Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2023

English Literature

Unit 1

The Study of Prose

GEL11

[GEL11]
WEDNESDAY 17 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** Simon, show how far you agree that Simon is an **outsider**.

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

stemup.co.uk

2 Hornby: *About a Boy*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** relationships, show how far you agree that relationships are **important** to Will.

stemup.co.uk

3 Johnston: *How Many Miles to Babylon?*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Alexander, show how far you agree that Alexander **avoids** the problems in his life.

(b) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** attitudes to war, show how far you agree that Jerry and Bennett have **differing attitudes** towards war.

stemup.co.uk

4 **Lee:** *To Kill A Mockingbird*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** Scout, show how far you agree that Scout's attitudes to her family **change**.

(b) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** lying, show how far you agree that telling lies is **wrong**.

stemup.co.uk

5 Steinbeck: *Of Mice and Men*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

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

stemup.co.uk

6 Doyle: *Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** Paddy, show how far you agree that Paddy is a **loyal** brother to Sinbad.

(b) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** the relationship between Paddy's parents, show how far you agree that their marriage is an **unhappy** one.

stemup.co.uk

7 Orwell: *Animal Farm*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** Napoleon, show how far you agree that Napoleon is **selfish**.

(b) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** life on the farm, show how far you agree that life on the farm is **miserable** 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: *War of the Worlds* by **H.G. Wells**

(During an event in the night sky in 1894, when Mars is closest to earth, a number of observatory telescopes spot a flash of light coming from the red planet's surface. Night after night, the planet seems to ignite for a moment. The narrator himself witnesses this through a telescope owned by his friend, an astronomer named Ogilvy.)

Then came the night of the first falling star. It was seen early in the morning, rushing over Winchester eastward, a line of flame high in the atmosphere. Hundreds must have seen it, and taken it for an ordinary falling star. Albin described it as leaving a greenish streak behind it that glowed for some seconds. Denning, our greatest authority on meteorites, stated that the height of its first appearance was about ninety or one hundred miles. It seemed to him that it fell to earth about one hundred miles east of him.

I was at home at that hour and writing in my study; and although my French windows face towards Ottershaw and the blind was up (for I loved in those days to look up at the night sky), I saw nothing of it. Yet this strangest of all things that ever came to earth from outer space must have fallen while I was sitting there, visible to me had I only looked up as it passed. Some of those who saw its flight say it travelled with a hissing sound. I myself heard nothing of that. Many people in Berkshire, Surrey, and Middlesex must have seen the fall of it, and, at most, have thought that another meteorite had descended. No one seems to have troubled to look for the fallen mass that night.

But very early in the morning poor Ogilvy, who had seen the shooting star and who was persuaded that a meteorite lay somewhere on the common between Horsell, Ottershaw, and Woking, rose early with the idea of finding it. Find it he did, soon after dawn, and not far from the sand-pits. An enormous hole had been made by the impact of the projectile, and the sand and gravel had been flung violently in every direction over the heath, forming heaps visible a mile and a half away. The heather was on fire eastward, and a thin blue smoke rose against the dawn.

The Thing itself lay almost entirely buried in sand, amidst the scattered splinters of a fir tree it had shivered to fragments in its descent. The uncovered part had the appearance of a huge cylinder, caked over and its outline softened by a thick scaly dun-coloured incrustation. It had a diameter of about thirty yards. He approached the mass, surprised at the size and more so at the shape, since most meteorites are rounded more or less completely. It was, however, still so hot from its flight through the air as to forbid his near approach. A stirring noise within its cylinder he ascribed to the unequal cooling of its surface; for at that time it had not occurred to him that it might be hollow.

stemup.co.uk

He remained standing at the edge of the pit that the Thing had made for itself, staring at its strange appearance, astonished chiefly at its unusual shape and colour, and dimly perceiving even then some evidence of design in its arrival. The early morning was wonderfully still, and the sun, just clearing the pine trees towards Weybridge, was already warm. He did not remember hearing any birds that morning, there was certainly no breeze stirring, and the only sounds were the faint movements from within the cindery cylinder. He was all alone on the common.

Then suddenly he noticed with a start that some of the grey clinker, the ashy incrustation that covered the meteorite, was falling off the circular edge of the end. It was dropping off in flakes and raining down upon the sand. A large piece suddenly came off and fell with a sharp noise that brought his heart into his mouth.

For a minute he scarcely realised what this meant, and, although the heat was excessive, he clambered down into the pit close to the bulk to see the Thing more clearly. He fancied even then that the cooling of the body might account for this, but what disturbed that idea was the fact that the ash was falling only from the end of the cylinder.

And then he perceived that, very slowly, the circular top of the cylinder was rotating on its body. It was such a gradual movement that he discovered it only through noticing that a black mark that had been near him five minutes ago was now at the other side of the circumference. Even then he scarcely understood what this indicated, until he heard a muffled grating sound and saw the black mark jerk forward an inch or so. Then the thing came upon him in a flash. The cylinder was artificial—hollow—with an end that screwed out! Something within the cylinder was unscrewing the top!

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

stemup.co.uk

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.

GEL11/3
276759

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

Question number

1a

I agree to a great extent that Simon is an outsider. Golding presents him as physically different, misunderstood and mocked, and in the end he is literally cast out and killed by the group. However, I would argue that Simon is not simply rejected: he is set apart because he sees more clearly than anyone else. Golding makes his isolation both a source of suffering and a mark of his insight, so Simon is an outsider in the sense that a prophet or a saint is an outsider.

From his first appearance, Golding uses physical description to mark Simon as different. He is a "skinny, vivid little boy", and the adjective "skinny" suggests fragility, while "vivid" hints at an inner brightness that the others lack. He first arrives as one of Jack's choir, and he faints almost at once. Jack dismisses this carelessly, remarking that Simon is always throwing a faint, and so from the beginning Simon's body seems to separate him from the noisy, confident group. Even when Ralph chooses him for the first expedition, Golding shows him trailing behind: he "had to do a double shuffle to catch up with the others". The comic image of the little shuffle quietly suggests that Simon never quite keeps pace with the group, however much he is included.

