's childhood. The happiness of the early home makes its loss all the more painful.

7a

I largely agree that Snowball makes the Rebellion a success, because in the early chapters Orwell presents him as its organiser, its teacher and its military hero. However, Orwell also suggests that Snowball's gifts are the gifts of an idealist, and that the very qualities which help to win the Rebellion leave him unable to protect it. Snowball makes the Rebellion succeed as an event, but he cannot make it succeed as a lasting revolution.

Question number

From the start, Orwell sets Snowball up through careful contrast with Napoleon. Snowball is described as "a more vivacious pig than Napoleon, quicker in speech and more inventive", whereas Napoleon has a reputation for "getting his own way". The comparative adjectives favour Snowball in every respect except one, and that exception is telling: he is "not considered to have the same depth of character". Orwell's narrator reports this as received opinion, so the reader may wonder whether "depth" really means something more sinister in Napoleon, namely secrecy and patience. Even so, it is Snowball, along with Napoleon and Squealer, who works Old Major's teachings "into a complete system of thought" called Animalism. Without this, Major's dream would have remained a speech in a barn rather than a set of ideas the animals could live by.

Once Jones is driven out, Snowball gives the Rebellion its symbols and its purpose. He reduces the principles of Animalism to the Seven Commandments and paints them on the barn wall, and he designs the flag, explaining that the green field stands for England and the hoof and horn for the future Republic of the Animals. Orwell shows how important such symbols are to a group of creatures who mostly cannot read. Earlier, Snowball's patient question to Mollie, "Can you not understand that liberty is worth more than ribbons?", reveals that he understands freedom as a principle rather than a comfort, and when he throws the ribbons onto the fire he turns that principle into a visible act. He also sets the immediate task, urging the animals to make it "a point of honour" to get the harvest in more quickly than Jones ever did. The harvest that follows is the biggest success the farm has ever seen, which suggests that Snowball's energy gives the new society its early confidence.

Snowball's greatest contribution is his leadership at the Battle of the Cowshed.

Question number

Orwell tells us that he has studied an old book of Julius Caesar's campaigns, so his victory comes from preparation as well as courage. The violent image of the "pellets" that "scored bloody streaks along Snowball's back" shows that he leads from the front and is prepared to bleed for the cause, while Napoleon is notably absent from the account. The animals' decision to award him "Animal Hero, First Class" confirms that, at this point, the community itself recognises Snowball as the one who has saved the Rebellion. Without his defence, Jones would have retaken the farm and the Rebellion would have ended almost as soon as it began.

Yet Orwell undercuts this heroic picture in several ways. Snowball's committees are well meant and "indefatigable", but the narrator flatly concludes that "on the whole, these projects were a failure". The comic details, such as the Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee and the cat who agrees to be friendly but keeps her distance from the sparrows, suggest that his schemes are idealistic and impractical. His intellect also separates him from the animals he wants to help: the birds do not understand his long words, and so he invents the slogan "Four legs good, two legs bad". This simplification is meant to educate, but the sheep turn it into mindless bleating, which Napoleon later uses to drown out debate. Orwell may be suggesting that Snowball unknowingly creates the tools of his own defeat.

Even more damaging is Snowball's complicity in the theft of the milk and apples. Orwell's narrator notes that all the pigs agree on this point, "even Snowball and Napoleon". This small phrase matters structurally, because it is the first sign that the pigs see themselves as a privileged class, and Snowball does nothing to stop it. He also fails to notice Napoleon quietly removing the puppies to raise them in secret. While Snowball dreams of a windmill that will bring electric light and a three-day week, Napoleon is building his real source of power. The windmill debate

Question number

shows Snowball winning arguments through eloquence, but eloquence is useless against "nine enormous dogs". His expulsion, as he runs for his life and slips through a hole in the hedge, is presented with brutal speed, and he never returns.

Finally, Orwell shows that Snowball's absence becomes as useful to Napoleon as his presence was to the Rebellion. He is turned into a scapegoat, blamed for the collapse of the windmill and for every misfortune, and Squealer rewrites the Battle of the Cowshed to claim he was in league with Jones. The ease with which the animals' memories are altered suggests that Snowball's achievements were never secured, because he had built ideals rather than safeguards.

Overall, I agree that Snowball makes the Rebellion a success in its early stages: he gives it ideas, symbols, organisation and military victory. However, Orwell presents him as a leader who believes that reason and persuasion are enough. By the novel's end, when the animals cannot tell pig from man, the reader understands that Snowball helped to win the Rebellion but could not stop it from being betrayed.

7b

Through his presentation of life on the farm, Orwell suggests that Animalism was not doomed by its ideals, which are genuinely hopeful, but by the inequality that is present from the very first day of freedom. I largely agree that it was bound to fail, because Orwell structures the novel so that the seeds of corruption are planted almost immediately and grow steadily into tyranny. However, he also presents moments of real happiness and solidarity, which suggest that the tragedy lies in the betrayal of a dream that might have worked.

Orwell first makes the reader want Animalism to succeed. Old Major's speech presents life under Jones as unbearable: the life of an animal, he says, is "misery

Question number

and slavery", and the blunt pairing of these nouns makes rebellion seem not just justified but necessary. The Rebellion itself happens spontaneously, when the hungry animals break into the store-shed after Jones has neglected to feed them, which suggests that their uprising grows from genuine suffering rather than from ambition. In the first summer, Orwell presents life on the farm with warmth. The harvest is a triumph, every mouthful of food is "an acute positive pleasure", and Boxer becomes the admiration of everybody with his motto "I will work harder". This idyllic tone shows that the animals, at least at first, are capable of cooperation and contentment.

