Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education

English Literature

Unit 1

The Study of Prose

GEL11

[GEL11]
Assessment

Assessment Level of Control:
Tick the relevant box (✓)

Controlled Conditions	
Other	

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** Ralph, show how far you agree that Ralph is a **strong leader**.

(b) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** the killings on the island, show that the boys **react** to the killings in differing ways.

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 is **immature**.

(b) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** friendship, show how far you agree that Ellie and Marcus have a **strong** friendship.

stemup.co.uk

3 Johnston: *How Many Miles to Babylon?*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Alicia, show how far you agree that Alicia is **deliberately** cruel.

(b) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** the lives of Jerry and Alec, show how far you agree that they are **treated unfairly**.

stemup.co.uk

4 Lee: *To Kill a Mockingbird*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** Atticus, show how far you agree that Atticus is **respected** by the people of Maycomb.

(b) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** how Mrs Dubose, Boo Radley and Dolphus Raymond suffer, show that they **cope** with suffering in differing ways. Which of these three characters do you admire most? Give reasons for your opinions.

stemup.co.uk

5 Steinbeck: *Of Mice and Men*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** dreams in the novel, show how far you agree that these dreams are **harmful**.

stemup.co.uk

6 Doyle: *Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Mr Clarke, show how far you agree that Mr Clarke is a **good father** to Paddy.

(b) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Paddy's childhood, show how far you agree that Paddy has a **violent** childhood.

stemup.co.uk

7 Orwell: *Animal Farm*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** Boxer, show how far you agree that Boxer is **valued** by the other animals on the farm.

(b) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** the problems on the farm, show how far you agree that the human characters are the **cause** of the problems on the farm.

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

Extract from: *'Great Expectations'* by **Charles Dickens**.

(This novel is about a boy named Pip, an orphan who lives with his sister and her husband, Joe. The story begins at a graveyard and the reader sees Pip looking at the gravestones of his mother and father, when suddenly an escaped criminal appears.)

"Hold your noise!" cried a terrible voice, as a man started up from among the graves at the side of the church porch. "Keep still, you little devil, or I'll cut your throat!"

A fearful man, all in coarse grey, with a great iron on his leg. A man with no hat, and with broken shoes, and with an old rag tied round his head. A man who had been soaked in water, and smothered in mud, and lamed by stones, and cut by flints, and stung by nettles, and torn by briars; who limped, and shivered, and glared and growled; and whose teeth chattered in his head as he seized me by the chin.

"O! Don't cut my throat, sir," I pleaded in terror. "Pray don't do it, sir."

"Tell us your name!" said the man. "Quick!"

"Pip, sir."

"Once more," said the man, staring at me. "Give it mouth!"

"Pip. Pip, sir."

"Show us where you live," said the man. "Pint out the place!"

I pointed to where our village lay, on the flat in-shore among the alder-trees and pollards, a mile or more from the church.

The man, after looking at me for a moment, turned me upside down, and emptied my pockets. There was nothing in them but a piece of bread. When the church came to itself—for he was so sudden and strong that he made it go head over heels before me, and I saw the steeple under my feet—when the church came to itself, I say, I was seated on a high tombstone, trembling, while he ate the bread ravenously.

"You young dog," said the man, licking his lips, "what fat cheeks you ha' got."

I believe they were fat, though I was at that time undersized for my years, and not strong.

"Darn me if I couldn't eat 'em," said the man, with a threatening shake of his head, "and if I han't half a mind to't!"

I earnestly expressed my hope that he wouldn't, and held tighter to the tombstone on which he had put me; partly, to keep myself upon it; partly, to keep myself from crying.

"Now lookee here!" said the man. "Where's your mother?"

stemup.co.uk

“There, sir!” said I.

He started, made a short run, and stopped and looked over his shoulder.

“There, sir!” I timidly explained. “Also Georgiana. That’s my mother.”

“Oh!” said he, coming back. “And is that your father alonger your mother?”

“Yes, sir,” said I; “him too; late of this parish.”

“Ha!” he muttered then, considering. “Who d’ye live with—supposin’ you’re kindly let to live, which I han’t made up my mind about?”

“My sister, sir—Mrs. Joe Gargery—wife of Joe Gargery, the blacksmith, sir.”

“Blacksmith, eh?” said he. And looked down at his leg.

After darkly looking at his leg and me several times, he came closer to my tombstone, took me by both arms, and tilted me back as far as he could hold me; so that his eyes looked most powerfully down into mine, and mine looked most helplessly up into his.

“Now lookee here,” he said, “the question being whether you’re to be let to live. You know what a file is?”

“Yes, sir.”

“And you know what wittles is?”

“Yes, sir.”

After each question he tilted me over a little more, so as to give me a greater sense of helplessness and danger.

“You get me a file.” He tilted me again. “And you get me wittles.” He tilted me again. “You bring ’em both to me.” He tilted me again. “Or I’ll have your heart and liver out.” He tilted me again.

I was dreadfully frightened, and so giddy that I clung to him with both hands, and said, “If you would kindly please to let me keep upright, sir, perhaps I shouldn’t be sick, and perhaps I could attend more.”

He gave me a most tremendous dip and roll, so that the church jumped over its own weather-cock. Then, he held me by the arms in an upright position on the top of the stone, and went on in these fearful terms:

“You bring me, to-morrow morning early, that file and them wittles. You bring the lot to me, at that old Battery over yonder. You do it, and you never dare to say a word or dare to make a sign concerning your having seen such a person as me, or any person sumever, and you shall be let to live. You fail, or you go from my words in any partickler, no matter how small it is, and your heart and your liver shall be tore out, roasted, and ate.”

Glossary

- great iron – metal rings joined by a chain
- wittles – food
- Battery – a small building put up by the army

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

Sources

Q8.....From ‘Great Expectations’ (Wordsworth Classics) by Charles Dickens. Published by Wordsworth Editions; Reprint edition © 1992

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.

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

Question number

1a

Golding presents Ralph as a leader whose strength is real but limited. He is strong in his moral clarity, his commitment to rescue and his ability to command an assembly, yet he lacks the intellect of Piggy and the ruthless charisma of Jack. I largely agree that Ralph is a strong leader, but only if strength is measured by principle rather than power: by the end of the novel he has lost almost all of his followers, but he has never lost sight of what is right.

At the start of the novel Golding makes Ralph look like a natural leader. He is described as fair-haired and physically impressive, with a build that suggests he could become a boxer, and the narrator notes a "mildness" about his mouth and eyes that "proclaimed no devil". This careful physical description signals to the reader that Ralph is attractive and trustworthy. His election as chief is decided partly by the conch, which he holds, and partly by his calm stillness among the shouting boys. Golding is perhaps suggesting that the boys choose Ralph instinctively, for his look and his symbol, rather than for any proven skill, which already raises the question of how strong his leadership really is.

In the early assemblies Ralph's strength lies in his clear sense of purpose. His simple statement that "we want to have fun. And we want to be rescued" balances the boys' desires with their needs, and his insistence on the signal fire shows practical foresight. Golding shows his authority growing: when he holds up the conch the boys fall quiet and "He went on in the silence, borne on his triumph". The metaphor of being "borne" suggests that he is carried along by the approval of the group, a heady and fragile kind of power. He is also democratic, setting rules about who may speak and trying to share power with Jack by giving

Question number

him the choir as hunters. This is a mature gesture, but it is also arguably his first mistake, since it hands Jack an army.

Ralph's strength is clearest when Golding contrasts him with Jack. When the fire goes out and a ship passes, Ralph's anger is controlled and morally serious, and in rebuilding the fire it is noted that "No-one, not even Jack, would ask him to move". The phrase "not even Jack" tells us that, at this moment, Ralph has won the struggle, while "Jack was powerless and raged". Golding uses the boys' "eager faces" turned towards Ralph to show that the group still looks to him for direction. On several occasions he only needs to raise his hand for silence, a small gesture which shows how much natural authority he has in the first half of the novel.

However, Golding gradually exposes the weaknesses in Ralph's leadership. As the novel progresses he struggles to think clearly, and at a later assembly he begins "The fire's the most important thing on the island, because, because..." and cannot finish. The repetition and the trailing ellipsis show his mind clouding, and it is Piggy who supplies the word "Rescue". Ralph's growing dependence is shown through his questions, such as "Piggy, what are we going to do?", which shift the real thinking onto Piggy. Golding suggests that Ralph can recognise good ideas but cannot always produce them, and that he is never quite able to explain why the rules matter to boys who would rather hunt.