Golding also shows how the other boys' language pushes Simon to the edge. Ralph, who likes him, still calls him "queer" and "funny", words which suggest affection mixed with bafflement. Piggy, himself an outsider, is even harsher, telling him "You shut up, young Simon!" and later calling him "cracked". It is striking that even the most rational boy cannot understand Simon. Golding uses the two characters as foils: Piggy is excluded because of his body and his manner, Simon because of his mind, and the fact that one outsider mocks the other shows how

Question number

complete Simon's isolation is.

The most painful example is the assembly in which Simon tries to explain the beast. He suggests that "maybe it's only us", and the narrator explains that he is trying to "express mankind's essential illness". The boys respond with ridicule, and Golding personifies their mockery: "the laughter beat him cruelly and he shrank away defenceless to his seat". The verb "beat" turns laughter into a physical attack, and "defenceless" presents Simon as a victim long before his death. Structurally, this is a key moment, because Simon has the truth about the beast but no language the others can accept. His outsider status is tragic precisely because it stops the truth from being heard.

However, Golding also suggests that some of Simon's isolation is chosen. He slips away into the forest to a hidden space among the creepers, and he glances around to confirm that he is "utterly alone". In this place the language becomes calm and beautiful, as the candle buds open in the evening light. Simon is the only boy who seeks solitude and finds peace in it, so his separation is not only rejection but contemplation. Golding also shows his kindness to the littluns, as he reaches up for fruit and passes it down to their outstretched hands. In these moments Simon is not excluded from goodness; he is the one boy who still practises it, which sets him apart from the others in a different way.

Golding's symbolism deepens this sense of Simon as a figure apart. His confrontation with the Lord of the Flies, where the pig's head tells him that the beast is part of him, gives him a private vision that no one else shares. When he climbs the mountain and frees the dead parachutist, he alone discovers that the beast is harmless and horrible. He is the only boy who acts on truth, and the only one who tries to bring it back to the group. Many readers see him as a Christ

Question number

figure, and this reading explains why he must be an outsider: like a prophet, he brings a message the community cannot bear.

The climax of the novel makes Simon's exclusion literal and violent. Golding uses pathetic fallacy to build menace before his death, and the storm makes the scene feel apocalyptic as the boys dance. The chant "Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!" uses brutal monosyllables, and when Simon stumbles out of the forest Golding refers to him as "a thing" and "the beast". This dehumanising language shows that, in the boys' frenzy, Simon has been pushed so far outside the group that he is no longer recognised as a boy at all. Even afterwards, Piggy insists that Simon "asked for it", so even his memory is cast out.

Yet the description of Simon's body in the sea reverses this exclusion. The water "dressed Simon's coarse hair with brightness", and the "moonbeam-bodied creatures" surround him with light. The elevated, almost religious language glorifies him, suggesting that Simon is set apart not because he is less than the others but because he is better.

Overall, I strongly agree that Simon is an outsider. Golding presents him as physically different, verbally dismissed, ridiculed and finally murdered. However, the novel invites us to see that his separation comes from his goodness and insight. Simon is excluded because he understands the darkness in human beings, and his fate suggests Golding's bleak view that a society driven by fear will always destroy the person who tells it the truth.

1b

I agree only to a limited extent that life on the island is thrilling for the boys. At the beginning Golding presents the island as a paradise of adventure, and the thrill

Question number

of freedom is real. However, the novel is structured as a gradual descent, and the excitement soon becomes a darker thrill in hunting and violence before it collapses into fear, sickness and terror. By the end, the island is less an adventure playground than a nightmare, and Golding seems to use the boys' early excitement to expose how quickly innocence can turn savage.

In the opening chapters Golding presents life on the island as exhilarating. When Ralph realises there are no adults, the delight of a realised ambition overcomes him and he stands on his head, a comic, childish image of pure joy. He looks at the water with "bright, excited eyes", and the adjectives suggest a boy alive with possibility. His slang, "Whizzoh!" and "Wacco. Wizard. Smashing", is breathless and playful, the language of a schoolboy who feels that his wildest stories have come true. Golding also stresses the beauty of the setting, such as the bathing pool with its ledge of pink granite, so that the island seems to offer both adventure and paradise.

The boys' excitement is also shaped by the books they have read. When they climb the mountain on the first expedition, Jack insists "This is real exploring", and the boys excitedly compare their situation to adventure stories such as "Treasure Island" and "Coral Island". Golding uses these interrupted exclamations to show that they see their situation as a game. The narrator also notes that there is "no parent to let fall a heavy hand", which suggests that much of the thrill comes from freedom from adult control. However, these literary echoes are deeply ironic. Golding is rewriting the comforting Victorian adventure story, and the reader suspects from the start that the island will not be the playground the boys imagine.

As the novel develops, the thrill of adventure is replaced by the thrill of hunting.

Question number

Jack's obsession is presented as almost a drug: he feels a compulsion to track down and kill that is swallowing him up. After the first kill, the boys' chant "Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Spill her blood." uses blunt monosyllables and repetition to create a hypnotic rhythm, and their excitement is clearly genuine. In the mock hunt with Robert, even Ralph feels that "the desire to squeeze and hurt was over-mastering". The word "over-mastering" suggests that this thrill controls the boys rather than the other way round. Golding is careful to show that life on the island is thrilling here, but the thrill has become violent and disturbing, and the reader's response is horror rather than delight.

At the same time, Golding presents the daily reality of the island as far from exciting. The boys suffer from sores, dirt and diarrhoea, and the littluns, who are prominent in the early chapters, are presented as vulnerable. They suffer "untold terrors in the dark" and huddle together for comfort, and their fear of the "beastie" spreads to the older boys. The disappearance of the boy with the mulberry birthmark after the first fire is a sinister turning point. Piggy's anxious question about where he has gone is never answered, and the silence that follows suggests that the island is dangerous from the start. For the youngest boys, island life is frightening rather than thrilling.

