Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2022

English Literature

Unit 1

The Study of Prose

GEL11

[GEL11]
WEDNESDAY 25 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** Jack, show how far you agree that Jack is **cruel**.

(b) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** events on the island, show how far you agree that the island is a **dangerous** place.

stemup.co.uk

2 Hornby: *About a Boy*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** Fiona, show how far you agree that she is a **bad parent** to Marcus**.**

(b) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** the lives of Will and Marcus, show how far you agree that their lives are **lonely**.

stemup.co.uk

3 Johnston: *How Many Miles to Babylon?*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Jerry, show how far you agree that he **deserves** sympathy.

(b) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** the lives of Alicia and Frederick, show how far that you agree that their lives are **unhappy**.

stemup.co.uk

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

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** Calpurnia, show how far you agree that Calpurnia is too **hard** on the children.

(b) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** the court verdict, show that characters react to the verdict in **differing** ways.

stemup.co.uk

5 Steinbeck: *Of Mice and Men*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** people on the ranch, show how far you agree that people on the ranch are **disrespectful** towards each other.

stemup.co.uk

6 Doyle: *Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Paddy's mother, show how far you agree that Paddy's mother is **strong-willed**.

(b) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** school experiences, show how far you agree that the children's school experiences are **negative**.

stemup.co.uk

7 Orwell: *Animal Farm*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** Squealer, show how far you agree that Squealer is to **blame** for the failure of Animalism.

(b) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** the lives of the animals, show how far you agree that the Revolution makes life **worse** for the animals.

stemup.co.uk

Section B – Unseen Prose

Read carefully the extract below and answer the question.

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

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

You should consider:

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

Extract from *Black Beauty* by Anna Sewell

(The novel *Black Beauty* depicts the life of a male horse in 19th century England. The novel is narrated by Black Beauty himself, and he describes his life under the various masters who own him.)

One night, a few days after James had left, I had eaten my hay and was lying down in my straw fast asleep, when I was suddenly roused by the stable bell ringing very loud. I heard the door of John's house open, and his feet running up to the hall. He was back again in no time; he unlocked the stable door, and came in, calling out, "Wake up, Beauty! You must go well now, if ever you did;" and almost before I could think he had got the saddle on my back and the bridle on my head. He just ran round for his coat, and then took me at a quick trot up to the hall door. The squire stood there, with a lamp in his hand.

"Now, John," he said, "ride for your life – that is, for your mistress' life; there is not a moment to lose. Give this note to Dr. White; give your horse a rest at the inn, and be back as soon as you can."

John said, "Yes, sir," and was on my back in a minute. The gardener who lived at the lodge had heard the bell ring, and was ready with the gate open, and away we went through the park, and through the village, and down the hill till we came to the toll-gate. John called very loud and thumped upon the door; the man was soon out and flung open the gate.

"Now," said John, "do you keep the gate open for the doctor; here's the money," and off he went again.

There was before us a long piece of level road by the river side; John said to me, "Now, Beauty, do your best," and so I did; I wanted no whip nor spur, and for two miles I galloped as fast as I could lay my feet to the ground; I don't believe that my old grandfather, who won the race at Newmarket, could have gone faster. When we came to the bridge John pulled me up a little and patted my neck. "Well done, Beauty! good old fellow," he said. He would have let me go slower, but my spirit was up, and I was off again as fast as before. The air was frosty, the moon was bright; it was very pleasant. We came through a village, then through a dark wood, then uphill, then downhill, till after eight miles' run we came to the town, through the streets and into the market-place. It was all quite still except the clatter of my feet on the stones – everybody was asleep. The church clock struck three as we drew up at Dr. White's door. John rang the bell twice, and then knocked at the door like thunder. A window was thrown up, and Dr. White, in his nightcap, put his head out and said, "What do you want?"

stemup.co.uk

“Mrs. Gordon is very ill, sir; master wants you to go at once; he thinks she will die if you cannot get there. Here is a note.”

“Wait,” he said, “I will come.”

He shut the window, and was soon at the door.

“The worst of it is,” he said, “that my horse has been out all day and is quite done up; my son has just been sent for, and he has taken the other. What is to be done? Can I have your horse?”

“He has come at a gallop nearly all the way, sir, and I was to give him a rest here; but I think my master would not be against it, if you think fit, sir.”

“All right,” he said; “I will soon be ready.”

John stood by me and stroked my neck; I was very hot. The doctor came out with his riding-whip.

“You need not take that, sir,” said John; “Black Beauty will go till he drops. Take care of him, sir, if you can; I should not like any harm to come to him.”

“No, no, John,” said the doctor, “I hope not,” and in a minute we had left John far behind.

I will not tell about our way back. The doctor was a heavier man than John, and not so good a rider; however, I did my very best. The man at the toll-gate had it open. When we came to the hill the doctor drew me up. “Now, my good fellow,” he said, “take some breath.” I was glad he did, for I was nearly spent, but that breathing helped me on, and soon we were in the park. Joe was at the lodge gate; my master was at the hall door, for he had heard us coming. He spoke not a word; the doctor went into the house with him, and Joe led me to the stable. I was glad to get home; my legs shook under me, and I could only stand and pant. I had not a dry hair on my body, the water ran down my legs, and I steamed all over, Joe used to say, like a pot on the fire. Poor Joe! he was young and small, and as yet he knew very little, and his father, who would have helped him, had been sent to the next village; but I am sure he did the very best he knew. He rubbed my legs and my chest, but he did not put my warm cloth on me; he thought I was so hot I should not like it. Then he gave me a pailful of water to drink; it was cold and very good, and I drank it all; then he gave me some hay and some corn, and thinking he had done right, he went away. Soon I began to shake and tremble, and turned deadly cold; my legs ached, my loins ached, and my chest ached, and I felt sore all over. Oh! how I wished for my warm, thick cloth, as I stood and trembled. I wished for John, but he had eight miles to walk, so I lay down in my straw and tried to go to sleep. After a long while I heard John at the door; I gave a low moan, for I was in great pain. He was at my side in a moment, stooping down by me. I could not tell him how I felt, but he seemed to know it all; he covered me up with two or three warm cloths, and then ran to the house for some hot water; he made me some warm gruel, which I drank, and then I think I went to sleep.

Black Beauty by Anna Sewell (ISBN: 9780681005860) © Longmeadow Press, 1994

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.

GEL11/4
262684

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 Jack is cruel, but Golding is careful not to present him as a monster from the first page. Instead he charts a gradual process in which a bossy, insecure schoolboy discovers that cruelty brings him power, and then gives himself up to it completely. By the end Jack's cruelty is extreme, yet Golding also suggests it was always latent in him, waiting only for the removal of adult rules. Jack is therefore cruel, but he is also Golding's means of showing how cruelty grows in anyone once the restraints of civilisation fall away.

From his first appearance, Jack's cruelty is linked to control. He marches the choir along the beach in their black cloaks, and Golding's verb "controlled" shows that he treats the boys as possessions rather than companions. The gothic image of the choir as a dark creature moving across the hot sand creates an ominous atmosphere around him before he has said much at all. Crucially, he ignores the choirboys' suffering even when they plead, "Please, Merridew", and when one of them faints he dismisses it carelessly: "He's always throwing a faint". The casual tone reveals an absence of empathy that Golding presents as the root of everything that follows.

Jack's treatment of Piggy is the clearest early sign of cruelty. His first words to him, "Shut up, Fatty", and his blunt rejection, "We don't want you", are designed to humiliate. Golding makes Piggy the voice of reason and adult intelligence, so Jack's contempt for him symbolises a contempt for thought itself. Piggy's terrified reaction to the idea of Jack as chief, "Oh lord! Oh no!", works as dramatic foreshadowing: the weakest character sees most clearly what Jack will become. The verbal bullying soon becomes physical when "Jack smacked Piggy's head" and

Question number

Piggy's glasses are broken. Golding structures this escalation carefully, so that words lead to blows and, finally, to murder.

However, Golding does complicate the picture. When Ralph is chosen as chief, Jack feels "a blush of mortification", a detail which exposes vulnerability and wounded pride rather than pure malice. In the early chapters he explores the island with Ralph and Simon, and the three boys "turned to each other, laughing excitedly", which presents him as an ordinary, likeable child. Most tellingly, when he first raises his knife over the trapped piglet he cannot bring himself to strike, and "Jack's face was white under the freckles". Golding uses this pause to show that Jack still carries the inhibitions of his upbringing, and he explains that the boy hesitates because of "the enormity of the knife descending and cutting into living flesh". At this stage Jack is not yet cruel, and the reader may even feel some sympathy for a boy struggling to be the leader he thinks he should be.