Ralph's leadership is also challenged directly. Jack speaks without the conch, breaking the rules Ralph set, and later asks "Why should choosing make any difference?". This rhetorical question attacks the foundation of Ralph's power: if democracy means nothing, Ralph has nothing. Ralph's lament that the hunters will not listen to him shows that his power depends on consent, and once consent is withdrawn he has no way of forcing obedience. A reader might argue that a truly

Question number

strong leader would have found a way to keep the group together; on the other hand, Golding seems to be suggesting that reasonable leadership is always vulnerable to the excitement that Jack offers.

Most troubling is Ralph's own moral failure. He is pulled into the frenzy of the pig hunt and then into the dance during which Simon is killed. His later broken speech, "Don't you understand? The things we did", shows guilt and honesty, but it also shows that he was not strong enough to resist the savagery he hated. When Piggy is killed by the rock, Ralph is powerless to protect him, and by the end Jack's tribe sets fire to the island to hunt Ralph down. Golding has reduced the chief to prey, a reversal that is shocking in its completeness.

Yet Golding does not present Ralph's fall as simple weakness. Even when he is alone, Ralph refuses to join Jack's tribe and refuses to accept that the rules are meaningless. Ironically, when the naval officer asks "Who's boss here?", Ralph replies "I am", and no-one protests. This moment is both moving and bitterly ironic: he is still chief in name, but chief of almost nothing. His final weeping for "the end of innocence" and for the death of his "true, wise friend" Piggy shows that he alone fully understands what has happened.

Overall, I agree that Ralph is a strong leader in terms of values, decency and persistence, but Golding presents him as too ordinary to hold back the darkness he faces. His strength is not enough, and that, perhaps, is Golding's point: good leadership depends on followers willing to be led by reason, and on this island there are too few of them.

1b Golding uses the killings on the island as a kind of moral measuring instrument.

Question number

Each death, from the first pig to Piggy, reveals how far each boy has travelled from civilisation, and the differences in their reactions grow sharper as the novel goes on. Jack and Roger come to find killing thrilling, Piggy tries to deny what he has witnessed, and Ralph, though he too is drawn in, responds with a guilt and grief that mark him out as the novel's conscience.

The pattern begins before any killing takes place. In the first chapter Jack draws his knife over a trapped piglet but cannot bring it down, held back by the "enormity" of cutting into living flesh. Golding shows that at this stage the inhibitions of home are still active. Jack's reaction to his failure, however, is revealing: he is embarrassed and vows that next time there will be no mercy. From the outset, then, Golding hints that for Jack the inability to kill is a shame to be overcome rather than a decency to be kept.

When the first pig is finally killed, the boys' reactions divide sharply. Jack returns with the hunters chanting, too ecstatic to care when Ralph reproaches him for letting the fire go out while a ship passed. Golding describes him as gripped by a "compulsion to track down and kill", and the noun "compulsion" suggests something closer to addiction than to a practical need for meat. Piggy, by contrast, cries out "shrilly" against the hunters' neglect of the fire, while Simon and Piggy look on with unease at the procession carrying the "gutted carcass of a pig". The chant of "Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Spill her blood" turns the killing into ritual, and its blunt, repetitive imperatives show that the language of violence is becoming the boys' shared vocabulary.

The killing of the sow later in the novel marks a further, darker stage. Golding presents this hunt in disturbingly sexualised language, and when Roger's spear lodges in the dying animal the hunters respond with laughter. That the boys "cried

Question number

with laughter" at an animal's agony is one of the most chilling details in the novel: cruelty has become entertainment. Jack eagerly guts the sow, and the head is left on a stick as an offering to the "beast". Simon's reaction is completely different. Alone in his clearing he faces the head, the Lord of the Flies, and learns that the beast is not something they can hunt and kill, because it is part of them. Golding uses Simon's silent, almost mystical response to give the reader the meaning that the other boys are unable to see.

Simon's own death is the turning point, and here Golding is careful to show differing reactions within the very boys who resist Jack. During the storm Ralph and Piggy join the dance, and Simon, crawling out of the forest to tell them the truth, is torn apart as the "beast". Afterwards Ralph cannot escape what has happened: he says plainly "That was Simon" and later names it "murder". His broken speech, "Don't you understand? The things we did", with its unfinished sentence, shows a mind struggling to hold an unbearable truth, and his voice is described as "low and stricken". Golding describes him rocking "to and fro", a childlike, self-comforting gesture that reminds the reader he is still only a boy.

Piggy reacts in a very different way. He insists that it was dark, that there was "that bloody dance", and that it was an accident. His most shocking words are defensive and almost callous: Simon "had no business crawling like that out of the dark. He was batty. He asked for it". Golding presents Piggy, the voice of reason, clinging to rationalisation because the alternative is to admit that he too is capable of savagery. In a similar way Sam and Eric claim they left the feast early, so that denial runs through the remnants of Ralph's group. Ralph's confession, "I'm frightened. Of us", stands out against these evasions as painfully honest. Meanwhile Jack simply rewrites the event, telling his tribe that the beast came disguised, so that the killing strengthens his power rather than troubling his

Question number

conscience.

The death of Piggy shows the final split. Roger releases the rock "with a sense of delirious abandonment", and the adjective "delirious" presents killing as a kind of ecstasy for him. Jack's reaction is brutal and triumphant: "See? See? That's what you'll get! I meant that". The repeated questions and the exclamation show a boy who now owns murder as a weapon of rule, and the shattering of the conch at the same moment symbolises the destruction of order. Ralph, by contrast, is struck dumb: "Ralph's lips formed a word but no sound came out". Golding's use of silence here is powerful, suggesting there is no language left for what Ralph has seen.

The novel closes with Ralph weeping in "spasms of grief" for the end of innocence and for his "true, wise friend" Piggy. Only Ralph mourns openly, and it is significant that his tears come in front of the naval officer, the adult world returning. Golding therefore shows that the boys react to the killings in differing ways, from Roger's delight and Jack's exploitation to Piggy's denial and Ralph's grief. The range of reactions is itself the novel's argument: the capacity for violence lies in all of them, but the willingness to recognise it, and to be horrified by it, is what separates the civilised from the savage.

2a

At the start of About a Boy Hornby presents Will Freeman as a thirty-six-year-old who has never really grown up, and much of the novel's comedy comes from the gap between his age and his behaviour. I agree that Will is immature for most of the novel, but Hornby structures the story as a coming-of-age narrative in which the adult, not the child, is the one who has to do most of the growing. By the end Will has not become a model of responsibility, but he has learned to care about other people, which is the beginning of maturity.

Question number

Hornby establishes Will's immaturity through his lifestyle. Living on the royalties from a Christmas song written by his father, he does not need to work, and Hornby suggests that this freedom has left him without purpose. He fills his days with magazine questionnaires about how cool he is, and when one tells him he scores highly the narrative bursts into delighted exclamations: "He was, according to the questionnaire, sub-zero! He was dry ice! He was Frosty the Snowman!". The free indirect style lets us hear Will's own childish excitement, and the bathos of moving from "dry ice" to a cartoon snowman mocks him even as he congratulates himself. Hornby adds that "he awarded himself an extra five points for not having to work at all", a detail that shows Will treating idleness as an achievement, like a child adding up points in a game.

Hornby makes it clear that Will's obsession with surface is a substitute for real achievement. The narrator observes that "being men's-magazine cool was as close as he had ever come to an achievement", a line whose dry irony exposes how empty his life is. Will judges people by trainers and music, and his references to children's television, such as comparing a woman to Aunt Sally from Worzel Gummidge, show that his imagination is rooted in childhood. His philosophy that "No problem was his problem" sums up his refusal of responsibility: he has organised his whole life to avoid needing or being needed.

Will's immaturity is most obvious in his relationships. He is frightened of commitment, and the narrator suggests that if there was a man better suited to "the meaningless fling, he wouldn't like to meet him". His scheme to meet single mothers by inventing "a two-year old son called Ned" and joining a single parents' group is both funny and morally childish; he treats other people's pain as a dating opportunity. Hornby's treatment of Fiona's suicide attempt is especially telling.

Question number

Will's first thought, that "she had tried to kill herself. Now that was interesting", reveals an inability to respond to real suffering with anything but curiosity. Even Will recognises this, crying "I'm horrible!", but the exclamation sounds almost proud, as if being horrible were another way of being cool. He initially sees Fiona and Marcus as entertainment, a replacement for good causes that "could replace soup kitchens", and his teasing of Marcus, "Ooooh. I'm scared", is the voice of a schoolboy rather than an adult.

The structure of the novel sharpens this immaturity through contrast. Hornby alternates chapters between Will and Marcus, and the reader quickly notices that the twelve-year-old is often more thoughtful and honest than the adult. Marcus worries about his mother, while Will worries about his image. This role reversal is central to Hornby's method: by placing a childish man beside an old-fashioned, serious boy, he invites us to ask who is really the grown-up.