The deaths of Simon and Piggy complete this change. Simon is killed in a frenzy during a storm, and Golding's dark, menacing descriptions make the dance feel like a ritual of terror. Afterwards Ralph and Piggy are haunted by what they have done, and Samneric are presented in "quiet terror" as they are forced to join Jack's tribe. Piggy's death on the rocks, with the conch exploding into a thousand white fragments, destroys the last symbol of order. In the final chapter, Ralph is hunted across the island, and his feelings are described as panic rather than excitement. The hunt that once thrilled the boys now has a human target, and the language

Question number

of hunting becomes the language of terror.

Golding's ending makes the irony explicit. The naval officer assumes the boys have been having "fun and games" and compares them to "Coral Island", but Ralph weeps for the end of innocence and the darkness of man's heart. The officer's cheerful misunderstanding reminds us of the boys' own early fantasy, and it shows how far the reality has fallen from it. The structure of the novel moves from light to dark, from play to murder, and from thrill to grief.

In conclusion, life on the island is thrilling for the boys at the start, and in a darker way during the hunts. However, Golding presents this thrill as temporary and dangerous. As order collapses, excitement becomes fear, and the boys experience terror, hunger, sickness and death. I therefore only partly agree with the statement: the island is thrilling only for as long as the boys fail to see what it is revealing about themselves.

2a

I largely agree that Marcus is thoughtful. Hornby presents him as a boy who thinks constantly and anxiously about other people, especially his mother, and much of the novel's humour and sadness comes from watching a twelve-year-old carry adult worries. However, Marcus's thoughtfulness is not always the same as consideration. At times he is so absorbed in his own plans and his own loneliness that he ignores what other people want, so Hornby presents him as thoughtful in some ways and surprisingly thoughtless in others.

Hornby's most important method is his use of dual narration. The chapters alternate between Will and Marcus, and in Marcus's chapters we are placed inside his mind, following his questions, worries and odd logic. This structure lets the

Question number

reader see how much he notices. Marcus knows he is weird, and he works out that part of the reason is that his mum is weird too. The flat, reasoning tone of his thoughts is comic, but it also shows a child trying hard to understand his own situation rather than simply reacting to it.

Marcus is especially thoughtful towards his mother, Fiona. He is shown supporting her hope of finding a partner: he kind of hopes she will meet someone who will make her happy. The tentative phrase "kind of hoped" captures a child's uncertainty, but the wish itself is unselfish. When she is depressed he feels that he ought to say something optimistic, and Hornby shows him trying to understand why she cries by thinking about "EastEnders" and the reasons people cry there, apart from money, death and boyfriends. The comedy of this reference to popular television should not hide its poignancy: Marcus is using the only evidence he has to try to make sense of adult sadness. He also manages what she watches, because he does not want her to see anything about death. After Dead Duck Day, when Fiona attempts suicide, this protectiveness becomes even more touching, as Marcus starts to realise that two people are not enough and that they need other people around them.

This realisation drives his relationship with Will, and here his thoughtfulness becomes more complex. Marcus is determined to bring Will into their lives as a kind of back-up, and he tries to set Will up with his mother. On one level this is generous, because he wants Fiona to be safe and happy. On another level it is a plan for his own security, and Hornby shows Marcus persisting even when Will clearly wants to be left alone. He turns up at Will's flat every day after school, and when Will ignores the buzzer, Marcus simply buzzes again. The repetition is comic, but it shows that Marcus can be blind to other people's wishes when he has decided what is best.

Question number

Hornby also presents Marcus as thoughtful towards Will himself. He invites Will to Christmas so that Will will not be alone, and later he agrees to look after Ali so that Will and Rachel can have time together. The small detail of Marcus glancing at Will and Will nodding once suggests an understanding between them that does not need words, and shows that Marcus can read situations more maturely than at the start. With his father and Lindsey, too, Marcus says that he would like a baby and that he likes babies, although he does not really. This polite lie is a sign of growing tact: he puts their feelings before his own honesty.

His friendship with Ellie also shows thoughtfulness. When Kurt Cobain dies, Marcus supports her through her grief, although he does not share her feelings about the singer, and when she comes with him to Cambridge and smashes a shop window, he stays loyal to her rather than abandoning her. Some readers might argue that he first values Ellie because she protects him from the bullies at school, but by the end of the novel his care for her seems genuine.

However, there are moments where Marcus seems more demanding than thoughtful. When his mother is struggling, he tells her that if she cannot look after him properly she will have to find someone who can. The commanding tone reveals a child's fear and frustration, and it is a reminder that Marcus also needs to be cared for. He also defies Fiona's instruction not to go round to Will's flat again. These moments suggest that his thinking can be driven by his own needs rather than anyone else's.

By the end of the novel, Hornby presents a change in Marcus. He becomes more like an ordinary teenager, more interested in his own friends and less consumed by worry about his mother. Ironically, this is a sign of his development rather than a

Question number	
	loss of thoughtfulness: he has learned that he does not have to carry the adults' problems alone.
	Overall, I agree that Marcus is thoughtful. Hornby uses his narration to show a boy who reflects deeply, cares intensely and tries to protect the people around him. However, his thoughtfulness is that of a child, sometimes clumsy, sometimes self-interested and sometimes thoughtless in practice. This makes him more convincing, and it supports Hornby's suggestion that thinking about others is only the beginning of learning how to care for them.
2b	I agree that relationships become deeply important to Will, but only by the end of the novel. Hornby presents Will at the start as a man who has deliberately organised his life to avoid commitment, and his relationships are shallow, selfish or invented. The structure of the novel traces his reluctant journey from isolation to involvement, so the statement is false of the early Will and true of the man he becomes. Hornby suggests that relationships matter to Will long before he is willing to admit it.
	In the early chapters Hornby presents Will as proudly independent. Living off the royalties from his father's Christmas song, he does not need to work, and he fills his days by dividing them into units of time, such as a bath or a trip to the shops. Will considers that all men are islands, reversing the famous idea that no man is an island, and Hornby's comic narration shows him enjoying this freedom. His smug question to himself, "How cool was Will Freeman?", reveals a man whose sense of identity depends on image rather than on other people. He prefers to peek over the fence at other people's lives rather than live one of his own, and Hornby's metaphor suggests a voyeur who watches relationships without risking

Question number

anything.