The turning point is the mask. Golding describes the painted face as "a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame". The word "liberated" is deeply ironic: what Jack is freed from is conscience. One reading is that the mask does not create cruelty but releases it, suggesting that Jack's capacity for violence was always present beneath the head boy's uniform. Soon he can announce "I cut the pig's throat" "proudly", and the adverb shows that killing now gives him status and pleasure. Golding's narrative voice describes "the compulsion to track down and kill that was swallowing him up", and the metaphor of being swallowed implies that Jack is consumed by something larger than himself. His language shifts accordingly into violent, aggressive verbs: he "slashed" and "slammed his knife into a trunk", and "suddenly Jack shouted in rage".

Jack's cruelty also spreads to others, which makes it more dangerous. The hunting

Question number

chant and the ritual dances that he leads turn play into violence, and in the re-enactment Robert is genuinely hurt and screaming while Jack holds him "by the hair". The chilling suggestion "Use a littl'un" reveals that he now sees the youngest children as no different from animals. Once he forms his own tribe, he rules through fear: Wilfred is to be beaten for no stated reason, and Samneric describe "the Chief" as one of the "terrors". The capital letter on "Chief" shows how Jack has turned himself into an idol, something closer to a tyrant than a schoolboy. His rejection of order is summed up in his cry "Bollocks to the rules!"

In the final chapters, Golding presents Jack's cruelty at its most absolute. After Piggy's death, Jack screams in triumph rather than horror, and he then organises the hunt for Ralph, moving from killing pigs to hunting a human being. He is even willing to set the whole island on fire to destroy Ralph, destroying the food and shelter on which the tribe depends. Golding's structure makes this the logical endpoint of the cruelty first glimpsed on the beach. Yet when the naval officer arrives, Jack is reduced to "a little boy" in tattered remains of a cap, and the sudden shift in perspective forces the reader to remember that this tyrant is a child.

In conclusion, I agree to a great extent that Jack is cruel, especially from the middle of the novel onward, where his violence becomes deliberate, pleasurable and murderous. However, Golding's presentation is more complex than a simple villain. Through Jack's early hesitation, his embarrassment and his transformation behind the mask, Golding suggests that cruelty is learned and released rather than innate in one boy alone. Jack is cruel, but his story is a warning about what any of us might become without the restraints of civilisation.

Question number	
1b	I agree that the island becomes a dangerous place, but Golding suggests that the real source of danger is not the island itself. At first it is presented as a paradise, a playground offering food, water and freedom. As the novel progresses, Golding's descriptions grow darker and more threatening, yet this shift mirrors the boys' own descent into savagery. The island is dangerous chiefly because of what the boys bring to it, so Golding uses the setting as a mirror of human nature rather than as the true villain. From the opening chapter, Golding introduces hints of threat beneath the beauty. The crash has left "the long scar smashed into the jungle", and the noun "scar" presents the boys' arrival as a wound to the natural world, while the description of it as "a bath of heat" makes the setting feel oppressive. A bird "flashed upwards with a witch-like cry", and the simile adds a supernatural, sinister note to an otherwise exotic scene. Even physically the island resists the boys: Piggy complains, "I can't hardly move with all these creeper things", and on their exploration "Ralph was badly scratched". Golding's images of "fallen trees" and "decaying coconuts" introduce decay into paradise, quietly foreshadowing the corruption to come. However, Golding also gives powerful evidence that the island is not dangerous at all. The first description of the lagoon is full of light and colour, with the water "clear to the bottom and bright with the efflorescence of tropical weed and coral". The rich, almost lyrical language invites the reader to share the boys' delight. Ralph's excited claim, "It's a good island", and the promise that "we can have a good time on this island" present it as an adventure-story setting, the kind of place found in the boys' own books. There is fruit and fresh water and there are materials for shelters. Simon's secret place is the most peaceful setting of all, described with "dark aromatic bushes", "the bright fantastic birds" and

Question number

"honey-coloured sunlight". Here the sensory detail suggests harmony between a good person and the natural world. These descriptions support the view that the island is neutral or even generous.

The first real danger comes from the boys' own carelessness. When they light a signal fire on the mountain it races out of control, and Golding personifies the flames as a "heart of flame" which "leapt nimbly across the gap". The fire is lively and almost playful, which makes it more frightening, and a small boy with a birthmark disappears and is never seen again. This structural moment is significant: the first death on the island is caused not by nature but by the boys' disorder. Similarly, the food that sustains them also brings "stomach-aches" and "chronic diarrhoea", suggesting that their failure to organise themselves makes even the island's gifts harmful.

As the novel goes on, the danger becomes psychological. The fear of "the beast" grows among the littluns, and at night "the darkness was full of claws, full of the awful unknown and menace". The rhythm of the repeated "full of" builds tension, and the vague phrase "the awful unknown" shows that the boys fear what they cannot see. Simon expresses this anxiety when he suggests it is "As if it wasn't a good island", a tentative phrase that shows how far the boys' sense of paradise has collapsed. Yet Simon also realises the truth, that the beast may be "only us". When the Lord of the Flies speaks to him, it mocks the idea of something "you could hunt and kill", revealing that the danger lies inside the boys themselves. Golding's narrative voice confirms the loss of order: "The world, that understandable and lawful world, was slipping away."

The most violent events on the island are presented through pathetic fallacy. At the moment of Simon's death, "The dark sky was shattered by a blue-white scar",

Question number

and the storm reflects the chaos of the boys' frenzied dance. The repetition of "scar" from the first chapter is a powerful structural echo: the wound the boys made at their arrival has now spread to the whole island and the sky above it. However, it is the boys, not the storm, who kill Simon. The island merely reflects their violence.

Later, Golding shows the boys turning the island's landscape into a weapon. Castle Rock, reached only by "a narrow ledge of rock, a few yards wide", becomes a fortress, and Roger levers a boulder down onto Piggy. The rock "bounded" on, "thumping and smashing" towards the beach, and the violent participles convey brutal force. Piggy falls onto the rocks and the sea takes his body. Finally, Jack sets the island alight to hunt Ralph, turning paradise into a burning wreck. Ironically, this destruction brings the rescue ship.

In conclusion, I agree that the island is a dangerous place, especially by the end of the novel, where it contains fire, deadly cliffs and boys who kill. However, Golding suggests that the island's danger is created by its inhabitants. At first it offers beauty, food and peace, and only becomes threatening as the boys' fear and savagery grow. When Ralph weeps for "the darkness of man's heart", Golding makes clear that the true danger was never the island, but human nature itself.

2a

I agree to some extent that Fiona is a bad parent to Marcus, but Hornby presents her failings with real sympathy. She loves her son deeply and holds strong values, yet her depression, her rigid principles and her blindness to Marcus's daily life leave him exposed and unprotected. Hornby's portrait is not of a cruel mother but of a struggling one, and by the end of the novel she recognises her own shortcomings. She is, perhaps, a flawed parent rather than simply a bad one.

Question number

The strongest evidence against Fiona is the instability she brings to Marcus's life. Through Marcus's narrative strand, Hornby shows how her relationships come and go without warning: he "had quite liked Roger", but "now, apparently, he'd never see him again". The word "apparently" is quietly devastating, because it shows that Marcus is not consulted or even properly told about decisions that affect him. The move from Cambridge to London has similarly uprooted him, leaving him friendless at a school where "the kids were harder and meaner and less understanding". Hornby uses the close third-person narration to let the reader see this confusion from a child's limited viewpoint, which makes Fiona's choices seem careless.

Fiona's depression is the most painful aspect of her parenting. Marcus lives in a state of constant anxiety about what he will find when he comes home, and after her attempted overdose on the day of the picnic he begins to see that "there were only two of them". The implication is left frightening and unfinished: if Fiona dies, Marcus will have nobody. Hornby therefore shows that the child has taken on the role of protecting the parent, and the blunt demand "If you can't look after me properly then you'll have to find someone who can" exposes how far the normal relationship between mother and son has broken down.

Fiona also imposes her own values on Marcus with little regard for how they affect him. She dresses him in "the hairy jumper Fiona had given him for Christmas and a disastrous pair of canary-yellow cords", and the adjective "disastrous" reflects the mockery Marcus suffers as a result. Her vegetarianism, her taste in music and her dislike of popular culture make him an outsider among his peers. When Will tells her that "Marcus is being eaten alive at school", the brutal metaphor exposes how little she has understood the bullying, and the accusation "You haven't got a clue, have you?" sums up the gap between her ideals and Marcus's reality. Her hostile

Question number

response to Will, "Marcus doesn't need a father, and he certainly doesn't need a father like you", shows her refusing the very help that Marcus has gone looking for himself.