However, Hornby charts a gradual change in Will. Almost against his will, he starts to protect Marcus from the bullies and to teach him how to survive at school, buying him trainers and talking to him about music. The narrator notes with irony that "He had somehow turned himself into a single parent", and the word "somehow" captures how unplanned his growth is. He also begins to support Fiona, realising that he "did want to make her feel better", and to his surprise it is easier than he had expected. Hornby suggests that maturity is not a decision but something that grows out of being drawn into other people's lives.

The emergencies near the end of the novel complete this change. When Marcus and Ellie end up in trouble with the police in Cambridge and Fiona turns to him for help, Will realises that "the neutrality had gone": he can no longer stand outside events as an amused observer. His love for Rachel, a woman he wants a

Question number

serious relationship with, shows that he is now willing to risk the commitment he once avoided. He also begins to see Marcus more clearly, admitting that he had never "properly given Marcus credit for being a good kid". By the close Hornby gives Will a calm, contented certainty that Marcus "would be OK", a tone very different from the frantic self-congratulation of the opening.

Overall, I largely agree that Will is immature, because Hornby presents his shallowness, selfishness and fear of commitment with comic precision. Yet the novel is ultimately about his growth. Will remains witty and a little self-centred, but he moves from believing that no problem is his problem to accepting that other people's problems are part of his life. Hornby's title is deliberately ambiguous: the "boy" of the novel may be Marcus, but it is just as much Will.

2b

Hornby presents the friendship between Ellie McCrae and Marcus as one of the most important relationships in Marcus's development, and in many ways it is strong: it gives him protection, confidence and a new way of seeing the world. However, Hornby also shows that it is unequal and unstable, built on Marcus's admiration and on Ellie's volatile moods. I agree that the friendship is strong in its effect on Marcus, but I would argue that its real strength lies in what it teaches him, including the lesson that he must eventually step back from it.

Hornby builds the friendship on contrast. Ellie is older, loud, rebellious and devoted to Kurt Cobain; Marcus is timid, old-fashioned and baffled by pop culture. Their first encounter is not friendly at all. When Marcus asks about the face on her sweatshirt, Ellie mocks him by telling him "He plays for Manchester United", and the joke exposes how out of touch Marcus is. Hornby uses this unpromising start to make their later closeness more surprising, and to suggest that genuine

Question number

friendship can grow from difference rather than similarity.

What draws them together is that both are outsiders. Ellie is in trouble with teachers and Marcus is bullied by pupils, and Hornby presents her, ironically, as a kind of guardian. She confronts his tormentors with "Give him those back or you'll get such a slap", an imperative that shows her forceful, protective energy, and Marcus later sums her up simply: "she beats up bullies". Her invitation, "Come to our form room", offers Marcus a refuge at lunchtime, and Hornby notes that he "did feel he'd been adopted". The verb "adopted" is telling, since it suggests the friendship meets something like a family need for a boy whose home life is fragile.

The friendship clearly strengthens Marcus. Because of Ellie he gains status and security at school, and Hornby records with quiet satisfaction that "He had friends, he could look after himself". The short, balanced clauses here show a new steadiness in Marcus's life. Their conversations also widen his understanding. Ellie, like Marcus, comes from a single-parent family, and she gives him blunt but useful advice about his mother: "But, you know. It's her life". This simple remark helps Marcus begin to see Fiona as a separate person rather than someone he must constantly rescue. Their talk about Kurt Cobain and his troubled family lets both of them put their own situations in perspective, and at the New Year's Eve party Hornby notes that "Marcus had never had a proper talk with someone of his own age before". The word "proper" captures how significant this is for a boy who has always been isolated.

However, Hornby also suggests the friendship is one-sided. Marcus hero-worships Ellie and is "overcome" by her style and beauty, and his feelings for her are partly a crush. Ellie, meanwhile, often treats him with amused tolerance rather than equal affection. The reader may sense that Marcus needs Ellie much more than

Question number

she needs him, and Hornby leaves it unclear whether Ellie would notice if Marcus disappeared from her life.

The weakness of the friendship is exposed most dramatically after Kurt Cobain's death. Ellie is devastated, and on the train to Cambridge she is supposed to be his support, yet she "produced a bottle of vodka" from her bag and becomes drunk and frightening. In Cambridge she smashes a shop window displaying Cobain's image, using a boot "as a hammer". Hornby's violent verbs and physical detail make this a moment of real loss of control, and the result is that both teenagers are taken to the police station. Marcus, who had relied on Ellie to keep him safe, is left vulnerable, and Hornby describes him as sounding "little and frightened and lonely". The triple adjectives emphasise how far the friendship has failed him at the moment he needed it most.

This episode marks a turning point in Marcus's understanding. Hornby gives him a sharp insight into his friend: "Ellie spent her whole time wanting life to be shit, and then making life shit". The repetition of "shit" in this chiasmus-like structure shows Marcus seeing a destructive circle in Ellie's behaviour, and his ability to judge her shows how much he has grown, partly through knowing her. By the end of the novel he has other friends and feels, as he puts it, safer than before. He has not simply rejected Ellie, but he no longer depends on her.

Overall, I agree to a large extent that Ellie and Marcus have a strong friendship, because Hornby presents it as genuinely transforming: Ellie protects Marcus, gives him confidence and teaches him to see the world and his mother more clearly. Yet Hornby is honest about its limits. The friendship is uneven, and Ellie's instability means it cannot always hold Marcus up. Perhaps its greatest strength is that it helps Marcus become independent enough not to need it, which fits the novel's

Question number

wider idea that people grow up through relationships with those who are very different from themselves.

3a

Johnston presents Alicia Moore as one of the most chilling characters in How Many Miles to Babylon?, a mother and wife whose words repeatedly wound the people closest to her. I largely agree that Alicia is cruel, and much of her cruelty appears calculated rather than careless. However, Johnston complicates our judgement by showing her through the eyes of a hurt son and by hinting at the loneliness and frustration of her own life. She is perhaps best seen as a woman who uses cruelty deliberately because it is the only power she has.

Johnston's narrative method shapes everything we learn about Alicia. The story is told by Alexander, writing in retrospect as he awaits his own execution, so her portrait is filtered through the memory of a lonely child. This first-person viewpoint makes her cruelty feel intimate and immediate, but it also means we never hear her side directly. The reader must therefore decide how far Alec's memories are fair, and Johnston deliberately leaves some questions, such as the truth about his parentage, unresolved.

Alicia's cruelty is most obvious in her marriage. Johnston presents the Moores' home as a place of "Comfortable meals and uncomfortable talk", an antithesis which captures the gap between their wealth and their unhappiness. Alicia dominates Frederick and openly belittles him in front of their son: "Oh Frederick, you do become so boring when you talk on about nothing like that". The patronising "Oh" and the exaggeration of "nothing" reduce her husband to a tiresome child. Elsewhere she remarks that "inadequate would be the word", choosing a cold, almost clinical term to dismiss him. Johnston notes that "She

Question number

ignored him as he must have known she would", suggesting a long-established pattern in which silence is used as a weapon. Her refusal to let him touch her, hinted at through broken, hesitant speech, adds to the sense of a marriage frozen into hostility.

Her cruelty becomes more deliberate as Frederick grows ill. She shows little interest in his health, and her statement "I have no intention of remaining alone in this house with you" is devastating in its directness. The formal phrasing, "no intention", makes it sound like a considered decision rather than an outburst, and it reveals that her desire to keep Alec at home, and later to send him to war, is bound up with her own needs rather than his.

Alicia's treatment of Alec is equally controlling. She has him educated at home and keeps him away from other children, so that, as he says, he was "isolated from the surrounding children of my own age". She refuses to let him go away to school, apparently because she does not want to be left alone with Frederick. Johnston uses physical detail to suggest the coldness of her mothering: her fingers bite into his arm "like angry little teeth", a simile that turns a mother's touch into an attack. When Alec's friendship with Jerry Crowe is discovered, she dismisses the boy with snobbish contempt, warning that "You can never tell what those sort of people will get up to".

The most deliberate act of cruelty comes when the war begins. Alicia wants Alec to enlist and, when he hesitates, she accuses him of being "a coward" and then reveals that Frederick may not be his father. The timing of this revelation makes it seem calculated: she uses the most damaging secret she possesses to push her son into leaving. Whether or not it is true, Johnston presents it as a weapon, and its effect on Alec is to cut him off from the father who has quietly loved him.

Question number

Her farewell, "run along, dear boy", is shockingly light and dismissive for a mother sending her only child to war. The affectionate phrase "dear boy" becomes ironic, almost mocking, because it contains no real tenderness.