Hornby also shows Will's disdain for family life. When he visits friends with children, he is horrified by the mess, and his exclamation "Clutter! How could people live like this?" is both funny and revealing: for Will, other people are clutter. He cynically believes that the only reason for having children is so that they can look after you when you are old. His relationships with women are presented as temporary. When his relationship with Angie, a single mother, threatens to become entangling, his reaction is almost violent: he wants to push the table over and run. Hornby uses this exaggerated physical response to show that commitment frightens him.

However, Hornby makes it clear that Will is drawn to relationships even when he is avoiding them. He invents a two-year-old son called Ned so that he can join SPAT, the single parents' group, and meet women. This is a selfish deception, but it is also revealing: Will seeks out a group defined by family and connection. The irony is that a lie told for casual relationships leads him to Marcus and Fiona, who will change him.

Will's relationship with Marcus is the heart of the novel. At first he tolerates Marcus because the boy will not go away, and he still sees Fiona and Marcus as a kind of replacement for charity work, a way of feeling good about himself. Yet Hornby gradually shows a change. Will notices that Marcus needs help to be a kid rather than an adult, and he realises that this is exactly the kind of help he is qualified to give. The humour of this idea, that Will's expertise in being cool and shallow is finally useful, hides a real development: he has found a role that depends on someone else. He buys Marcus trainers and teaches him about music, and when Rachel tells him that he is involved and that he cares about Marcus,

Question number

she voices something Will has not admitted to himself.

Christmas is an important moment in this change. Will's narration reveals that he sees Christmas as a message about where you are in life, and he admits that being alone at Christmas would show how deep a hole he has dug for himself. Beneath the joke is real loneliness. When he spends Christmas with Marcus and Fiona, uncomfortable as it is, he is entering a family for the first time.

Will's love for Rachel completes his transformation. He falls in love on New Year's Eve, and the experience takes him completely by surprise. Hornby's choice of "surprise" is significant, because Will has always believed he was in control of his feelings. For the first time he wants a relationship that matters more than his image, and he finds himself anxious and uncertain, which shows how new and how important real feeling is to him.

In the final section, Hornby structures the crisis so that Will is at the centre. When Marcus gets into trouble in Cambridge with Ellie, Will no longer stands outside events. He becomes worried about Marcus, and he takes responsibility for helping. Hornby concludes that Will has lost his shell and his cool and his distance. The tricolon strips away, one by one, the defences that defined him in the opening chapters.

Overall, I agree that relationships are important to Will, though Hornby presents this as something he must learn. The early Will hides from commitment behind irony, routine and lies, but the novel's structure gradually pulls him into connection with Marcus, Fiona and Rachel. Hornby suggests that Will's independence was never really freedom, only fear, and that relationships are what finally make his life meaningful.

Question number

3a

I agree to a large extent that Alexander avoids the problems in his life. For most of the novel Johnston presents him as passive, lonely and obedient, a young man who retreats into silence, fantasy or flight rather than confronting his parents, his class or the war. However, the climax of the novel overturns this pattern. In shooting Jerry, Alexander finally makes a choice of his own and accepts its consequences, so Johnston presents a character who avoids his problems until he is faced with one that he cannot escape.

Johnston's narrative structure is important from the start. Alexander tells his story in the first person from a prison cell as he waits to be executed, and so the novel begins and ends in the same place. This circular structure gives the whole story a sense of inevitability: whatever Alexander does to avoid his problems, the reader already knows where his life will lead. His calm, detached narrative voice also suggests a man who has spent his life standing back from his own experience.

Alexander's avoidance is clearest in his relationship with his parents. His mother Alicia is a dominant, manipulative figure, and his father Frederick is gentle but withdrawn. Rather than challenge his mother, Alexander "kept my mouth shut", and the colloquial phrase captures a habit of silence. When she announces her plan to take him to Europe, he briefly questions her, "We? You and I?", but the challenge fades almost at once into the meek reply "No, I don't suppose I will". Johnston uses this deflating dialogue to show how easily Alexander gives way. During his parents' bitter rows, he retreats to his bedroom, and the image of the lonely boy in the big house suggests that avoidance has become his way of surviving.

Question number

His friendship with Jerry is also shaped by avoidance. When his parents forbid him to mix with a stable boy, Alexander obeys rather than confronting the class barriers that divide them. Yet he does not give Jerry up entirely; he continues the friendship in secret. Instead of resolving the problem, he escapes into a dream that one day he and Jerry will run a racing yard together. This vision sustains him whenever he is unhappy, and Johnston presents it as a fantasy that allows Alexander to avoid accepting that his life has already been mapped out for him by his class and his inheritance.

Johnston also reveals that Alexander avoids people more generally. He admits that he would like to live alone and that he is "only afraid" when he is "with other people". This confession is striking, because it suggests that relationships themselves are the problem he most wants to escape. It also explains why the friendship with Jerry is so precious to him: it is one of the few relationships in which he does not feel afraid.

The turning point comes when Alicia reveals that Frederick is not his real father. Alexander describes himself as "Dispossessed in a sentence", and the stark phrase captures how suddenly his identity and his inheritance are taken from him. His reaction is violent: "I picked up the poker and beat and beat at the fire". The repetition of "beat" shows rage that has nowhere to go. Instead of confronting his mother, he turns his anger on an object, and then he enlists. Johnston presents this as the ultimate act of avoidance: Alexander runs away from the crisis at home into a war he does not believe in. His father's earlier remark that "The real cowards are unable to face life" becomes painfully ironic, because Alexander's decision to fight is less brave than it appears.