However, Hornby balances this criticism with evidence of Fiona's love and good intentions. She moved to London at the start of the summer holidays so that Marcus could settle in before term began, a thoughtful decision even if it did not work. She praises him warmly, telling him, "You've been really good about everything", and she takes him to places like Glastonbury to broaden his experience. Her principles are not merely selfish: she says she wants "to teach you to think for yourself", which shows she values independence and honesty. When she discovers that Marcus has been visiting Will's flat, Hornby uses capital letters, "YOU GO ROUND HIS FLAT AFTER SCHOOL?", to convey her shock. The typography is comic, but her alarm about her son spending time with a strange man is the reaction of a responsible parent.

Fiona's efforts to fight her depression also deserve credit. Hornby notes small signs of recovery, such as the fact that "the duvet had been put away", a modest detail which suggests the enormous effort it costs her simply to function for Marcus's sake. She has also complained to the school about the bullying, and she invites Will, Marcus's father Clive and his girlfriend Lindsey to Christmas because Marcus wants them there. These actions show a mother listening to her son, even if imperfectly.

Most importantly, Fiona eventually admits her failings. After Marcus is taken to the police station in Cambridge, she confesses, "I haven't been a good mother". The simple, direct sentence is moving because it shows self-awareness rather than defensiveness. Hornby's structure allows Fiona to grow alongside Will and Marcus,

Question number

and by the end she has accepted that Marcus needs more people than just her. Her observation near the end that he seems "so much older" suggests both pride and a recognition that he has had to grow up quickly, partly because of her.

In conclusion, I agree only partly that Fiona is a bad parent. Her depression, her self-absorbed relationships and her insistence on her own values cause Marcus real harm, leaving him isolated and burdened with adult worries. Yet Hornby presents her as loving, principled and, crucially, capable of change. Through the dual narrative, he invites the reader to judge her as Marcus finally does: not as a villain, but as a mother doing her imperfect best.

2b

I agree that the lives of Will and Marcus are lonely for much of the novel, though in very different ways. Will has chosen isolation and dresses it up as freedom, while Marcus has loneliness forced upon him by bullying, a fragile mother and his own oddness. Hornby's alternating chapters set the two lonely figures side by side, and the structure of the novel traces how each slowly draws the other out. By the end neither is truly alone, so loneliness is the condition Hornby begins with rather than the one he leaves us with.

Will's loneliness is disguised as contentment. Living off the royalties of his father's Christmas song, he has never needed a job and therefore meets very few people. He prefers to "peek over the fence at other people's lives", and the image of the fence presents him as an observer rather than a participant, someone deliberately keeping a barrier between himself and others. He even thinks of himself as an island, comparing himself to Ibiza, a glamorous and self-sufficient place. Hornby's comic tone makes this sound appealing, yet the joke contains a sadness: an island, however lively, is cut off.

Question number

Hornby shows how empty Will's days really are. He divides his time into units, filling them with magazine quizzes, Countdown and new pop records, and he admits that "the evenings were OK; it was the days that tested his patience and ingenuity". The ironic word "ingenuity" suggests that doing nothing requires effort, revealing the boredom behind his lifestyle. His terror of commitment is captured in the comic exclamations "He was dry ice! He was Frosty the Snowman!", and the hyperbole presents his emotional coldness as almost a source of pride. When John and Christine ask him to be a godfather, it seems an act of pity as much as friendship. Most revealing of all is Christmas: Will reflects that how you spent it "was a message to the world about where you were at in life", showing that beneath his indifference he fears being seen as alone.

Marcus's loneliness is far rawer, because he lacks Will's defences. Newly arrived in London, he finds that "the kids were harder and meaner and less understanding", and the list of comparatives emphasises how much worse his situation has become. He is "ignored" and called "weird", and Hornby captures his isolation in his inability to read social situations: "People often thought Marcus was being funny when he wasn't. He couldn't understand it." The short final sentence conveys his bewilderment. Even his only friends abandon him, telling him "we don't want you hanging around with us any more". Hornby uses hyperbole from a child's perspective, as when something is the "scariest thing he'd ever seen, by a million miles", to show how overwhelming his experiences are.

At home, Marcus is lonely in a different way. His father lives far away in Cambridge, and his mother's depression means he carries his fears in secret. Hornby uses anaphora to convey this: "He couldn't say it to his mum, he couldn't say it to his dad, he couldn't say it to Suzie". The repeated structure closes off

Question number

every possible confidant, one after another. After Fiona's overdose, his deepest fear emerges in the stark realisation that "there were only two of them". This explains why Marcus seeks out Will: he is trying to widen his circle so that he will never be left completely alone.

However, Hornby makes clear that neither life stays lonely. The relationship between Will and Marcus is the turning point for both. Marcus invites Will for Christmas, and Will realises that the boy, "in his artful, skewed way", did not want him to be alone. The adjectives show Will's growing tenderness and understanding. Will then "fell in love on New Year's Eve" with Rachel, and his friendship with her son Ali means that "Most Saturdays now, Will took Ali and Marcus out somewhere". The casual habit in "most Saturdays" shows how naturally company has become part of his life. Will has gone from observer to participant.

Marcus, too, moves out of isolation. His friendship with Ellie, older, rebellious and fiercely herself, gives him an ally at school, and at a party he realises he "had never had a proper talk with someone of his own age before". The trip to Cambridge, though chaotic, reconnects him with his father. By the end, Hornby presents him as someone who could become "as robust and unremarkable as every other twelve-year-old kid", and the word "unremarkable" is, for Marcus, a triumph. Will's final certainty that "Marcus would be OK" closes the novel on a note of hope.

Some readers may argue that Will was never really lonely, since he seemed genuinely happy alone. Yet Hornby's satire suggests that his contentment was a defence, and his change shows how much he gained from letting others in.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that the lives of Will and Marcus are lonely at the

Question number	
	start of the novel, Will's through choice and Marcus's through circumstance. However, Hornby's dual structure allows each to rescue the other, and by the end both have built networks of friends and family. Overturning Will's early belief that every man is an island, Hornby suggests that no man, or boy, can truly live as one.
3a	I strongly agree that Jerry deserves sympathy. Johnston presents him as a lively, loyal and courageous young man whose life is limited at every turn by class, poverty and the brutality of war, and whose final act of loyalty to his family leads directly to his execution. Yet Johnston does not present him simply as a victim. Jerry is confident, spirited and often freer than Alexander, so our sympathy is for a vivid person whose potential is wasted, rather than for a pitiable weakling. Because the story is told by Alexander from his prison cell, we see Jerry through the eyes of someone who loved him, and this deepens the sense of loss throughout. From the beginning, Jerry's life is shaped by hardship. He comes from a poor Catholic family in the village near the Moores' estate, and he has to leave school early to earn money. He suffers at the hands of his father, and even his mother, though loving, is keen for him to enlist because the army pay will help the family survive. Johnston shows that Jerry's choices are made for economic reasons, in sharp contrast to Alexander, who has every privilege. The reader sympathises because Jerry's intelligence and talent with horses could flourish in another life, but his social position denies him that chance. However, Johnston also presents Jerry as remarkably confident and free. When Alexander first meets him at the lake and accuses him of trespassing, Jerry

Question number

replies, "There's lots of room for both of us". The calm, equal tone shows that he refuses to be intimidated by Alexander's class, and the line also works symbolically: in the natural world of the lake and the hills, the boys are equals. Jerry teaches Alexander to fight, introduces him to drink and tobacco, and plays rebel tunes. In many ways he enjoys a happier family life than Alexander does, surrounded by a loving mother and siblings rather than the cold silence of the big house. Some readers might argue that this freedom makes him less deserving of sympathy, since he is spared the emotional coldness that blights Alexander's childhood.

Yet the friendship itself is constantly threatened, and Jerry sees this clearly. He astutely realises that neither family will tolerate it, and Alicia's description of it as "an unsuitable relationship" confirms his judgement. The formal, cold adjective "unsuitable" reduces a deep friendship to a social error. Johnston shows that Jerry's life is dictated by forces beyond his control, and the reader sympathises with his understanding of a world that will not let him be himself.