Yet Johnston does give glimpses of another Alicia. She claims that she tried, at the beginning, to make Frederick happy, and her bitterness may come from years trapped in a loveless marriage from which, in her time and class, there is no escape. One of the most striking moments is her relationship with the swans on the lake. Alec hears her calling to them "in a voice so unlike her own recognisable voice" that he feels a sudden "glow of love for her". The swans, graceful and free, may symbolise everything Alicia's life lacks, and this scene suggests a capacity for gentleness that her family never sees. She even admits, "I'm not a nice woman", which shows self-awareness, though it might also be read as a cold refusal to change.

Structurally, Johnston removes Alicia from the second half of the novel, which is set in Flanders. Her absence is significant: having driven Alec into the war, she disappears from his story, as if the damage has been done. Her influence lingers, however, in Alec's loneliness and in his inability to connect with anyone except Jerry.

In conclusion, I agree to a large extent that Alicia is deliberately cruel. Her words are chosen to hurt, and her revelation about Alec's parentage is the clearest example of cruelty used for a purpose. However, Johnston's use of a single, wounded narrator and the brief moment with the swans suggest that her cruelty grows out of her own frustration and unhappiness. She is not a monster, but a woman who has turned her disappointment into a weapon and aimed it at those least able to defend themselves.

Question number

3b

Johnston presents Jerry Crowe and Alexander Moore as two boys from opposite ends of Irish society whose friendship is repeatedly punished by the people around them. I agree that both are treated unfairly, but in different ways: Jerry suffers the open injustices of poverty, class prejudice and military authority, while Alec suffers the quieter cruelty of a cold home and a mother who uses him for her own ends. Johnston's most powerful point is perhaps that, in the end, the system forces the two friends to destroy each other.

From their first meeting Johnston uses contrast to show how unfairly life has treated Jerry. Alec notices that Jerry's feet "were bare, dust grey", set against his own "expensive, black leather shoes". The juxtaposition of bare feet and polished leather is a simple but telling symbol of inequality, and Johnston adds that although they are the same age Jerry is "smaller than I was, with twig-like bones". The natural image of "twig-like" bones suggests fragility and hints at malnutrition. Jerry's family life is hard: his father is "rare and quick with the fist", and Jerry has left school to work, explaining that there is little to do at home but "plant the spuds and then dig them up". The circular structure of that phrase captures a life of repetitive labour with no escape.

Jerry is also judged unfairly because of his class. Alicia assumes he is dangerous, warning that "You can never tell what those sort of people will get up to", and the dismissive phrase "those sort of people" reduces him to a social type. In the army this prejudice becomes more serious. Major Glendinning marks him out immediately as "a potential trouble maker" and assumes that his wish to work with the horses is a search for "an easy billet".

Question number

The injustice reaches its height after Jerry's father goes missing. His mother's letter, with its plea that she is "hoping that you will maybe find him" and finds it hard to manage "with the two of ye gone", places a heavy emotional burden on him. When Jerry asks for leave to search, Glendinning's reply is a curt "The answer is no", and Johnston's use of a short, blunt sentence conveys the coldness of military power. Jerry goes anyway, out of loyalty to his family, and is court-martialled as a deserter. Glendinning admits that the sentence is about discipline as much as justice: "Deserters must be made an example of". He even suggests that, because of his background, there is "a strong possibility he might also have been a traitor", which shows how prejudice inflates Jerry's guilt. Most damning of all, those who condemn him barely know who he is, and Johnston highlights this with the questioning "Jerry?". A man is to be shot by officers who cannot even name him properly.

Some readers might argue that Jerry is not wholly a victim. He knew the penalty for desertion, and by military law his sentence is standard. His mother clearly loves him, signing herself "your loving mam", which is more warmth than Alec ever receives. Bennett treats him as a friend, and Alec admires him as "the best horseman in County Wicklow". Jerry's own motives for joining up, partly to learn soldiering for the struggle in Ireland, also suggest that he is not simply a passive figure. Even so, Johnston leaves the reader in little doubt that the punishment is out of all proportion to the motive.

Alec's unfair treatment is less visible but just as damaging. Although he has privilege, horses and music lessons, he is lonely. He is educated at home and "isolated from the surrounding children of my own age", so he grows up without the social skills he will need. His mother's touch is described as fingers that "bit into my arm like angry little teeth", a simile that turns affection into hostility.

Question number

Meals are eaten in strained silence, and his father, though gentle, offers little protection, asking only "I do insist that you are kind to her". When Alec's friendship with Jerry is discovered, he is told bluntly "Well, no more Jerry", and the only real bond of his childhood is forbidden.

Alicia's treatment of Alec when war begins is especially unjust. She pressures him to enlist, brushing aside his question "Supposing I said I didn't want to go?" with "But you won't, will you?", a reply that pretends to ask but really commands. She calls him "a coward" and casts doubt on whether Frederick is his father, using the secret to drive him away. In Flanders, Glendinning forbids the friendship again: "I will have no talking between the men and the officers". The repetition of this ban, first at home and then in the army, shows Johnston's structural point that class barriers follow the two friends wherever they go.

The final injustice falls on both of them together. Alec is ordered to command the firing squad that will execute his closest friend. Rather than let Jerry face that, he shoots him himself in his cell, and as a result he too awaits execution. Johnston's cyclical structure, beginning and ending with Alec in confinement, makes this tragic outcome feel inevitable from the opening pages.

Overall, I strongly agree that Jerry and Alec are treated unfairly. Jerry's suffering is the more obvious, as poverty and prejudice bring him to a firing squad, but Alec, despite his wealth, is denied love, choice and friendship. Johnston presents a society in which loyalty between two people across class lines cannot survive, and the unfairness lies not only in individual cruelty but in the whole system that surrounds them.

Question number

4a

I largely agree that Atticus is respected by the people of Maycomb, but Lee presents that respect as divided, conditional and often silent. The town trusts him, relies on him and even elects him, yet when his principles collide with its prejudices, many of its people turn on him. Lee's decision to filter everything through Scout's limited, gradually maturing perspective is central to this, because the reader, like Scout, slowly learns how much Atticus is valued and by whom.

At the start of the novel Scout herself does not seem to respect her father very much. She and Jem think of him as "feeble" because he is nearly fifty, and they compare him unfavourably with their "schoolmates' fathers", who hunt, play football and do exciting things. Lee uses this childish view deliberately: it sets up a structure of revelation, in which Atticus's worth is uncovered layer by layer. The episode with the mad dog is the turning point. When Heck Tate hands Atticus the rifle and he kills the dog with one shot, the children discover that he was once "One-Shot Finch", the best shot in the county. Heck Tate's deference shows professional respect for his skill, but Miss Maudie's explanation is more revealing: she suggests that "maybe he put his gun down when he realized God had given him an unfair advantage". Lee implies that Atticus earns respect not just for what he can do but for the restraint he shows, and Maudie's rhetorical challenge, "still think your father can't do anything?", invites the reader to share the children's new admiration.

Miss Maudie is the novel's most consistent voice of respect. Her comment that Atticus is "the same in his house as he is on the public streets" praises his integrity: there is no gap between his private self and his public reputation. Later, after the trial, she insists that the town is paying him "the highest tribute" it can by trusting him "to do right". The vocabulary of trust and tribute suggests that even those who disagree with him recognise his moral authority. Judge Taylor's

Question number

choice of Atticus to defend Tom Robinson, which Maudie says "was no accident", reinforces the idea that the town's institutions rely on him precisely because he is fair.

The strongest image of respect comes at the end of the trial. Scout is sitting in the coloured balcony when Reverend Sykes tells her, "Miss Jean Louise, stand up. Your father's passin'." Lee makes this a silent, collective gesture: the entire Black community rises as Atticus walks out, having lost the case. The formal address "Miss Jean Louise" and the simple present continuous "passin'" give the moment a ceremonial quality, almost like a congregation standing in church. Lee suggests that the people with least power in Maycomb understand Atticus's courage most fully. This is echoed the next morning when food is left on the Finches' back steps, with the message that "they 'preciate what you did". Earlier, Reverend Sykes has already called him the best friend the church has. For this community, respect is expressed through gratitude rather than words in public.

However, Lee is equally clear that much of Maycomb withholds respect when Atticus challenges its racial order. Children reflect the views of their parents: Cecil Jacobs taunts Scout in the schoolyard, and Cousin Francis repeats insults he has heard at home, accusing Atticus of loving Black people and disgracing the family. Mrs Dubose shouts from her porch that Atticus is no better than the people he works for. Lee uses these minor characters to show that the town's hostility is not personal but inherited and widespread. Even Aunt Alexandra, at first, disapproves of his decision to keep Calpurnia and of his defence of Tom, and Scout overhears that she nearly said Atticus was disgracing the family.