At the front, Johnston shows Alexander retreating into himself again. Faced with

Question number

the horror of the trenches, he focuses on his "petty discomforts and indispositions", a formal, almost comic phrase that suggests a mind protecting itself by concentrating on small things. He is also unable to stand up to Major Glendinning, whose contempt for Jerry he resents but cannot openly challenge.

However, the ending of the novel shows a different Alexander. When Jerry deserts to search for his missing father and is condemned to be shot, Glendinning orders Alexander to command the firing squad. For once, Alexander does not avoid the problem. He goes into Jerry's cell and shoots him himself, sparing his friend the horror of the execution. This is the bravest and most catastrophic decision of his life, and it means that he too will face a firing squad. In the final moments, as he stands quite still with his eyes shut, Johnston presents a man who is no longer running. Ironically, by this act he also defeats the plans that his mother and Glendinning had for him.

Overall, I largely agree that Alexander avoids the problems in his life. Johnston presents him as passive, silent and escapist for most of the novel, retreating from his parents, his class and the war. Yet the climax shows that he is capable of facing a problem directly, at terrible cost. Perhaps Johnston suggests that Alexander's tragedy is that he only learns to confront life when it is too late to live it.

3b

I agree to a large extent that Jerry and Bennett have differing attitudes towards war. Johnston presents Jerry, the Irish stable boy, as a practical young man who joins for money and sees the war as someone else's quarrel, while Bennett, the English public school officer, at first treats it as an adventure and a game. However, Johnston also draws them together. Both men are detached from the

Question number

official cause, both have a healthy disrespect for authority, and both are eventually stripped of any illusions. Their attitudes begin far apart but move closer as the war reveals itself.

Johnston establishes Jerry's attitude through sharp, unsentimental details. When he tells Alexander that his mother wants him to join the army, Johnston juxtaposes her wish with his reaction: "He spat". The single, blunt action says more than any speech, showing contempt for the idea of fighting for Britain. When Jerry does enlist, he is honest about his reasons: "Cash, Alec. That's what is driving me." The direct address and short, clipped sentences convey a working man's practicality. For Jerry, the war is a job that will feed his family, not a cause.

Jerry's attitude is also shaped by his Irish nationalism. He declares that he is learning to shoot a gun so that he can use it later in Ireland, against the British if necessary. This makes his position ironic: he wears a British uniform while planning to turn its training against the Empire. Johnston uses this to show that Jerry's loyalties lie at home rather than at the front. Jerry's comment that the Germans will fix all the "eejits" in Europe, with its Irish dialect word, also suggests a simple, rather dismissive view of the conflict, as if it were a brawl between foolish strangers.

Bennett's attitude is presented as strikingly different. He arrives at the front with the breezy confidence of a public schoolboy, and his response "Righty ho. What fun it'll be" uses schoolboy slang to make war sound like a sports fixture. His casual invitation "Want to see a show?" is a dismissive understatement, treating the violence of the front line as entertainment. Johnston shows that Bennett is excited by the prospect of battle, hoping it will "stir the blood", and he admits

Question number

that he finds "something rather splendid about it all". The adjective "splendid" belongs to the language of patriotic recruitment, and it contrasts sharply with Jerry's spitting and talk of cash.

Johnston exposes the naivety of Bennett's view through other characters. A small, irate major tells him "I suppose you think you're here for fun", and the rebuke makes explicit what the reader already senses: Bennett has brought his school attitudes to a place of slaughter. Unlike Jerry, Bennett seems drawn to the romantic idea of a heroic death, which suggests that he sees the war through the stories of his class.

The most powerful contrast comes in their response to suffering. When a wounded man is heard screaming in no man's land, Jerry is appalled by his agony, and Johnston presents his distress as an instinctive human response. Jerry's ultimate attitude to the war is revealed when his father goes missing. He deserts to look for him, and Johnston's bald, stark description of his meeting with Alexander after the desertion shows that his duty to his family completely outweighs any duty to the army. For Jerry, the war never deserved his loyalty in the first place.

However, Johnston also presents a change in Bennett, which narrows the gap between them. As the war goes on, Bennett becomes disenchanted with those in charge, blaming "The fat men at home" for the slaughter. The phrase is contemptuous and political, suggesting that he now sees the war as a crime committed by comfortable old men against the young. His bitter remark "Performing dogs. We're neither more nor less" uses a degrading metaphor to show that the soldiers have no control over their fate. This is a long way from "What fun it'll be". By the end he expects that his death will be "slow and squalid", and the alliteration emphasises the ugliness he once failed to see.

Question number

There are also similarities from the start. Bennett admits that his life at home was "indescribably dull", so, like Jerry, he has joined partly to escape his circumstances rather than out of patriotism. Both men are detached from the official reasons for the war. Both share a healthy disrespect for authority, and Bennett's friendship with Alexander and his tolerance of Alexander's friendship with Jerry set him against Major Glendinning's rigid discipline. Both are, in different ways, outsiders in the army.

In conclusion, I largely agree that Jerry and Bennett have differing attitudes towards war. Johnston contrasts Jerry's practical, unglamorous and nationalist view with Bennett's schoolboy romanticism, using their dialogue and reactions to make the difference vivid. Yet the novel also shows that the experience of war erodes Bennett's illusions until he shares Jerry's sense that the war is not theirs. Johnston seems to suggest that, whatever men bring with them to the trenches, the reality of war reduces their attitudes to the same bleak disillusionment.

4a

I largely agree that Scout's attitudes to her family change, but Lee presents this change as uneven rather than complete. Scout's loyalty to her family is constant from the first chapter to the last; what alters is her understanding of them. Because the story is told by an adult Jean Louise looking back on her childhood, Lee lets us see both the young girl's fierce, often mistaken judgements and the older narrator's quiet recognition of how wrong, or how narrow, they were.