In the army, Johnston intensifies our sympathy. Jerry is treated with contempt by his superiors, addressed as "Crowe, you good for nothing, get your backside out of there at once", and the insult strips away his name and his dignity. Despite his skill, he is not allowed to work with the horses. Major Glendinning in particular embodies the rigid class system, insisting that officers and men cannot be friends, which means Jerry cannot benefit from his closeness to Alexander. Johnston contrasts this harshness with Jerry's kindness. Although he is unwell himself, he rubs alcohol into Alexander's aching feet, a quiet act of care that reverses the usual roles of officer and private. He is also appalled by the screaming of a wounded soldier in No-Man's Land, revealing a sensitivity that the war's brutality cannot destroy.

Question number

The turning point comes when Jerry receives a letter from home asking him to find his father, who is missing. Alexander asks for leave on Jerry's behalf, but Glendinning refuses with the cold reply, "The answer is no. Crowe goes to the front again tomorrow with the rest of his squalid friends." The short, final sentence leaves no room for argument, and the adjective "squalid" reveals contempt for the ordinary soldiers. Jerry's decision to search anyway is presented as an act of loyalty and courage rather than cowardice. When Alexander offers him money, Jerry brushes him aside with "Ah leave that, Alec", and the use of the familiar name and the dismissive phrase show his pride and his refusal to be patronised.

Jerry's fate is the most powerful source of sympathy in the novel. He learns that his father is dead, and on his return he is court-martialled for desertion. Johnston's cruellest irony is that Alexander is ordered to command the firing squad. Rather than let his friend be shot at dawn, Alexander shoots Jerry himself in the cell, an act of love that the army sees as a crime. The novel's frame, opening with Alexander awaiting his own execution, means that the reader knows from the start that this story will end in death, which gives every earlier scene of laughter and companionship a tragic weight.

In conclusion, I agree almost entirely that Jerry deserves sympathy. He is a victim of poverty, of a rigid class system, and of a war that punishes loyalty to family as desertion. Johnston complicates this by presenting him as confident, spirited and, in some ways, freer than Alexander, but these qualities only make his death more tragic. Through Alexander's retrospective first-person narration, Johnston ensures that our final feeling for Jerry is not pity for weakness but grief for a life cut short.

Question number

3b

I strongly agree that the lives of Alicia and Frederick are unhappy. Johnston presents their marriage as a cold, loveless arrangement in which Alicia's contempt and Frederick's passivity trap them both, with their son Alexander caught between them. Yet Johnston also suggests that their unhappiness is partly hidden behind social routine, and that each finds small consolations. Seen through Alexander's retrospective first-person narration, their marriage is an unhappy one, but it is also a portrait of two people imprisoned by the expectations of their class and time.

The most obvious sign of unhappiness is Alicia's cruelty towards Frederick. She speaks to him with open hostility, declaring, "I have no intention of remaining alone in this house with you". The phrase "alone in this house with you" suggests that she finds his company not merely dull but unbearable, and the formal, precise wording makes the rejection sound cold and calculated rather than impulsive. She dismisses him as "ineffective and old", two adjectives that strip him of authority and vitality. Her scathing remark "Yes, inadequate would be the word all right" is delivered with cutting irony, as if she is coolly selecting the most wounding term available.

Johnston shows that Alicia's contempt extends to humiliating Frederick in front of their son. Her complaint, "Oh Frederick, you do become so boring when you talk on about nothing like that", belittles him publicly, and the exclamatory "Oh" conveys weary impatience. Alexander, as narrator, records these moments without much comment, and the restraint makes them more painful: the boy has grown up accustomed to his parents' coldness. Alicia's reflection on "the humiliation of living with someone who is completely indifferent to you" is especially revealing. She seems to feel that she is the wronged party, which suggests that her own unhappiness is genuine, even if she inflicts much of the misery.

Question number

The emotional distance between them is reinforced by physical distance. Alicia will not let Frederick touch her, and the hesitant phrasing of "ah...yes...being unable to touch in any way" uses suspension points to convey pain and embarrassment, as if the subject can barely be spoken about. Their meals are summed up in Johnston's neat antithesis, "Comfortable meals and uncomfortable talk", which shows that their material comfort cannot hide emotional discomfort. Most tellingly, Alexander observes that "their only meeting place was the child". This metaphor presents Alexander as the only point of contact in an otherwise divided household, and it explains why both parents compete for his loyalty.

Johnston's most shocking revelation seals the unhappiness of the marriage. Alicia hints, and finally tells Alexander, that Frederick is not his real father. This betrayal, used to push Alexander into enlisting, shows how far she is willing to wound both husband and son. Structurally, it is the moment that sends Alexander away from the house and towards the war, so the parents' unhappy marriage becomes one of the causes of the tragedy that follows. Frederick, meanwhile, allows Alicia to dominate and defers to her in every decision about Alexander. His passivity may be read as weakness, but it also suggests a man who has given up the struggle.

However, Johnston does offer some evidence that their lives are not entirely unhappy. On the surface, they maintain a busy social life and could be "excellent, generous hosts", which suggests that their unhappiness is disguised by the rituals of the Anglo-Irish gentry. Frederick seems to find a quiet contentment of his own in his estate, his books and his son. His gift of his own father's gold watch to Alexander is a tender moment, showing that he finds meaning in being a father whatever the truth of Alexander's parentage. He also avoids confrontation and does not retaliate when insulted, which allows him a kind of peace, and he even urges

Question number

Alexander to treat his mother with respect. Some readers might see dignity rather than defeat in his patience.

Alicia, too, is presented with some complexity. She openly admits, "I'm not a nice woman", and this rare moment of honesty suggests self-knowledge, perhaps even regret. Her devotion to Alexander, playing the piano with him and taking him travelling in Europe, shows that she pours her emotional life into her son because her marriage offers her nothing. Both partners stay together largely out of duty, and Johnston implies that they are trapped by the social conventions of their time, when divorce among their class would have been almost unthinkable. Their unhappiness is therefore not only personal but social.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that the lives of Alicia and Frederick are unhappy. Johnston uses sharp dialogue, painful silences and the cold detachment of Alexander's narration to present a marriage without warmth, sustained only by duty and by their shared, competing love for their son. Frederick finds some consolation in quiet resignation, and Alicia in her bond with Alexander, but these are small comforts. Ultimately their unhappiness spreads beyond themselves, driving Alexander towards the war that destroys him, which makes their marriage one of the novel's quiet tragedies.

4a

Lee presents Calpurnia through the eyes of the young Scout, and at first Scout certainly believes that Calpurnia is too hard on her. However, because the novel is narrated by an adult Scout looking back, Lee allows the reader to see what the child cannot: Calpurnia's strictness is a form of love, and her discipline prepares the children for the moral world they must later face. I would agree that Calpurnia is hard on the children, but not that she is too hard.

Question number

Lee's first description of Calpurnia makes her sound almost frightening. She is "all angles and bones", a description built from sharp, hard nouns that suggests there is nothing soft about her, and Scout adds that her hand "was wide as a bed slat and twice as hard". The comic simile, typical of the child's exaggerated voice, presents Calpurnia as a figure of physical force, and Scout's phrase for their quarrels, "epic" and "one-sided", turns a household argument into a mock battle that Scout always loses. The word "tyrannical", used for a presence Scout has felt "as long as I could remember", is the language of a subject complaining about a ruler. At this point, the reader may sympathise with Scout's view that Calpurnia is unfair, especially as Scout feels that Atticus always takes Calpurnia's side.

The Walter Cunningham episode is the clearest example of Calpurnia's harshness. When Scout criticises Walter for pouring syrup over his food, Calpurnia summons her into the kitchen, furious, and sends her back through the door with a "stinging smack". To Scout, who is only six, this feels deeply unjust, because she has only told the truth. Yet Lee structures the scene so that the reader sees Calpurnia's point before Scout does. Calpurnia's dialect speech, insisting that Walter is the family's company and must be treated with respect whatever he does, teaches a lesson about class and hospitality that runs through the whole novel. Her firmness here anticipates Atticus's advice about climbing into another person's skin, so her hardness is shown to serve the novel's central moral concern with empathy. The smack is harsh, but the lesson is kind.

Lee then softens Calpurnia immediately, and this careful structuring is significant. At the end of Scout's grim first day at school, Calpurnia makes crackling bread and, unexpectedly, kisses her, telling her "I missed you today". The narrator jokes that perhaps Calpurnia "had at last seen the error of her fractious ways", but the

Question number

humour exposes the child's misunderstanding. The adult narrator recognises that Calpurnia's strictness and her tenderness come from the same place. Her teaching is described as having "no sentimentality", yet the reader senses that she shows love through action rather than words: she taught Scout to write by making her copy from the Bible, which is why Scout arrives at school already literate.