The scene at the jailhouse shows both respect and its limits. When Atticus asks the men to keep quiet because Tom is asleep, Scout notices that "in obedience to

Question number

my father" they lower their voices to near whispers, an unconscious habit of deference. Yet they still order him to move aside from the door, and it is only Scout's innocent conversation with Mr Cunningham about entailments and his son that shames them into leaving. Lee suggests that respect for Atticus as a man is not strong enough on its own to overcome the mob's purpose; it takes a child's reminder of their shared humanity.

The Ewells represent outright contempt. In court Mayella complains that she does not have to take Atticus's "sass", interpreting his courtesy as mockery, and Bob Ewell later spits in his face in the street. Atticus's dry remark that he wishes Bob Ewell did not chew tobacco shows that he refuses to be provoked, which perhaps increases the reader's respect for him even as Ewell denies it. Finally, Heck Tate, who clearly admires Atticus, overrules him at the end: "I'm still sheriff of Maycomb County, and Bob Ewell fell on his knife." Lee shows that respect does not mean obedience; Tate respects Atticus enough to protect Jem and Boo, but not enough to let Atticus have his way.

Overall, I agree that Atticus is respected, but the respect is strongest among the town's moral minority: Maudie, Judge Taylor, Heck Tate and the Black community. Alexandra's bitter observation that the town is willing to let him do what they are too afraid to do themselves sums up Lee's point. Maycomb respects Atticus enough to hand him its hardest moral task, yet it is not yet brave enough to follow him.

4b

Lee presents Mrs Dubose, Boo Radley and Dolphus Raymond as three of Maycomb's outsiders, each suffering in a way the town only partly understands. Through Scout's narrative, which begins in fear and gossip and moves towards understanding, Lee shows that they cope in very different ways: Mrs Dubose by

Question number

fighting, Boo by withdrawing, and Dolphus Raymond by pretending. Although all three earn sympathy, I admire Boo Radley most, because his response to suffering is not only to endure it but to turn it into kindness.

Mrs Dubose's suffering is physical and hidden. To the children she is simply a terrifying old woman, and Lee piles up harsh adjectives such as "vicious" and "wrathful" to show how Scout sees her. She shouts abuse from her porch and insults Atticus for defending Tom Robinson, so her suffering expresses itself as anger directed outwards. It is only after her death that Atticus reveals she had been taking morphine as a pain-killer for years and was determined to break the addiction before she died, so that she would leave the world "beholden to nothing and nobody". Lee structures this revelation as a delayed twist: the reader, like Jem, has resented her, and must now reinterpret every fit and cruel remark as a symptom of withdrawal. Jem's reading sessions, which seemed like a punishment, become a distraction that helps her through each fit. Her way of coping, therefore, is confrontation: she faces her suffering head on, even at the cost of being hated.

Atticus makes her the novel's definition of courage. He tells Jem that real courage is "when you know you're licked before you begin but you begin anyway and you see it through no matter what", and he calls her the bravest person he ever knew. Lee uses her to prepare the reader for the trial, where Atticus himself knows he is "licked" but defends Tom anyway. However, Mrs Dubose remains a racist to the end, and her courage is entirely private, aimed at saving herself rather than helping others, which is one reason I do not admire her most.

Boo Radley suffers through isolation imposed by others. After a youthful scrape, his father keeps him shut inside the house for years, and the town fills the gap with myth. Lee lets Scout repeat the "neighbourhood legend" in which Boo is a

Question number

"malevolent phantom" who eats raw squirrels and peeps in windows, and any strange event in Maycomb is blamed on him. The comic exaggeration of the children's stories shows how prejudice grows from ignorance. The children make him the subject of their games, acting out his life and trying to make him come out, which is a kind of cruelty they do not understand.

Yet Boo copes by quietly reaching outwards. The gifts in the knot-hole of the tree, the chewing gum, the carved soap figures of the children, the mended trousers left folded for Jem and the blanket placed around Scout's shoulders on the night of the fire, are presented as small, silent acts of affection. When Nathan Radley fills the knot-hole with cement, Lee shows Boo's one line of communication being cut off, and Jem's tears suggest he understands the loss. Boo's final act, rescuing the children from Bob Ewell, transforms him from phantom to protector. When Scout finally sees him, his appearance is pale and fragile, and her simple greeting, "Hey, Boo," replaces years of fear with friendship. Heck Tate decides that dragging Boo into the spotlight would be a sin, and Scout agrees that it would be like shooting a mockingbird. After walking him home, she never sees him again. His coping is withdrawal, but it is not bitter.

Dolphus Raymond suffers social rejection because he lives with a Black woman and has mixed-race children, who, as Jem explains, do not belong anywhere. He copes through a deliberate performance. He appears always to be drinking from a paper bag, and the town assumes he is a drunk, but he shows Scout and Dill that it holds only Coca-Cola. He explains that this pretence helps folks if they can "latch on to a reason" for the way he lives. Lee uses him to satirise Maycomb's need for comfortable explanations: the town would rather believe he is ruined by alcohol than accept that a white man chooses this life freely. Unlike Mrs Dubose, he is good-humoured, chuckling at Scout's questions without offence, and unlike Boo he

Question number

is fully aware of how the town works. His remark about "the simple hell people give other people" shows real insight into the cruelty he endures.

Comparing them, each coping strategy reflects a different relationship with the community. Mrs Dubose battles on her own terms, Dolphus Raymond hides behind a mask that lets him live as he wishes, and Boo retreats but still acts with love. Dolphus Raymond is admirable in his honesty with the children, but his solution is also a kind of surrender: he accepts the town's judgement instead of challenging it, and he lives on the edges.

I admire Boo most because, despite suffering the most complete isolation, he never becomes bitter. Lee places him at the structural heart of the novel, opening with the children's obsession with him and ending with Scout standing on the Radley porch, imagining the events of the past years from his point of view. This fulfils Atticus's advice about climbing into someone's skin and walking around in it. Boo is the clearest of the novel's mockingbirds, harmless and kind, and through him Lee suggests that the best way to cope with suffering is to protect others from it.

Sa

I agree to a large extent that George is responsible for what happens to him and Lennie, but Steinbeck presents that responsibility as tragic rather than simply blameworthy. George chooses to take charge of Lennie, makes the key decisions that bring them to the ranch and finally takes the most terrible decision of all. Yet Steinbeck surrounds him with forces he cannot control: Lennie's strength and limited understanding, Curley's aggression, Curley's wife's loneliness, and a harsh world in which, as the novel's circular structure suggests, plans rarely survive.

From the opening chapter, Steinbeck makes George the one who thinks and

Question number

decides. He is introduced as "small and quick", with "restless eyes" and "sharp, strong features", while Lennie is compared to a bear dragging his paws. This contrast in description makes clear who leads. George gives the orders: he tells Lennie not to drink too much, takes away the dead mouse and, crucially, instructs him that if he gets into trouble he should come back to the brush by the pool and hide. Steinbeck uses this instruction as foreshadowing. George knows that trouble is likely, yet he still takes Lennie to a new ranch, which suggests that he accepts responsibility for whatever follows.

George's responsibility is partly born of choice and partly of habit. He tells Slim that he took Lennie on after Aunt Clara died, and admits that once you get used to going around with a guy you cannot get rid of him. More troublingly, he confesses that he used to play jokes on Lennie, and once told him to jump into the Sacramento River even though Lennie could not swim. Lennie jumped, and nearly drowned, and was grateful to George for pulling him out. Steinbeck uses this confession to show both George's power and his guilt: Lennie will do anything George says, which means George is responsible for how that power is used.

At the same time, George's frustration shows he does not always want this burden. In his outburst by the fire he says that if he was alone he "could live so easy", and imagines spending his money on whisky and cathouses. The repetition of what he could do without Lennie reveals genuine resentment. Yet Steinbeck immediately undercuts the rant: George feels ashamed when he sees Lennie's face, and Lennie offers to go off and live in a cave. The pattern of anger followed by tenderness suggests that George's responsibility is a choice he keeps renewing, even when he resents it.

The dream of the farm is perhaps where George's responsibility is greatest. He tells

Question number

it to Lennie in a rhythmic, almost ritual form: "Guys like us, that work on ranches, are the loneliest guys in the world." The contrast with "But not us!" and the parallel phrasing "I got you to look after me, and you got me to look after you" present their friendship as unique. Steinbeck shows George believing in the dream more and more once Candy offers his savings. This hope may make George less watchful. He leaves Lennie at the ranch on Saturday night while he goes into town, and, later, does not see the danger as Lennie is drawn towards Curley's wife, despite having warned him that she is "jail bait". Some readers might argue that George has done all he reasonably can; others might feel that, knowing what happened in Weed, he should never have let Lennie stay near her.