Scout's attitude to Atticus is the clearest example. At the start she says that she and Jem "found our father satisfactory", a cool, almost businesslike adjective which suggests that she takes him for granted. The children are even embarrassed by

Question number

him: he is "feeble", nearly fifty, and will not play football or hunt. Lee uses the plot device of the mad dog, Tim Johnson, to overturn this view. When Atticus shoots the dog with one bullet, the children learn that he was once "One-Shot Finch" and chose not to boast about it. Scout's reply to Miss Maudie, given "meekly", shows a sudden humility, and the episode teaches her, and the reader, that real courage is quiet. Yet Lee is careful to show that some things never change. Scout is defensive of Atticus long before she admires him: she fights Cecil Jacobs and her cousin Francis when they insult him, even though she does not fully understand what "defending" Tom Robinson means. Her attitude therefore develops from instinctive loyalty into informed respect, and when she tells Uncle Jack that Atticus hears both sides when she and Jem "fuss", she is already recognising his fairness as a value rather than a habit.

Her relationship with Jem changes more painfully. In the early chapters she follows him without question; the adult narrator admits that, "having never questioned Jem's pronouncements", she saw no reason to begin. As Jem reaches twelve, however, Lee shows Scout being pushed out of his world. She describes him as "difficult to live with, inconsistent, moody", a list of adjectives that captures her confusion at adolescence, and she resents his new authority, asking whether she has to "mind him" now. The turning point comes when Jem tells Atticus that Dill has run away. Scout calls this a betrayal of "the remaining code of our childhood", and the formal, almost legal language shows how seriously a child treats such rules. Yet by the end of the novel her anger has softened into protectiveness and acceptance. After the attack on Halloween she is most concerned for Jem's broken arm, and Lee closes the novel with Atticus sitting by Jem's bed, a quiet image of the family drawn together again. Her attitude changes, but the bond itself survives.

Question number

Aunt Alexandra provides the strongest case for change. Lee uses extended metaphor and exaggeration to show Scout's early hostility: Alexandra is compared to Mount Everest, simply "cold and there", and she is "fanatical" about Scout's clothes. When she arrives to stay, Scout hears in her words "a dull permanence", an auditory image which makes her presence sound like a prison sentence. Scout cannot accept that being a lady means wearing dresses and sitting still. However, at the Missionary Society tea, after Atticus brings news of Tom's death, Scout watches her aunt pick up her composure and return to the guests. Her conclusion, "if Aunty could be a lady at a time like this, so could I", is a turning point. Lee shows Scout redefining what a lady is: not someone obsessed with frills, but someone with dignity and self control under pressure. This is a genuine shift, although it is worth noting that Scout never fully adopts her aunt's snobbery about "fine folks", so she accepts the courage without the prejudice.

Calpurnia, who functions as a member of the family, completes the pattern. At first Scout sees her as "tyrannical", and the simile of a hand "wide as a bed slat and twice as hard" turns her into a figure of punishment. Their battles are described as "epic and one-sided", a comic phrase from the adult narrator who now sees how unfair the young Scout was. Over time, Lee shows her beginning to value Calpurnia. When Jem shuts her out, she turns to the kitchen and starts to think there might be "some skill involved in being a girl". The visit to First Purchase Church is a revelation: the idea that Calpurnia "led a modest double life" had never occurred to her. Lee uses this moment to widen Scout's view of family beyond blood and beyond her own needs.

Nevertheless, the change has limits. At the end of the novel Scout is still a young child. She falls asleep while Atticus reads to her, and her final reflections on Boo, and on Atticus's comment that most people are nice "when you finally see them",

Question number

show a child who is learning rather than one who has finished learning. Her developing empathy, standing on the Radley porch and seeing the street from Boo's view, mirrors the way she has learned to see her relatives from their side too.

Overall, I agree to a large extent. Lee presents Scout's attitudes to Atticus, Jem, Aunt Alexandra and Calpurnia as shifting from childish resentment or indifference to understanding and respect. However, the dual perspective of the retrospective narrator suggests that the real change is in her capacity to understand them; her love for her family was there all along.

4b

Lee certainly presents lying as wrong when it is used to protect power, pride or prejudice, and the false accusation against Tom Robinson is the most destructive act in the novel. However, I only partly agree with the statement, because Lee also shows that some lies are acts of kindness or justice. The novel moves from a world in which Atticus insists on absolute honesty towards an ending in which he accepts a lie, and this structure suggests that what matters is not whether a statement is true but whose interests it serves.

Atticus is the moral centre of the novel and he is defined by honesty. When he overhears Uncle Jack dodging Scout's question about a swear word, he tells his brother that when a child asks something, "answer him, for goodness' sake", adding that evasion "simply muddles" children. The informal, impatient exclamation shows how strongly he feels. Throughout the novel he tells his children the truth even when it is uncomfortable: he explains what rape means, admits that he is defending a black man and that they will hear ugly things at school, and tells Scout plainly that he will lose the case. Miss Maudie confirms that he is the same

Question number

in his house as he is on the public streets. Lee therefore establishes truthfulness as a sign of integrity, and readers are invited to measure every other character against Atticus.

Against this standard, the Ewells' lies appear deeply wrong. In the courtroom scenes, Lee uses Bob Ewell's body language to expose his dishonesty: when he is pleased with himself he swells up like "a red little rooster", a comic animal image that reduces him to a strutting, vain creature. Mayella's lies are presented differently. Her repetition, "I'll answer any question you got", sounds defensive rather than confident, and when she finally bursts out "wrathfully" against the court, the adverb suggests anger mixed with shame. Atticus's closing speech recognises that she has broken a "time-honoured code" by kissing a black man, and that she lies to cover her guilt. Lee allows some sympathy for her loneliness, yet the consequence of her lie is that an innocent man is convicted and later shot seventeen times while trying to escape prison. This is the clearest evidence in the novel that lying is wrong: it is the lie that kills the "mockingbird" Tom.

Lee intensifies this through Tom's own honesty. When he says that he helped Mayella because he "felt right sorry for her", he is telling the truth, but the narrator notes that the damage was done: a black man pitying a white woman offends the jury. The irony is bitter. Tom's honesty condemns him, while the Ewells' lies are believed. Lee seems to suggest that in a prejudiced society truth alone is not enough, which complicates any simple view that honesty is always rewarded.