Calpurnia's protectiveness becomes clearer as the novel develops. During the episode of the mad dog, it is Calpurnia who takes control, telephoning for help and running to warn the neighbours, even the Radleys. Lee shows her moving with a speed and authority that reveal how seriously she takes the children's safety. When Atticus is away, she is trusted completely, and Atticus treats her as an equal, which Scout reports when he tells his sister that anything fit to say at the table is fit to say in front of Calpurnia. Lee uses Atticus's respect to guide the reader's judgement: if the novel's moral centre trusts her, the reader is invited to trust her too.

Some readers might argue that Calpurnia is too hard when she takes the children to First Purchase church, where Lula confronts them and Scout senses "we were being advanced upon". It could seem careless to expose them to hostility. However, the visit reveals a new side of Calpurnia, her "modest double life", and her dignified handling of Lula shows her shielding the children rather than endangering them. When she explains why she speaks differently in different places, she becomes a teacher of a quieter kind, showing the children that there are worlds within Maycomb they do not understand.

As the children grow, Lee shows their relationship changing. Calpurnia is the first to notice that Jem is growing up, calling him almost "Mister Jem", and Scout recalls that Calpurnia's "tyranny" had faded into a gentler disapproval. When Scout

Question number

feels shut out by Jem, she flees to Calpurnia in the kitchen, the same place she was once punished. This reversal is quietly moving: the room that once symbolised discipline becomes a place of comfort.

The contrast with Aunt Alexandra strengthens the case for Calpurnia. Alexandra's rules are about appearances and the Finch family name, and she wants Calpurnia dismissed. Atticus refuses, calling her a "faithful member of this family". Lee implies that Calpurnia's strictness has a moral purpose, whereas Alexandra's is about social snobbery.

In conclusion, Lee presents Calpurnia as hard on the children, and the child narrator's comic exaggerations make that hardness vivid. However, the double perspective of the narration allows the reader to see that her discipline is never cruel and always purposeful. Calpurnia is not too hard on the children; she is exactly as hard as she needs to be to raise them well in Atticus's absence, and the adult Scout's affectionate retelling suggests that, in the end, she knew it.

4b

Lee presents the guilty verdict in Tom Robinson's trial as the moral turning point of the novel, and she uses it as a kind of test: each character's reaction reveals who they really are. Through Scout's first-person narration, Lee shows the verdict producing grief, dignity, anger, gratitude and spite, and the variety of these responses exposes the deep divisions within Maycomb.

Lee builds the moment of the verdict with great care. The jury takes hours, and Scout, waiting late at night, notices a strange stillness and compares the scene to the morning of the mad dog, when the street was deserted and waiting. This echo links the verdict to an earlier moment of danger, suggesting that something

Question number

destructive is approaching. When the verdict comes, Scout presents it in fragments, recalling that each "guilty" was like a separate blow to Jem. The repetition slows time down and forces the reader to feel the word land again and again, while the image of Jem's shoulders jerking makes his pain physical.

Jem's reaction is the most intense in the novel. He has been certain that Atticus will win, because he believes the evidence is overwhelming, and his faith is shattered. Lee describes his face as "streaked with angry tears", and his repeated cry "It ain't right" is simple and childlike, yet morally precise. The plainness of his language mirrors the plainness of his belief that justice should follow the truth. In the following chapters, his disillusionment continues. He tells Miss Maudie that he always thought Maycomb folks were the best folks in the world, and the past tense quietly marks the death of his innocence. Later, his idea that juries should be done away with shows a boy struggling to understand a system that has failed. Lee uses Jem to dramatise the painful process of growing up, the moment when a child discovers that adults can be unjust.

Atticus, by contrast, responds with restraint. He speaks briefly to Tom, gathers his papers, and walks out of the courtroom without a word. Lee's decision to give him silence rather than speech is powerful, because the reader expects the hero of the trial to protest. His silence suggests both exhaustion and a refusal to show bitterness, which fits his belief in courtesy and self-control. Yet Lee does not present him as untouched. When the Black community leave gifts of food in the kitchen the next morning, his eyes fill with tears, and he asks Calpurnia to tell them never to do this again because times are too hard. The moment shows that their gratitude affects him more deeply than the defeat itself.

The reaction of the Black community in the balcony is perhaps the most

Question number

memorable. As Atticus leaves, everyone in the "coloured balcony" rises to their feet, and Reverend Sykes tells Scout to stand up because her father is passing. Lee's choice of the verb "passin'" gives the moment a ceremonial quality, as if Atticus were a dignitary. Structurally, this silent tribute comes straight after the verdict, so Lee juxtaposes the white jury's injustice with the moral recognition offered by those who have the least power in the town. Their response is not anger but respect, which makes the verdict seem even more shameful.

Bob Ewell's reaction is completely different. Although he has won, he feels humiliated, because Atticus has exposed him in court. He spits in Atticus's face and threatens him, and Atticus's dry comment that he wishes Bob Ewell did not chew tobacco shows his refusal to be provoked. Lee presents Ewell's victory as hollow: he has gained nothing but resentment, and his desire for revenge drives the novel towards its climax, the attack on Jem and Scout. In this way, the verdict's consequences are spread across the rest of the narrative.

Miss Maudie offers a more reflective reaction. She tries to comfort Jem by showing him that some people did care, pointing to Judge Taylor's choice of Atticus and to the length of time the jury stayed out. She sees the verdict as a small step forward rather than total defeat, and her measured voice helps the reader to look beyond Jem's despair. Later, at the missionary circle, her sharp sarcasm towards the ladies who criticise Atticus shows her anger in a controlled form.

Aunt Alexandra's reaction is particularly interesting because it changes. She has disapproved of Atticus taking the case, yet when he returns home after the verdict she tells him "I'm sorry, brother", the affectionate address suggesting that family loyalty is beginning to outweigh her concern for appearances. When news arrives of

Question number

Tom's death, her voice shakes, and her outburst that the town is willing to let Atticus do what they are too afraid to do themselves reveals that the verdict has forced her to see her brother more clearly. She even gives Miss Maudie "a look of pure gratitude" for defending him. Lee uses her shift to show that the verdict can unsettle even the most rigid attitudes.

Scout and Dill react in quieter ways. Scout reports events calmly, but her narration lingers on what she saw, which suggests the scene left a mark on her. Dill, already upset during the trial by the way Tom is treated, imagines escaping into laughter by becoming a clown. Even the children's reactions differ.

Through these contrasting responses, Lee shows that the verdict divides Maycomb not only between Black and white, but between those who can recognise injustice and those who cannot. The differing reactions turn a single word, "guilty", into a mirror held up to the whole town.

Sa

Steinbeck presents Slim as the moral centre of the ranch, a man whose quiet authority is matched by real understanding of others. I largely agree that Slim is caring. However, Steinbeck makes his care practical rather than sentimental: Slim accepts the harsh logic of ranch life, and at times his kindness looks like detachment. His care is real, but it is the care of a man who knows that, in this world, not everyone and everything can be saved.

Steinbeck introduces Slim in a way that sets him apart from every other character. The narrative voice slows down and describes him moving with "a majesty only achieved by royalty and master craftsmen", and calls him the "prince of the ranch". This elevated language contrasts sharply with the plain, often rough

Question number

descriptions of the other men, and it suggests that Slim's authority comes from natural dignity rather than force. The narrator adds that his word is taken on any subject, and later that his opinions were "law". From the outset, Steinbeck invites the reader to trust Slim's judgement, which is important because so much of his caring is expressed through judgement.

His first conversations with George and Lennie show that he is welcoming. Where Curley is hostile and the boss suspicious, Slim speaks gently and observes that it is unusual for men to travel together. His comment that perhaps everyone in the world is scared of each other is one of the few moments when a ranch worker reflects on loneliness, and it encourages George to confide in him. Steinbeck uses dialogue here to show that Slim listens; George tells him about Lennie and Weed, a secret he has kept from everyone else. Slim's response, that Lennie "ain't mean" and that he can tell a mean guy a mile off, shows insight and compassion. He sees past Lennie's size to his innocence.

The puppies show a more complicated side. Slim drowns four of the newborn pups straight away, explaining that the mother "couldn't feed that many". On the surface this seems ruthless, but his reasoning shows concern for the survival of the rest and for the mother. He then gives one of the remaining pups to Lennie, and later warns him not to pet them too much. Steinbeck presents Slim's care as practical: he makes difficult decisions in order to protect what can be protected.