The fight with Curley complicates the question further. Curley attacks Lennie, who does nothing until George shouts at him to fight back, and Lennie then crushes Curley's hand. Here George's command directly causes harm, but it is also a defence of his friend against an unprovoked attack. Steinbeck suggests that in a world of violence, even George's protection can only be expressed through more violence.

When Lennie kills Curley's wife, the barn scene is quiet and almost peaceful before the discovery, and the contrast makes the chaos that follows more brutal. Curley wants to shoot Lennie in the guts, and George knows Lennie would be lynched or locked in a cage. George's decision to steal Carlson's Luger and reach Lennie first is his final act of responsibility. Steinbeck links this to Candy's earlier regret that he "shouldn't ought to of let no stranger shoot my dog". George ensures that no stranger does this to Lennie. At the pool, he calms Lennie by telling the dream one last time, so that Lennie dies looking across the river and seeing the farm. The heron seizing the water snake at the start of the chapter suggests that nature itself is indifferent and predatory, and that George's act, terrible as it is,

Question number

may be the only mercy available.

Slim's response, "You hadda, George. I swear you hadda", offers a judgement on George's responsibility: he is responsible for the act, but not guilty in a moral sense. Carlson's baffled final question shows that most of the ranch cannot understand what George has lost. Steinbeck returns to the same pool where the novel began, suggesting a cycle that could not be broken.

In conclusion, George is responsible for what happens to him and Lennie in the sense that he leads, chooses and finally acts. However, Steinbeck presents his responsibility as a burden he carries out of love in a world that offers men like them almost nothing. Lennie's strength and the cruelty of others shape the ending as much as George does, and the real tragedy is that George's care for Lennie leads him to the only choice that destroys his own hope as well.

Sb

Steinbeck presents dreams in Of Mice and Men as both a lifeline and a trap. I largely agree that they are harmful, because each character's dream raises hopes that the world of the novel is determined to crush, and the pain of losing them seems greater than if they had never hoped at all. However, Steinbeck also suggests that without dreams these lonely characters would have nothing to keep them going, so the dreams are harmful only because their reality is so harsh.

The central dream belongs to George and Lennie: a small farm where they will "live off the fatta the lan'" and Lennie will tend the rabbits. Steinbeck presents it through repetition and ritual. Lennie begs George to "tell about the rabbits", and the speech is told in almost identical words each time, like a bedtime story or a prayer. The rhythmic phrasing of "Guys like us, that work on ranches, are the

Question number

loneliest guys in the world" followed by "But not us" gives the dream a comforting, reverential tone. In this sense, the dream is beneficial: it calms Lennie, gives them both a shared identity, and separates them from the drifting, isolated men around them.

Yet the rehearsed quality is also a warning. Because the dream is recited rather than planned, it feels like a story that can never come true. George admits near the end that he thinks he knew from the very first that they would never do it, which suggests that some part of him always recognised it as fantasy. Steinbeck's title, borrowed from the idea that the best laid schemes of mice and men often go wrong, frames the whole novel around the failure of plans. The structure supports this: the novel begins and ends at the same pool, so that the dream leads nowhere.

The dream becomes most dangerous when it starts to seem possible. When Candy offers his savings, George suddenly realises they could buy the place within a month, and the three men sit "entranced" with the picture. Steinbeck's language here becomes soft and wondering, and George's practical caution seems to slip. One could argue that this hope makes George less careful, because he begins to trust that Lennie can stay out of trouble until the end of the month. When Lennie kills Curley's wife, the dream does not simply fail: it collapses at the very moment it was closest. Candy's bitter words to the dead body show how cruelly the loss affects him, and his eyes are blinded with tears. For Candy, the dream had meant a dignified old age rather than being thrown out like his dog; its loss leaves him with nothing.

Crooks shows how harmful dreams can be to people who have already learned not to hope. At first he scorns the idea, saying "I seen too many guys with land in

Question number

their head. They never get none under their hand." His dialect and the bleak antithesis between "head" and "hand" express years of watching men fail. Yet even Crooks briefly lets himself believe, and offers to work for nothing. Curley's wife then crushes him with a threat about what she could do to him, reminding him how powerless he is as a Black man on the ranch. Crooks immediately withdraws his offer. Steinbeck suggests that for Crooks, the dream is harmful because it exposes him to a humiliation that his cynicism had protected him from.

Curley's wife's dream is perhaps the most tragic. She tells Lennie that she could have been in the movies, that a man told her he could put her in pictures and promised to write, but the letter never came. She believes her mother stole it. Steinbeck presents her dream in rushed, breathless speech, showing how desperate she is to be listened to. Her dream has already harmed her: it led to her hasty marriage to Curley, which leaves her lonely and despised by the men, who call her a "tart". When she dies, Steinbeck describes her face as sweet and young, with "the meanness and the plannings and the discontent" gone. This suggests that only death frees her from the restless longing her dreams created.

However, the novel also shows that dreams make life bearable. The ranch hands' existence is one of hard work, cheap pleasures and loneliness, and the dream is the only thing that gives George and Lennie a future. Even in the final scene, George tells the dream one last time as he prepares to shoot Lennie, so that Lennie dies happy, looking across the river towards the farm. Here the dream is not harmful but merciful, the only gift George has left to give. Steinbeck's peaceful description of the evening light at the beginning of the chapter contrasts with the violence that follows, and the dream becomes a kind of shelter for Lennie's last moments.

Overall, I agree that the dreams are harmful, but not because dreaming is foolish

Question number

in itself. Steinbeck shows that in a society that offers poor, old, Black or female characters so little, dreams expose them to deeper pain when they fail. They give the characters a reason to keep going, yet they also make their loneliness sharper. The dream dies with Lennie, and George is left, as he once feared, just another drifting worker. Steinbeck's point is perhaps that the dreams are not the problem; the world that makes them impossible is.

6a Doyle presents Mr Clarke as a father who is, at times, warm, funny and attentive, and Paddy clearly adores him. However, I only partly agree that he is a good father, because the same man becomes unpredictable, cold and violent, and his failing marriage fills Paddy's childhood with anxiety. Doyle's choice of a first-person child narrator is crucial: Paddy reports his Da's behaviour without fully understanding it, so the reader sees both the love Paddy feels and the damage his father does.

In the earlier parts of the novel, Mr Clarke is presented as a source of wonder and knowledge. He tells Paddy that "No one's fingerprints are the same as someone else's", and Paddy is fascinated. The confident, factual tone of the line shows how Paddy treats his father as an authority on the world, and Doyle captures the child's delight in collecting facts from him. Mr Clarke also explains news events, such as the conflict between the Arabs and Israelis, and shows interest in Paddy's school work and his braille. These moments suggest a father who wants to widen his son's horizons beyond Barrytown and who takes his curiosity seriously.

He is also playful. Doyle shows him joining in with the secret of Santy at Christmas and teasing Paddy with gentle, deadpan humour. When the boys hope to keep a mouse, he answers "Not in this house", and the dry joke suggests a father

Question number

who enjoys language and banter, much as Paddy himself does. The scenes of them watching Manchester United together, and of Paddy enjoying having his Da to himself when the others are in bed, are presented with a quiet intimacy. Paddy's simple statement, "I loved him, he was my Da", is typical of Doyle's child narration: the short, plain clauses carry deep feeling without decoration. He also helps Paddy with his spellings and, Paddy says, he was usually fair and listened when they were in trouble. At these points, it is easy to argue that he is a good father.

However, Doyle undercuts these images steadily. Paddy notices that his father could be "really mean for no reason", and the casual phrasing suggests that this unpredictability has become normal to him. The book about Manchester United that his father gives him for his birthday contains what is meant to be George Best's autograph, but it turns out his Da wrote it himself. This small deception could be read as affectionate, but it also introduces the idea that Mr Clarke's love is not always honest. When Paddy comes home excited with a medal, his father dismisses him harshly, telling him to get out and that it is not the time. Doyle's abrupt, clipped dialogue, set out with dashes rather than speech marks, makes the rejection feel as sudden to the reader as it is to Paddy.

The most damaging aspect of Mr Clarke is his treatment of Paddy's mother. Doyle presents their arguments through what Paddy hears from his bed or from the stairs. Paddy describes his father's temper and observes that "he sometimes lost his temper and he liked it", a chilling insight from a child who has learned to read his father's moods. The fights are described as gathering momentum, and the moment when Paddy sees his father hit his mother is presented in brutally short phrases: "He'd hit her. Across the face; smack." The onomatopoeia and fragmented syntax mirror Paddy's shock, as if he can barely form the sentence. From this

Question number

point, Paddy's childhood is shaped by fear. He tries to stay awake at night to listen, as though by watching he could stop the fights, and he takes on a responsibility no child should carry.