The novel also contains smaller, gentler lies. Scout tells Aunt Alexandra she would like her to stay, admitting that this was a lie, "but one must lie under certain circumstances". The adult narrator's formal phrasing is humorous, but it reveals a

Question number

child learning that politeness sometimes requires untruth. Dill lies to cover the loss of Jem's trousers, and Jem returns to the Radley house at night because he would rather face danger than lie to Atticus or be whipped; ironically, he risks his life to avoid being found out. Dolphus Raymond is an even more interesting case. He pretends to be drunk, carrying Coca-Cola in a paper sack, so that Maycomb can explain why he lives with black people. He says that it helps folks if they can "latch onto a reason". His deception harms no one and protects his way of life from the town's prejudice, so Lee presents him as a man who lies in order to be free.

The most powerful challenge to the statement comes at the end. After Bob Ewell is killed, Heck Tate insists that he fell on his knife, even though he knows that Boo Radley stabbed him to save the children. Atticus at first believes Jem did it and refuses to let it be hidden: "nobody's hushing this up". The short, firm declaration shows that he is prepared to sacrifice his own son to the truth. Heck's reply, "Let the dead bury the dead this time", uses biblical language to give the lie a moral authority, and he argues that dragging the shy Boo into the limelight would be a sin. Scout's response, that exposing Boo would be "sort of like shootin' a mockingbird", connects the lie directly to the novel's title and its central moral image. Lee structures the final chapters so that the character who never lies accepts a lie, which makes the moment feel like a hard won conclusion rather than a convenience.

In conclusion, I agree that Lee presents lying as wrong when it is selfish, cowardly or rooted in prejudice, as the Ewells' lies show. However, Lee does not suggest that telling lies is always wrong. The lies of Dolphus Raymond and Heck Tate protect the innocent from a cruel society, and Atticus's acceptance of Heck's version proves that, for Lee, justice and compassion can matter more than literal truth.

Question number

Sa

Steinbeck presents Curley as a threat from the moment he appears, but I would argue that his threat is more complicated than it first seems. He is dangerous less because he is strong than because he is insecure and has the power of the boss's son behind him. Steinbeck shows him repeatedly humiliated by men who refuse to fear him, yet at the end of the novella his anger becomes genuinely deadly, so that the threat he poses to Lennie is ultimately realised.

Curley's entrance in the bunkhouse is carefully staged, which reflects Steinbeck's intention to write the novella almost like a play. He wears high-heeled boots "like the boss", a detail which signals his inherited status, and his glance is "at once calculating and pugnacious". The adjective "calculating" suggests cold assessment of who he can attack, while "pugnacious" means eager to fight, so he is presented as both cunning and aggressive. He immediately singles out Lennie, the biggest man in the room, and when Lennie lets George answer for him, Curley insists that the "big guy" should speak. His hands close into fists and he drops into a slight crouch. Steinbeck uses this physical description to make the reader anticipate violence long before it happens.

Candy's explanation turns this threat into a pattern. He tells George that Curley is "handy", a former boxer, and that he is like a lot of little guys who hate big guys because he "ain't a big guy". Steinbeck presents Curley's aggression as a form of compensation, a need to prove himself. The danger is increased by the system around him: Candy points out that Curley can pick a fight knowing that no one can fight back without getting "canned". George instantly sees the risk, admitting he is scared he will "tangle" with Curley himself. In this way Curley is a threat not only physically but economically, because in the Depression losing a job means

Question number

losing everything, including George and Lennie's dream.

Curley's restless movement adds to the sense of menace. Steinbeck repeatedly uses dynamic verbs when he enters: he "bounced" or "burst" into the bunkhouse, and he looks "threateningly" around the room while demanding to know where Slim is. His constant searching for his wife suggests jealousy and possessiveness. The glove "fulla vaseline", which he keeps on to keep his hand soft for his wife, is a crude detail that disgusts the men and presents his marriage as something he displays rather than shares. His wife, in turn, becomes "apprehensive" when Slim mentions where Curley has gone, which hints that she fears him. In her later conversation with Lennie in the barn she complains that she does not like Curley and that he is not a nice fella, so Steinbeck implies that she too lives under his threat.

However, there is strong evidence that Curley's threat is limited. Slim treats him with contempt, telling him he is "gettin' God damn sick" of his questions, and Carlson openly mocks him, calling him yella and threatening to kick his head off if he comes for him. The profanity shows that these men feel no fear at all. The fight with Lennie then exposes Curley's weakness completely. Steinbeck uses violent verbs such as "slashed" and "slugging" and the shocking image of Lennie's face "covered with blood" to show Curley at his most dangerous, yet the moment Lennie fights back, the power reverses. The simile "flopping like a fish on a line" reduces Curley to a helpless, trapped animal, and afterwards he is "white and shrunken". Slim's threat to tell everyone, so that the men will "get the laugh" on him, takes away his ability to have Lennie sacked. Steinbeck seems to suggest that bullies like Curley depend on others' fear, and that when men stand together, as Slim and Carlson do, he can be contained.

Nevertheless, the ending proves that Curley is truly a threat, especially to Lennie.

Question number

When Curley's wife is found dead, he does not show grief but instant rage, and his cry that he will shoot "the guts outa that big bastard" himself is brutal and graphic. The focus on "guts" suggests a slow, painful death rather than justice. He leads the lynch mob, and Slim warns George that Curley will want Lennie shot, or worse, locked up and caged. Steinbeck structures the novella so that Curley's threat, first introduced in the bunkhouse, finally forces George to kill Lennie himself. George's mercy killing is a response to Curley: he chooses a quick, gentle death by the river rather than leaving Lennie to the man who hated him from the start.

In conclusion, I largely agree that Curley is a threat to others. Steinbeck presents him as weak in himself, a small man easily humiliated by Slim, Carlson and Lennie, but his insecurity, jealousy and position as the boss's son make him dangerous to anyone without power. His wife and Lennie, the most vulnerable characters, are the ones who suffer, which suggests that Steinbeck saw cruelty as most dangerous when it is aimed at those who cannot defend themselves.