The death of Candy's dog is the scene where readers might question Slim most. Carlson pushes to shoot the dog, and Candy looks to Slim for help, but Slim agrees that the dog is no good to himself and says that he would want someone to shoot him if he became old and "a cripple". This remark, said in front of the elderly and disabled Candy, seems thoughtless, and when Candy looks at Slim for a long time

Question number

hoping for "some reversal", Steinbeck makes the reader feel Candy's despair. Yet Slim also offers Candy a pup, and after the shot he tells Carlson to take a shovel, a quiet instruction that spares Candy the sight of his dog's body. His care here is limited by his acceptance that the useless must be put out of their misery, a harsh principle that foreshadows the ending.

Slim's treatment of Curley shows that his caring does not extend to bullies. He mocks Curley's jealousy and dismisses his complaints about his wife, so his tone towards Curley is cold and contemptuous. Yet when Lennie crushes Curley's hand, it is Slim who acts first, insisting that Curley must see a doctor, and then making Curley promise to say his hand was caught in a machine. This could be seen as threatening, because Slim tells Curley that otherwise everybody will laugh at him, but its purpose is to protect Lennie and George from being fired. Steinbeck shows Slim using his authority on behalf of the vulnerable.

The ending is where Slim's caring is most clearly revealed. When Lennie kills Curley's wife, Slim is the only man who considers what is best for Lennie rather than what Curley wants. He tells George that if Lennie is locked up and strapped down, "that ain't no good", which suggests that he understands that death may be kinder than captivity. After George shoots Lennie, Slim alone goes to him and tells him, "You hadda, George. I swear you hadda." The repetition of "hadda" is simple but deeply consoling, and his invitation to go and get a drink offers George the companionship he has just lost. Carlson's baffled question about what is eating the two of them shows that only Slim understands.

In conclusion, Steinbeck presents Slim as caring, but in a way shaped by the brutal world of the ranch. He is willing to drown pups, to agree to the death of a dog, and to see that Lennie cannot survive. However, each of these decisions is

Question number

made with thought for others, and his final words to George show tenderness that no other character offers. Slim's care is not soft, but it is genuine, and through him Steinbeck suggests that compassion can survive even in a place defined by loneliness.

5b Steinbeck presents the ranch as a place where disrespect is woven into everyday life. Insults, suspicion and cruelty pass between almost every group of characters, and those with the least power, Crooks, Candy, Curley's wife and Lennie, suffer most. I largely agree that people on the ranch are disrespectful towards each other. However, Steinbeck also shows that much of this harshness grows out of loneliness and fear, and that moments of genuine respect, though rare, are all the more striking for that.

From the moment George and Lennie arrive, Steinbeck shows a culture of suspicion. The boss questions George sharply about why he speaks for Lennie and asks what stake George has in him, assuming he must be exploiting him. Curley then enters looking at Lennie with hostility and demands that Lennie answer when he is spoken to. His clipped, aggressive dialogue and his habit of looking for a fight establish him as the embodiment of disrespect. Steinbeck uses Curley to show how a man with power, but no natural authority, uses insult and intimidation to feel important.

Even friendship on the ranch is expressed through rough language. George swears at Lennie throughout the novella and, in the opening section, tells him that if he were a relative of his he would shoot himself. This is cruel, and George's angry speech about how easy his life could be without Lennie suggests real resentment. Yet Steinbeck structures the scene so that the anger is followed by guilt and

Question number

gentleness, as George retells the dream of the farm. The reader comes to see that his harsh words often protect Lennie, warning him away from Curley and his wife. The rough vernacular is the normal speech of men who live hard lives, so it is not always a sign of disrespect.

The treatment of Crooks is the clearest example of systematic disrespect. The men refer to him not by name but by a racial slur, and he lives alone in the harness room. In his conversation with Lennie, Crooks explains that he is excluded from the bunkhouse and from card games because he is black, and adds simply, "They say I stink." The short, flat sentence carries a lifetime of humiliation. Steinbeck shows that disrespect passes down the hierarchy, because Crooks, given a rare moment of power, taunts Lennie by suggesting George might not come back. His cruelty is born of his own isolation, but it is cruelty all the same.

Curley's wife is perhaps the most disrespected character, and Steinbeck makes the point through form: she is never given a name. To the men she is "jail bait", a "tart" or simply Curley's property. George calls her a "rattrap" and Candy gossips about her and about Curley's glove "fulla Vaseline", so even private conversations are full of contempt. Yet Steinbeck does not make her only a victim. In the scene in Crooks's room, she mocks the three men left behind, calling them "bindle stiffs", and when Crooks tries to stand up for himself she threatens that she could get him "strung up on a tree so easy it ain't even funny". The shocking threat shows that she, too, uses the little power she has to crush someone weaker. Steinbeck presents disrespect as a chain in which each person, hurt by those above, hurts those below.

Candy's dog provides one of the most painful examples. Carlson complains about the smell of the old dog and insists on shooting it, pressing Candy repeatedly until

Question number

he gives in. Steinbeck slows the scene down with silence, as the men wait for the gunshot, so the reader feels how little Candy's grief is respected. Carlson later cleans his gun without thought, showing that he has never understood what the dog meant. Similarly, after Curley's wife's death, Candy speaks to her body with bitter insults, blaming her for ruining the dream. Even death does not earn her respect.

However, Steinbeck balances this with examples of respect. Slim is admired by everyone, and his opinions are taken as "law". He welcomes George and Lennie, praises Lennie's strength, and listens when George confides in him. Carlson greets the newcomers politely, and Candy describes the boss as a nice fellow despite his temper. Most importantly, the dream of the farm creates brief respect between unlikely companions. When Candy and Crooks are drawn into it, they speak to Lennie and George as equals, and for a moment the barriers of age, race and disability seem to fall away. Steinbeck shows that respect is possible when men share hope rather than fear.

The ending offers the most complicated image of respect. George shoots Lennie himself, rather than leaving him to Curley's lynch mob, and as he does so he describes the farm, letting Lennie die happy. This is an act of deep respect and love, even though it is also an act of killing. Slim's quiet words of comfort to George show that he alone recognises this.

In conclusion, Steinbeck presents people on the ranch as frequently disrespectful, and his use of insult, exclusion and namelessness makes this disrespect vivid and pervasive. Yet he suggests that it springs from loneliness, insecurity and a harsh economic world rather than simple wickedness. The rare moments of respect, especially between George and Lennie, show what the men might have been if

Question number

their world had allowed them to trust one another.

6a Doyle presents Paddy's mother entirely through the eyes of her ten-year-old son, and this first-person narration shapes how strong she appears. To Paddy she is at first a figure of firm authority, and later the quiet heart of a home that is falling apart. I agree that she is strong-willed, but Doyle shows that her strength is tested, and partly worn away, by a marriage in which she has little power. Her strength lies less in winning battles than in refusing to let her children see how much she is losing.

In the early episodes, Ma is presented as a strict parent whom Paddy respects and fears. When he describes a telling-off with the hyperbole "She killed me", Doyle captures the dramatic voice of a child, but also suggests that Ma's discipline is real and effective. In the episode of the letters to Santa, she will not give in to Paddy's demands for an envelope of his own and refuses to put up with his "whinging". The child's word, with its comic exaggeration, shows how firmly she sets limits. Doyle presents her here as a mother who runs the house with confidence, and Paddy's anxious awareness of what she will think, even when she is not present, shows how powerful her authority is.

Ma's strength of will is clearest when she stands up to Da. In one argument she tells him, "Don't shout at him", a short imperative that defends her son and directly challenges her husband's authority. In a household where the father is usually obeyed, this moment reveals her courage. Paddy reports it without commentary, as he reports most things, and the flatness of the narration leaves the reader to recognise the risk she is taking. Doyle repeatedly uses this gap between what Paddy notices and what he understands, so that the reader sees

Question number

Ma's strength more clearly than her son does.

Ma is also presented as the emotional centre of the family. Paddy describes how she would talk to a crying child and maybe hug him, and how she "could make him go from cry to laugh in a few seconds". The phrase suggests a kind of skill, almost magic, in her ability to comfort. This tenderness is not weakness; it shows the determination with which she keeps the family together. When she is in bed apparently ill, Paddy notices that there is "nothing in the fridge", and the simple detail reveals how much of the household depends on her. Her absence is felt as a sudden emptiness, which makes her presence seem all the more powerful.

As the novel progresses, however, Doyle shows the pressure on her growing. The episodes become darker and the fights between Ma and Da more frequent. Paddy observes that she "was always the one that tried to make them talk", which shows her determination to repair the marriage, but also that her efforts fail. Paddy's own attempts to stop the fights, staying awake to listen, keeping guard over the house, mirror his mother's, and Doyle suggests that both are fighting a battle they cannot win. The line "The fights didn't end now" and Paddy's sense that there are only gaps between them uses blunt, short statements to show how normal conflict has become.