Doyle's episodic, non-chronological structure reinforces this. Early sections are full of games, gangs and adventures, with the parents in the background. As the novel progresses, the family breakdown pushes into more and more episodes, and Paddy's tone becomes more anxious and fragmented. His cruelty towards Sinbad and his violence with other boys can be read as a reflection of the tension at home, suggesting that Mr Clarke's behaviour affects Paddy's own development.

At the end, Mr Clarke leaves the family. When he returns at Christmas, Paddy greets him with stiff politeness and shakes his hand, behaving like an adult receiving a visitor. This formality is devastating: the intimacy of the earlier sections is gone, replaced by distance. The title's playground chant, "Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha", gains a bitter meaning as the other children mock him for having no Da at home. Doyle suggests that the father's departure has forced Paddy to grow up too quickly.

Some readers might argue that Mr Clarke is not a bad father but an unhappy man trapped in a failing marriage, whose love for Paddy is genuine even when his behaviour is not. Doyle never gives us his point of view, so his motives are left uncertain, and we only see him through a child's partial understanding. Nevertheless, a good father protects his child from fear, and Mr Clarke does the opposite.

In conclusion, I disagree that Mr Clarke is a good father overall. Doyle shows that he has real moments of tenderness, humour and interest in his son, which is why

Question number

Paddy loves him so intensely. Yet his unpredictability, his coldness and his violence towards Paddy's mother make Paddy's home a place of anxiety, and his leaving ends Paddy's childhood. The tragedy Doyle presents is that Paddy keeps loving the father who lets him down.

6b I largely agree that Paddy has a violent childhood. Doyle fills the novel with fights, cruel games, harsh teachers and, most disturbingly, violence at home. However, Doyle also presents moments of adventure, tenderness and comfort, so the violence is set against a world that Paddy often enjoys. The first-person narration of a ten-year-old boy is central: because Paddy reports violence in the same excited, matter-of-fact voice as everything else, the reader recognises how normal it has become to him, and how much it shapes him.

Much of the violence is presented as part of play. The boys invent games with real consequences, such as their own Grand National, in which Liam breaks his teeth. Doyle presents such incidents with little sense of horror, as if injury is simply part of the fun. In the naming ceremony, Paddy exaggerates his pain in hyperbolic, almost comic-book language: "My back was ripped. The bones exploded." The short, dramatic sentences show a child who almost relishes violence as an adventure, turning pain into a story to be proud of. Similarly, killing a rat with a hurling stick is narrated as a triumph rather than a cruelty. Doyle suggests that violence is woven into the boys' idea of what it means to be tough.

Paddy is often the cause of violence rather than simply its victim. His treatment of his younger brother Sinbad is repeatedly cruel. He tricks and bullies him, and in one episode makes him put a lighter fuel capsule in his mouth and light it. Paddy would rather hurt Sinbad than lose face in front of the gang. Doyle's honest

Question number

narration does not excuse this, but by letting Paddy tell it without remorse, he shows how cruelty is learned and passed down among the boys. Later in the novel, as the family breaks down, Paddy begins to feel protective of Sinbad, which makes his earlier cruelty more poignant.

School is also violent. Paddy's teacher, Henno, hits the boys, and Paddy reports that "He thumped me hard on the shoulder" in the same plain tone he uses for games. Physical punishment is presented as routine, which suggests that the adult world teaches violence as much as it disapproves of it. Paddy's fights with other boys, such as Sean Whelan, are described with energetic verbs: "I ran and kicked. I'd got him hard." The monosyllables and rapid rhythm capture the excitement and chaos of the fight from inside Paddy's head.

The most serious violence happens at home. Paddy listens at night to his parents arguing, and Doyle presents these scenes through what Paddy hears rather than what he understands. When his father hits his mother, the moment is condensed into fragments: "He'd hit her. Across the face; smack." The onomatopoeia of "smack" and the broken syntax mirror Paddy's shock. Unlike the playground fights, this violence frightens him deeply. He tries to stay awake to keep watch, as though he can prevent the fights by listening, and his anxiety seeps into the rest of his life. Doyle's episodic, non-chronological structure allows these domestic scenes to increase as the novel goes on, so that the reader feels the home becoming more and more dangerous.

Towards the end, the violence becomes more serious among the boys too. Paddy fights Kevin, his former best friend, and the language is brutal: "I got my knee up clean, bang in the face." The silence of the onlookers, "the crowd was quiet", suggests that even the other boys sense this fight has gone too far. Afterwards

Question number

Paddy is boycotted and isolated, and even David Geraghty is made to hit him with one of his crutches. Doyle shows that Paddy's place in the gang depended on violence, and when he is excluded, violence is turned on him.

However, Doyle does not present Paddy's childhood as only violent. There are many moments of tenderness, particularly with his mother, who tends to him when he is hurt and reassures him when he worries that there will be a third world war, telling him that it is just the papers and they exaggerate. Paddy notices her singing to Sinbad to comfort him, and these scenes create a soothing atmosphere that contrasts with the fighting. With his father, too, there are close moments, such as watching Manchester United together on television and family trips to places like Phoenix Park and the zoo. The boys' adventures building huts with materials taken from the building sites and exploring the fields around Barrytown show a sense of freedom and imagination. In school, Paddy is fascinated by stories such as Father Damien and the lepers. These episodes remind the reader that childhood is also full of curiosity and joy.

Yet even these happier memories are coloured by what follows. Because Paddy is telling the story with growing awareness of his parents' failing marriage, the tender moments feel fragile. When his father finally leaves and other children taunt him with the chant that gives the novel its title, "Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha", the cruelty of the playground and the breakdown at home come together. The stiff handshake with which he greets his father at Christmas shows a boy who has been forced to grow up through emotional, not just physical, violence.

In conclusion, I agree that Paddy has a violent childhood. Violence runs through his games, his school, his friendships and, most painfully, his home. Doyle balances this with genuine love, laughter and adventure, but the structure of the novel

Question number

shows violence gradually overwhelming those happier experiences. Through Paddy's innocent, unflinching voice, Doyle suggests that the violence children witness at home shapes the violence they inflict on each other.

7a

I agree to a large extent that Boxer is valued by the other ordinary animals, who admire, imitate and finally mourn him. However, Orwell draws a sharp distinction between being valued and being protected. The animals value Boxer's goodness, but they are too trusting or too powerless to save him, while the pigs value him only as a source of labour. Orwell uses Boxer's story to show how a society can praise its most loyal worker while quietly using him up.

From the opening chapter Orwell establishes Boxer's status through the narrator's admiring description. He is "universally respected for his steadiness of character and tremendous powers of work", and the adverb "universally" suggests there is not a single animal on the farm who thinks otherwise. Orwell is honest about his limitations, noting that he is not of first-rate intelligence, yet this almost makes him more lovable: his worth lies in reliability rather than cleverness. Alongside Clover, he becomes one of the most faithful disciples of Animalism, and because the other animals look to these two horses and follow what they pass on, Orwell shows that Boxer's example matters. The others value him as a model of how to live.

This admiration grows during the harvest and the building of the windmill. The narrator's hyperbolic simile, "he seemed more like three horses than one", presents him as almost superhuman, and the comment that he was "the admiration of everybody" confirms that his effort is noticed and celebrated. Orwell gives Boxer two personal mottoes, "I will work harder!" and later "Napoleon is always right",

Question number

and their exclamatory, repeated form makes him sound like a living slogan. The fact that the other animals draw "inspiration" from his never-failing cry suggests that, as conditions worsen, Boxer becomes the emotional engine of the farm. His courage at the Battle of the Cowshed earns him the decoration "Animal Hero, First Class", a public sign of value. Yet Orwell complicates even this moment: Boxer is horrified when he thinks he has killed the stable lad, which shows a gentleness that makes him valued not just as a fighter but as a decent creature.

Orwell's most moving evidence of Boxer's value comes through Clover and Benjamin. Clover warns him not to overstrain himself and treats his split hoof after the Battle of the Windmill, and together she and Benjamin urge him to work less hard. When he collapses, half the animals rush to his side and others race back to raise help, while Benjamin lies down beside him and keeps the flies off him. These small physical details show a tenderness that the pigs never display. The climax of this theme is the scene with the van. Benjamin, who is usually cynical and detached, gallops and shouts for the first time anyone can remember, and his cry, "Fools! Do you not see what is written on the side of that van?", breaks his long silence. Orwell uses this sudden change in a character defined by indifference to measure how much Boxer means to him. The animals break off work without waiting for orders, cry out to Boxer to escape, and even appeal to the horses pulling the van. Their desperation leaves the reader in no doubt that Boxer is loved.