Yet even within this happy picture, Orwell inserts warning signs. The pigs do not actually work but "directed and supervised the others", and the narrator presents this as natural because of their "superior knowledge". The structure is significant: the very chapter that celebrates the harvest also reveals that the milk has disappeared and, later, that the windfall apples are to be reserved for the pigs. Squealer's justification is a clever blend of false science and threat, ending with the repeated question of whether the animals want Jones to come back. The animals' silence shows how easily fear can be used to silence objection. From this point, the reader senses that equality is already an illusion.

The rise of Napoleon confirms this. By secretly raising the puppies, he gains the "nine enormous dogs" that chase Snowball off the farm, and the debates that once gave life on the farm a democratic character are abolished. Orwell presents the change through the animals' confused perspective: they feel uneasy but cannot find the words to protest, and the sheep's bleating of "Four legs good, two legs bad" fills the silence. The same slogan that once united them now prevents thought. Orwell may be suggesting that a society in which most members cannot read or reason for themselves is especially vulnerable, which makes failure seem

Question number

inevitable.

Life on the farm becomes steadily harder. The animals work "like slaves", and Sunday afternoon work is described as voluntary, although any animal who absents himself will have his rations reduced. The irony here is bitter, because the language of freedom is being used to disguise compulsion. The Seven Commandments are quietly altered, so that "No animal shall sleep in a bed" gains the words "with sheets", and the commandment about killing gains "without cause". Orwell's use of these small additions is chilling, as it shows how power works by changing language rather than openly breaking rules. The show trials and executions, after which Clover gazes down at the farm and reflects that these scenes of terror were not what they had looked forward to, mark the moment when the dream visibly dies. Her inability to express her feelings, except by singing "Beasts of England", which is then banned, is deeply poignant.

The treatment of Boxer is perhaps the clearest evidence. His faith that "Napoleon is always right" and his tireless labour are rewarded by being sold to the knacker when his strength fails. Benjamin's desperate reading of the van's lettering and the animals' realisation come too late. Orwell presents this as a betrayal of the most loyal believer in Animalism, which suggests that the system rewards obedience only while it is useful.

At the same time, Orwell complicates the idea that failure was inevitable. The animals do defeat Jones at the Battle of the Cowshed, and after the windmill is destroyed they rebuild it with thicker walls. Even near the end, the narrator tells us that they never gave up hope and still felt honoured to be part of Animal Farm. Benjamin's cynical remark that "Donkeys live a long time" suggests that he always expected nothing to change, but most animals cling to the ideal, which shows that

Question number

Animalism itself remained powerful even as the pigs corrupted it.

The final scene, however, makes the failure absolute. The single remaining commandment, "All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others", is a paradox that destroys the meaning of equality, and the pigs now walk on two legs and carry whips. As the animals look through the window, the circular structure of the narrative is complete: they look "from pig to man, and from man to pig", and find it impossible to say which is which. Orwell returns the farm to its original name, Manor Farm, so the story ends where it began.

Overall, I agree that Animalism was bound to fail on this farm, not because the animals were incapable of a better life, but because power was unequal from the beginning and those who held it were never challenged. Orwell presents the ideal with sympathy, but shows that without education, vigilance and honest leadership, revolutionary hope is easily turned into a new form of slavery.

8

Stoker engages the reader by drawing us into Harker's growing fear through the intimate form of a diary, and by building tension through a pattern of sudden shocks and uneasy pauses. As Harker tries to stay rational, the reader begins to understand more than he does, which makes the extract both suspenseful and unsettling.

The diary form creates an immediate rapport. Harker writes in the first person and in the present moment, so his anxieties feel raw and private. His admission that there is "something so strange about this place" that he "cannot but feel uneasy" is vague, and this vagueness is itself frightening because the source of the danger is not named. The isolation is made explicit in the half-finished sentence about

Question number

the Count, which breaks off before Harker fears he is "the only living soul within the place". The broken syntax suggests a thought too disturbing to complete, and the word "living" hints, for the reader, at something unnatural. Harker's resolve to "be prosaic" and not let "imagination" run riot shows him fighting for self-control, so we watch a sensible man slowly losing it.

Stoker then shifts from reflection to dramatic action. The ordinary routine of shaving is interrupted by "Suddenly", and the polite "Good morning" is made eerie because it comes from a man Harker cannot see. The revelation is withheld until Harker turns back to the glass, and the exclamation "But there was no reflection of him in the mirror!" delivers the climax of the paragraph with shocking simplicity. The tension rises again when Harker's small cut bleeds. The Count's "eyes blazed with a sort of demoniac fury", and the verb "blazed" and adjective "demoniac" present him as hellish, while the "grab" at Harker's throat is animal and violent. Stoker engages us further by leaving the link between blood, the crucifix and the Count's sudden calm unexplained, inviting the reader to make the connection that Harker does not.

The Count's dialogue is quietly menacing. The repetition of "take care" sounds like courtesy but works as a threat, and the warning that cutting oneself is "more dangerous than you think in this country" contains dramatic irony. His contempt for the mirror as a "foul bauble of man's vanity", and the physical violence of "one wrench of his terrible hand" as he "flung" it out, suggest enormous strength. His silent exit adds to his mystery. Stoker then lowers the tension with Harker's almost comic annoyance about shaving, and his remark that the Count must be "a very peculiar man!" seems naive, which only increases our fear for him.

The structure of the final section is especially effective. Stoker offers a moment of

Question number

beauty, with the "sea of green tree tops" and the "silver threads" of the rivers, but this is framed by danger, as the castle sits on "a terrific precipice" and a falling stone would drop "a thousand feet". Harker rejects the view because he is "not in heart to describe beauty", and the repetition of "Doors, doors, doors" creates a frantic rhythm, echoing his panicked search. The final exclamation, "I am a prisoner!", ends on a cliffhanger, leaving the reader with dread and a strong desire to read on.