The most painful evidence is that Ma is a victim of her husband's violence. Paddy eventually sees Da hit her, and the moment is narrated with the shocked simplicity of a child who cannot process it. Earlier, Paddy notices that she "hadn't let me see her face", a detail that suggests she has been hiding signs of abuse to protect her children. This is strong-willed in a quiet, heartbreaking way: she controls what her children see even when she cannot control what happens to her. Yet the reader also recognises how trapped she is. Paddy states that "My da paid

Question number

for all the other food we got as well, everything", and the emphatic "everything" reveals her financial dependence. Doyle shows that a woman's strength of character could not, on its own, give her freedom.

Physically, too, the strain shows. Paddy notices that she "looked thinner", and his observation, made without understanding, suggests that the marriage is wearing her down. Some readers might argue that this shows her strength failing. However, Doyle never presents her as giving up. She remains present, caring for the children while Da becomes more distant.

At the end of the novel, Da leaves, and Ma is left to raise the children alone. Doyle gives this departure to Paddy's perspective, so the reader experiences it as his loss, but the implication is that Ma's endurance will now be tested more than ever. The fact that the home continues suggests that she will cope, even though Doyle offers no comforting certainty.

In conclusion, Doyle presents Paddy's mother as strong-willed: she disciplines firmly, defends her children, comforts them and tries to hold the marriage together. However, her strength exists within a relationship that limits and harms her, and the child narrator's partial understanding makes the reader acutely aware of what she suffers in silence. Her greatest strength, perhaps, is her determination that her children should not see her break.

6b

Doyle presents school through the voice of ten-year-old Paddy, who reports what happens in the classroom with the same matter-of-fact tone he uses for games, fights and family life. This flat, childlike narration is important, because it means the reader often sees the harshness of school more clearly than Paddy does. I

Question number

largely agree that the children's school experiences are negative: the classroom is a place of fear, humiliation and casual violence. However, Doyle also includes moments of kindness, curiosity and even admiration, which suggest that school is not wholly bleak.

The teacher who dominates the novel, Mister Hennessey, is presented as an unpredictable and often cruel figure. Paddy reports that Hennessey "hated" certain things about the boys, and the strong, emotive verb, coming from a child who uses it plainly, suggests a relationship based on hostility rather than care. Hennessey's teaching relies on fixed ideas about his pupils. In one episode he accuses James O'Keefe of being up to something at the back of the class, when O'Keefe is not even in school that day. Doyle uses this comic moment to expose the teacher's lazy assumptions: he does not see the children as individuals, only as troublemakers to be controlled.

Physical punishment is a constant presence. Paddy describes the rule of "One biff for every mistake" in the same tone he might use for a game, and the clipped phrase shows how normal violence has become. The word "biff" is almost playful, yet it refers to a teacher hitting a child, and the contrast between the light word and the reality is unsettling. Doyle does not need to comment; the casual way Paddy accepts the punishment is what makes it disturbing.

Humiliation is just as damaging as physical pain. When Liam struggles with spelling, Hennessey makes him repeat that he is a worm, forcing the answer "A worm, Sir". The question and answer format turns the insult into a ritual, and the boy's obedient reply shows how completely he is made to accept his own degradation. This episode is especially painful because Liam and his brother Aidan have lost their mother, so the reader recognises a vulnerable child being belittled.

Question number

The system of seating also reinforces failure: Paddy notes that if you were put in the last row it was very hard to get out again. This simple observation reveals a school that labels children rather than helping them improve.

Doyle also suggests that school fails to feed Paddy's curiosity. Paddy is fascinated by facts, by words and by stories, and he reads widely at home, describing one story about Father Damien as the best he ever read. His imagination, full of missionaries, lepers and heroism, is nourished outside the classroom, while lessons are often presented as repetition and routine. The contrast suggests that Paddy's real education takes place elsewhere, in books, in the streets and in his own restless thinking.

However, Doyle does not present school as entirely negative. The most striking moment of kindness comes when Liam dirties his trousers in class. Hennessey distracts the other boys and carries Liam out of the room, protecting him from further shame. This moment complicates the reader's view of the teacher: the man who can call a child a worm can also act with sensitivity. Doyle's refusal to make Hennessey simply a villain makes the portrayal more realistic, and perhaps more troubling, because it shows that cruelty and kindness can exist in the same adult.

The boys also admire Hennessey in some ways, especially his skill at handball, and Paddy's interest in what the teacher knows about the wider world, including his remarks about Communists not believing in God, shows that school can open the children's minds. Miss Watkins, reading the Proclamation of 1916 aloud while the children march, attempts to give them a sense of their history and identity. To Paddy, the marching is partly a game, and Doyle may be gently satirising the ritual, but it suggests that school offers the children a shared culture.

Question number	
	The world of the boys outside lessons is no gentler, especially as Paddy's home life collapses. Towards the end, Paddy's fight with Charles Leavy takes place in front of the other boys, and his defeat coincides with his growing isolation from his friends. Doyle suggests that the boys' own world can be as harsh as the classroom, a place where status is fought for and lost.
	Structurally, Doyle's episodic form, moving from classroom to home to street without chapter breaks, links school experiences with the breakdown of Paddy's family. As the arguments at home intensify, school becomes another place where Paddy must hide his feelings. For some children it may even offer structure when home is falling apart.
	In conclusion, Doyle presents the children's school experiences as largely negative, dominated by fear, physical punishment and humiliation. Yet he also shows moments of compassion and wonder, and the child narrator's acceptance of it all makes the cruelty more striking. School, like the adult world in general, is presented as something the boys must survive rather than enjoy.
7a	I agree to a large extent that Squealer is to blame for the failure of Animalism, because Orwell presents him as the pig who destroys the one thing the Revolution needed in order to survive: the truth. Animalism depends on the animals knowing what was promised and seeing what is happening, and Squealer systematically takes both away from them. However, I do not think he is solely to blame. Orwell presents him as an instrument rather than a master, a voice that serves Napoleon's power, and he also shows that the dogs, the sheep and the animals' own trust allow that voice to succeed. Squealer is perhaps best seen as the means by which Animalism fails rather than its single cause.

Question number

From his first appearance Orwell makes Squealer's skill with language sound dangerous. He is described as "a brilliant talker", and the narrator notes that the other animals said he "could turn black into white". This hyperbole is a warning: a creature who can invert the most obvious opposites can make the animals believe anything. Orwell also gives him physical tics, skipping from side to side and whisking his tail as he argues, which makes his persuasion seem like a performance designed to distract. Even his name, with its suggestion of a shrill, high-pitched noise, hints that what he produces is sound rather than sense.

The first betrayal of equality shows Squealer turning greed into self-sacrifice. When the pigs take the milk and apples, he insists, "It is for YOUR sake that we drink that milk and eat those apples." Orwell's capitalisation captures his emphatic, almost hysterical tone, and the reversal is breathtaking: the privileged pigs claim to be the servants of the animals they are exploiting. He then ends with a rhetorical question, "surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back?" This becomes his most effective weapon. By offering the animals a false choice between obedience and Jones, he makes any criticism of the pigs sound like treachery, and Orwell notes that the animals cannot argue against it. In this sense Squealer is directly responsible for normalising inequality at the very start.

After Snowball is driven out, Squealer becomes the voice of dictatorship. He tells the animals that Napoleon would gladly let them make their own decisions, then asks, "But sometimes you might make the wrong decisions, comrades, and then where should we be?" The inclusive "we" and the flattering "comrades" disguise the fact that he is persuading them to give up their democratic rights entirely. His maxim "Loyalty and obedience are more important" replaces the ideals of the Rebellion with the language of servitude. Orwell also shows him rewriting history,

Question number

claiming that the windmill was Napoleon's idea all along and that his opposition was mere tactics. Because Squealer controls the past, the animals cannot measure the present against it, and Animalism loses its foundation.

Orwell's most powerful image of Squealer's guilt comes at night, when the animals find a broken ladder beside the barn wall and "Squealer, temporarily stunned, was sprawling beside it" with a pot of paint. The comic, undignified detail is darkly ironic: the commandments, the sacred text of Animalism, are being altered in secret, and the animals are too innocent to understand what they have seen. Similarly, his euphemism for cutting rations, which he always called a "readjustment", never a "reduction", shows him corrupting language itself. Perhaps most damning of all is his lie about Boxer's death, when he turns the knacker's van into a vet's van and invents a deathbed tribute to Napoleon. Here Squealer does not merely defend the pigs but erases the betrayal of the most loyal animal on the farm.