However, Orwell also invites a darker reading. If the animals truly valued Boxer, the reader might ask why they allowed him to keep working through his split hoof and his visible decline as he approached retirement. Orwell's narrator notes the changes in his body in a flat, unemotional tone, which almost implicates the others in their failure to act. Boxer's retirement, the promise of a corner of the pasture, never

Question number

arrives, and nobody questions this. The pigs, meanwhile, show that their "value" is purely economic. When Boxer dares to question Squealer's claim that Snowball was a traitor from the start, Squealer casts "a very ugly look" at him, and soon afterwards the dogs attack Boxer. Napoleon does not visit him when he collapses but sends Squealer instead. Finally, the pigs sell him to Alfred Simmonds, the horse slaughterer, fulfilling Old Major's warning that Jones would one day sell him to the knacker. Orwell's structural irony here is devastating: the revolution that promised to save Boxer delivers him to the very fate it was meant to prevent.

The aftermath shows that the other animals' feelings can be manipulated. Squealer's invented deathbed scene, with Boxer supposedly crying "Long live Comrade Napoleon!", is accepted with relief, and the "oration in Boxer's honour" turns his memory into propaganda. The pigs clearly understand that the other animals value Boxer, which is precisely why his name is useful to them. Orwell's grim detail that the pigs acquire another case of whisky soon after reveals the true price they placed on his life.

Ultimately, I agree that Boxer is genuinely valued by the ordinary animals, and Orwell uses Clover and Benjamin in particular to show real affection. Yet their love is powerless because, like Boxer himself, they trust their leaders too much. By the final chapter he is remembered only by the few who had known him, and Orwell leaves the reader with the bitter suggestion that a society which values its workers in words, but not in actions, will always betray them.

7b

I agree only partly that the human characters are the cause of the problems on the farm. Orwell certainly presents Jones, Frederick and Pilkington as cruel, greedy and dishonest, and their behaviour starts the revolution and later threatens it.

Question number

However, as the novel progresses Orwell shifts the source of suffering from outside the farm to inside it. By the end, the pigs have become indistinguishable from the humans, which suggests that the real cause of the problems is not humanity itself but the hunger for power and the willingness of others to accept it.

In the opening chapter Orwell clearly places the blame on humans. Mr Jones is introduced as too drunk to remember to shut the pop-holes, a comic but damning detail that immediately presents him as neglectful. Old Major's speech then turns this neglect into a political argument. His declaration that "Man is the only real enemy we have" and his claim that man is the only creature that consumes without producing frame the humans as parasites. The rhetorical techniques Orwell gives Major, the direct address of "comrades", the rhetorical questions and the bleak summary of the animals' lives as miserable, laborious and short, make this argument powerful and persuasive. When the revolution finally happens, the trigger is human failure: Jones and his men neglect to feed the animals, and when the starving animals break into the store-shed the men attack them with whips. Orwell structures the rebellion as an almost accidental response to human cruelty, which strongly supports the view that humans cause the problems.

The early success of the farm without humans reinforces this. The harvest is described as the biggest the farm had ever seen, and the animals are presented as genuinely happy, working hard because the food is now their own. Afterwards, the humans remain a constant external threat. Jones and his men try to retake the farm at the Battle of the Cowshed, and later Frederick tricks Napoleon by paying for the timber with forged banknotes before attacking the farm and blowing up the windmill. Orwell's narrator reports the "terrible stories" about Frederick's cruelties, so the reader is encouraged to see the humans as villains who will exploit the animals whenever possible. Pilkington, though friendlier, offers no help when

Question number

the animals are attacked. In these sections Orwell presents humans as dangerous enemies.

However, Orwell plants the seeds of a different cause almost immediately after the revolution. The mysterious disappearance of the milk at the end of Chapter Two, followed by Squealer's announcement that the milk and apples are reserved for pigs, shows inequality beginning within days. The narrator's understated tone makes this moment quietly chilling: no human is present, yet the animals are already being cheated. Napoleon's secret training of the puppies, which later chase Snowball off the farm, reveals that violence and fear can come from within. Orwell's most shocking scene, the forced confessions and executions, makes the point explicit. The narrator describes a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet, and Clover reflects that these scenes of terror and slaughter were not what they had looked forward to. The animals feel that this bloodshed is worse precisely because it is happening among themselves. Here Orwell deliberately removes humans from the picture to show that the pigs are now the source of suffering.

Orwell also shows that the pigs blame humans and Snowball to hide their own failures. When the first windmill collapses in a storm, partly because its walls were too thin, Napoleon instantly blames Snowball, and Squealer constantly reminds the animals that Jones might come back. His repeated rhetorical question, asking whether any animal really wants Jones back, becomes a weapon that silences protest. Orwell suggests that the human threat, while real, is exaggerated and exploited by the pigs to keep control. The gradual rewriting of the commandments, such as the addition of "without cause" and "to excess", shows the pigs reshaping truth for their own benefit, a problem with no human origin at all.

Structurally, Orwell's circular plot brings the farm back to where it began, and this

Question number

is where the question becomes most interesting. In the final chapter the pigs walk on two legs, the sheep bleat "Four legs good, two legs better", and the single remaining commandment declares that some animals are more equal than others. At the dinner with the neighbouring farmers, Pilkington's joke comparing the "lower animals" to the human "lower classes" shows that pigs and men are now united as oppressors. The last line, in which the animals look from pig to man and back again and find it impossible to say which was which, suggests that the problem was never simply human beings. It was the system of exploitation, which the pigs have adopted.

Overall, I agree that the humans cause the problems at the start of the novel and remain a threat throughout. However, Orwell's main purpose is to show that removing one set of masters achieves nothing if another set, just as greedy, takes their place. The final image blurs pig and man together, implying that the true cause of the farm's suffering is the abuse of power, made possible by the trust, ignorance and silence of the other animals.

8 Dickens engages the reader by plunging us into a moment of sudden terror and letting us experience it through the eyes of a small, defenceless child. The extract becomes a gripping mixture of fear, pity and even dark comedy, as we are drawn into Pip's helplessness while also beginning to wonder about the desperate man who threatens him.

The opening is dramatic and shocking. Dickens begins in the middle of the action with the exclamation "Hold your noise!", and the "terrible voice" belongs to a man who "started up from among the graves". The graveyard setting is ominous, and the image of a figure rising from the graves almost makes him seem like a ghost

Question number

or a corpse coming to life. The threat "I'll cut your throat!" establishes the danger at once, so the reader is immediately anxious for Pip.

Dickens then builds a vivid picture of the convict through a long, cumulative sentence. The repetition of "A man" at the start of successive sentences, followed by the list of what has happened to him, "soaked in water, and smothered in mud, and lamed by stones", piles up detail after detail. The repeated "and" makes the description feel breathless, as though the frightened child is taking in everything at once. The "great iron on his leg" suggests that he is an escaped prisoner, and the animal-like verbs "glared and growled" make him seem wild. Yet the same list also creates sympathy: he has been "stung by nettles" and his teeth "chattered", so the reader senses that he is cold, injured and desperate. This ambiguity keeps us engaged, because we are not sure whether to fear him or pity him.

Pip's feelings are conveyed through his polite, terrified responses. He "pleaded in terror", and his repeated "sir" shows a child trying desperately to please. The short exchanges of dialogue, such as the abrupt command "Quick!", create a fast, tense rhythm. Pathos is created when Pip points to his parents' graves and explains "That's my mother", reminding us that he is an orphan with no one to protect him. The convict's dismissive "Ha!" makes him seem even more heartless.

The older narrating voice adds humour to the horror. When the man turns Pip upside down, the narrator describes the church going "head over heels" and the steeple appearing under his feet. This disorientating image shows the scene from the child's literal point of view, and it is both funny and unsettling. Similarly, the convict's remark about Pip's "fat cheeks" and his threat that he could eat them sounds like something from a fairy tale ogre, which heightens Pip's fear while amusing the reader.

Question number

Structurally, the tension rises to a climax. The repeated short sentence "He tilted me again" mirrors each fresh demand, so the reader feels Pip being pushed further into danger. The juxtaposition of eyes that looked "most powerfully down" and "most helplessly up" captures the imbalance of power. The extract ends with a gruesome threat that "your heart and your liver shall be tore out, roasted, and ate", a final, graphic image that leaves the reader terrified for Pip and eager to know whether he will obey.