Yet Orwell repeatedly presents Squealer as someone who acts on orders. The passive voice in "Squealer was sent to make the necessary explanations to the others" makes him an agent rather than a decision maker; the choices are Napoleon's, and Squealer simply sells them. It is Napoleon who raises the dogs in secret, chases out Snowball and stages the executions, and it is the "deep, menacing growls" of the dogs that end protests when words alone might fail. Indeed, Squealer often speaks with dogs beside him, which suggests that his persuasion works because terror stands behind it. The sheep, too, play their part, as their "tremendous bleating" drowns out any chance of debate. Orwell suggests that propaganda, force and noise work together, and Squealer is only one part of that machine.

Question number

Orwell also places some responsibility on the animals themselves. Their poor memories, and their willingness to accept what they are told, allow Squealer to succeed. Boxer's slogan "Napoleon is always right" shows how loyalty can become a kind of self-imposed blindness, and Benjamin, who understands more than most, chooses to say nothing. Animalism fails partly because the animals do not defend it.

By the final chapter, Squealer is the first pig seen "walking on his hind legs", and he has trained the sheep to bleat "Four legs good, two legs better". It is fitting that he should lead this final betrayal, because he has spent the whole novel reversing meaning. Overall, I agree that Squealer is heavily to blame, since without his lies the animals would have recognised their oppression far sooner. However, Orwell presents him as the voice of a wider corruption that begins with Napoleon's hunger for power and is completed by the animals' silence. Squealer does not dream up the betrayal of Animalism, but he makes it possible for the animals to live with it.

7b

I largely agree that the Revolution makes life worse for the animals, but only once it has been betrayed. Orwell presents the early days after the Rebellion as genuinely happier, which makes the later decline all the more painful. By the end of the novel, most animals work harder, eat less and live in greater fear than they did under Jones, and they have lost something Jones could never take from them: hope. Orwell's point seems to be not that revolution itself is doomed, but that a revolution seized by a new ruling class can leave the oppressed worse off than before.

Life under Jones is presented as grim. Old Major describes the animals' existence

Question number

as "miserable, laborious, and short", and the triple of adjectives sums up the hunger, exhaustion and early slaughter that awaits them. Jones is a neglectful drunk, and it is his failure to feed the animals that sparks the Rebellion. This establishes a baseline against which the Revolution must be judged, and Orwell makes it clear that the animals had very real grievances.

At first the Revolution seems to deliver everything Major promised. Orwell writes that "The animals were happy as they had never conceived it possible to be", a hyperbolic sentence that captures their joy at owning their own labour. Food becomes a delight: "Every mouthful of food was an acute positive pleasure", and the word "positive" stresses that eating is no longer a grudging ration handed out by a master. "There was more leisure too", Orwell adds, and the harvest is completed faster than Jones ever managed. The animals "grudged no effort or sacrifice" because they believe that everything they do is for themselves. If the novel ended here, the statement would clearly be false.

However, Orwell immediately plants signs of decline. The pigs take the milk and apples, and the hens later remember that Jones used to mix some of the milk into their mash, so even in the first weeks some animals are already worse off. As Napoleon seizes power, the workload grows: the animals "worked like slaves" through a sixty-hour week, with Sunday afternoon work described as voluntary, although any animal who refused would lose half its rations. Orwell's simile is pointedly ironic, since the Rebellion was fought to end slavery. The animals' refrain that "If they had no more food than they had in Jones's day, at least they did not have less" shows how their hopes have shrunk, and the narrator's quiet irony invites us to doubt even this claim.

The most shocking evidence that life has become worse is the terror of Chapter 7.

Question number

When the hens rebel against the sale of their eggs, Napoleon starves them until nine of them die. Then come the forced confessions and executions, until "there was a pile of corpses" and "the air was heavy with the smell of blood". Orwell's sensory imagery forces us to witness the horror, and the narrator notes that killing had happened under Jones too, but this was "far worse now that it was happening among themselves". The Revolution has not only brought death back to the farm but made it a betrayal of comradeship. Clover's sorrow on the knoll, as she reflects that this was not what they had hoped for on the night of Major's speech, is one of the saddest moments of the novel, yet she still believes they are far better off than under Jones, which shows the power of propaganda.

Boxer's fate is the clearest symbol of what the Revolution does to the workers. He gives everything, injured at the Battle of the Windmill with bleeding knees, a split hoof and pellets lodged in his leg, and his motto "I will work harder" never wavers. Yet when he collapses, the pigs sell him to the knacker. Under Jones, Major had warned Boxer that this would be his end, so Orwell's structure shows that the Revolution has delivered precisely the fate it promised to abolish, while the pigs buy whisky with the money.

It could be argued that the animals do not feel worse off. Squealer's lists of figures persuade them that production has risen, and Orwell notes that "doubtless it had been worse in the old days. They were glad to believe so." The phrase "glad to believe" is subtly damning: their contentment rests on illusion. They still feel "honour and privilege" at being members of Animal Farm, and Orwell grants that life seems to have "a greater dignity". This pride is touching, but it is pride in a dream rather than in reality. Moreover, some animals genuinely are better off: the pigs and the dogs, whose rations are never cut, so the Revolution has simply moved the privilege.

Question number

By the final chapter, Orwell states plainly that the lower animals did "more work and received less food than any animals in the county", and the farm is renamed Manor Farm. The final image, as the animals look "from pig to man, and from man to pig", completes the cyclical structure: the Revolution has led back to where it began, but with a crueller master who claims to be their comrade. Therefore I agree that, by the end, the Revolution makes life worse. The early happiness proves that a better life was possible, which makes its loss more tragic, and Orwell suggests that it is the betrayal of the Revolution, rather than the Revolution itself, that leaves the animals worse off than they were under Jones.

8 Sewell engages the reader by letting a horse tell a story of urgent human crisis, so that we experience a life-and-death ride through the eyes of the creature who pays its cost. The extract moves from breathless excitement to quiet suffering, and our sympathy shifts from the dying Mrs Gordon to Beauty himself.

The opening thrusts us into drama. Beauty is "fast asleep" when he is "suddenly roused by the stable bell ringing very loud", and the abrupt sound breaks the peaceful scene just as it breaks his sleep. Sewell then piles up rapid actions joined by semicolons and "and", as John runs, unlocks and saddles him "almost before I could think". The syntax sweeps the reader along as fast as Beauty. John's exclamatory imperative, "Wake up, Beauty!", and the squire's hyperbolic command to "ride for your life" create intense urgency, while the reminder that "there is not a moment to lose" makes us fear for the mistress.

The ride itself is exhilarating. Beauty's pride, "I wanted no whip nor spur", shows a willing, loyal spirit, and his comparison with his grandfather "who won the race at

Question number

Newmarket" adds a touch of humour and vanity that makes him endearing. Sewell's list of places, "through a village, then through a dark wood, then uphill, then downhill", uses repetition of "then" to convey the relentless distance covered. The calm of "the moon was bright" heightens the contrast when John "knocked at the door like thunder", a simile that captures his desperation, while the doctor's comic "nightcap" briefly releases the tension.

A turning point comes when the doctor asks to take Beauty back. John's line, "Black Beauty will go till he drops", is both praise and an ominous foreshadowing, and his plea "I should not like any harm to come to him" reveals a deep bond that engages the reader emotionally. Beauty's refusal to describe the return, "I will not tell about our way back", is a clever narrative choice: the silence suggests an ordeal too exhausting to relive.

The final section turns from action to suffering. The homely simile that he steamed "like a pot on the fire" makes his exhaustion vivid. Dramatic irony engages us here, because we sense that Joe's kindness is mistaken when he leaves off the warm cloth and gives cold water. Yet Beauty's forgiving exclamation, "Poor Joe!", and his insistence that "he did the very best he knew" show a generous nature that deepens our sympathy. The repetition in "my legs ached, my loins ached, and my chest ached" creates a cumulative sense of pain, and the cry "Oh! how I wished for my warm, thick cloth" is especially moving because a horse cannot ask for help. This makes John's return powerful. "He was at my side in a moment", and the remark that "he seemed to know it all" suggests an almost wordless understanding between man and horse. The quiet ending, "I think I went to sleep", brings the extract full circle back to sleep, leaving the reader relieved but still anxious about whether Beauty will recover.

Question number

Overall, Sewell engages the reader through the unusual first-person animal narrator, pace that rises and falls with the action, and a final focus on suffering and loyalty that turns a thrilling ride into a moving plea for kindness to horses.