Sb

Steinbeck presents the ranch as a place where loneliness is the normal condition and friendship is the exception, so in one sense I agree that friendships are almost impossible for the ranch workers. However, the novella is built around a friendship that does exist, between George and Lennie, and it also shows brief moments of companionship among Candy, Crooks and Slim. What Steinbeck suggests is not that friendship is impossible, but that the economic and social pressures of ranch life make it fragile and, in the end, unable to survive.

George's words to Lennie by the river in the opening chapter set out the problem. He says that guys like them, who work on ranches, are "the loneliest guys in the

Question number

world". The superlative presents isolation as the defining feature of the migrant worker's life. He goes on to say that they have no family, they belong nowhere, and they blow their stake in town. The rhythmic, almost ritual quality of this speech, which Lennie has clearly heard many times, suggests that loneliness is so universal it has become a kind of story. Candy reinforces this when he describes a former worker who simply quit "the way a guy will", and Steinbeck uses the casual phrasing to show how transient and impersonal relationships on the ranch are. Men arrive, work and drift away before anything lasting can form.

Steinbeck shows that prejudice and weakness make friendship even harder. Crooks, the black stable buck, lives in a room alone and tells Lennie that guys do not come into a coloured man's room very much. His bitter speech that a guy "goes nuts if he ain't got nobody" reveals the psychological cost of exclusion. Candy, old and missing a hand, is presented as equally isolated; when Carlson shoots his dog, his only companion, Steinbeck leaves him lying silently on his bunk facing the wall, an image of grief that no one in the room can share. Curley's wife is also excluded, constantly described by the men in derogatory terms such as "jail bait" and denied even a name. Steinbeck seems to suggest that the ranch hierarchy, based on race, age, gender and physical strength, prevents real friendships from forming across these divisions.

Yet George and Lennie's friendship is the clearest challenge to the statement. George's line "We got somebody to talk to that gives a damn about us" uses the inclusive pronoun "we" to set them apart from the other workers, and Lennie's enthusiastic interruption, "because I got you to look after me, and you got me to look after you", turns the friendship into a shared refrain. Lennie copies George's actions, checking to see if he has got them right, which shows trust and admiration. The other men find their bond unusual: the boss suspects George is

Question number

taking Lennie's pay, and Slim comments that it is funny how the two of them "string along together". The fact that Slim finds it strange shows how rare such friendship is, but its existence proves that it is not impossible.

There are also brief moments when the dream widens to include others. Candy offers his savings to join George and Lennie, and for a short time three, and almost four, men share a hope. Crooks, who began by mocking Lennie, even asks whether he could come and work on the farm for nothing. Steinbeck presents these moments as glimpses of what friendship might be, a community of outcasts united by a common goal. The scene in Crooks's room, where Lennie, Candy and Crooks talk together, is the nearest the novella gets to an equal gathering. Significantly, it is broken up by Curley's wife, whose threat to have Crooks lynched instantly reduces him to nothing. Steinbeck uses this structural interruption to show how easily power destroys fragile companionship.

The ending is the strongest evidence that friendship cannot last. After Lennie kills Curley's wife, Candy lies beside her body, and his tearful complaint that she has spoiled everything shows that the dream of friendship has died with her. George's killing of Lennie by the river is presented through physical details: his hand shakes violently as he raises the gun. Steinbeck shows that George's friendship is so deep that he kills Lennie to spare him a crueller death, a terrible act of love. Still, the result is that George becomes exactly the kind of lonely ranch worker he described at the start. The circular structure, opening and closing at the same pool, reinforces this sense of inevitability.

Even so, Steinbeck leaves a small hope. Slim reassures George that he "hadda" do it and leads him away to have a drink, which suggests a new, quieter friendship based on understanding. In contrast, Carlson's final question about what is eating

Question number

"them two guys" shows that most of the men cannot comprehend friendship at all.

Overall, I agree to a large extent. Steinbeck presents the ranch workers as trapped by poverty, prejudice and constant movement, so that lasting friendships seem impossible. However, George and Lennie's bond, and the final gesture from Slim, show that friendship can exist briefly. Steinbeck's tragedy is not that friendship is impossible, but that the world of the ranch will not allow it to survive.

6a

Doyle presents Paddy's relationship with Sinbad as a mixture of cruelty and tenderness, and for much of the novel it would be hard to call him a loyal brother. He bullies, mocks and betrays Sinbad, often to impress his friends. However, as his parents' marriage collapses, Paddy's feelings become more protective, and by the end his longing to be close to Sinbad suggests a deep, if confused, loyalty. Because the novel is told through Paddy's own voice, Doyle lets us see both his worst behaviour and his growing awareness of what his brother means to him.

The strongest evidence against loyalty is Paddy's casual cruelty, which Doyle presents without comment or apology. Paddy's narration is honest to the point of being shocking: he admits "I loved getting him into trouble", adding that the best way was to pretend he was helping. The verb "loved" shows that he takes real pleasure in it, and the idea of pretending to help reveals a calculated, almost adult hypocrisy. With Kevin, he gives Sinbad a "dead leg on each side" for not doing what they told him, and he describes holding Sinbad's nose while the tears were "getting out". The plain, unemotional sentences make the violence more disturbing, because to Paddy it is simply part of ordinary life. Doyle seems to suggest that, for boys in Barrytown, hurting younger children is a way of proving status within

Question number

the gang.

Paddy's loyalty to his friends often outweighs his loyalty to his brother. When Sinbad becomes a nuisance in front of the others, Paddy thinks that it was terrible that "in front of the others" he could not sort out his little brother. The phrase reveals that his concern is his own reputation rather than Sinbad's feelings. Most striking of all is his confession that he hated Sinbad and that "the only reason was that he was my little brother". Doyle uses this childlike logic to show that Paddy's hostility is not based on anything Sinbad has done; it is simply part of the rivalry between brothers.

Yet Doyle balances these moments with others that show genuine loyalty. Paddy imagines himself as the hero of Flight of the Doves, carrying his little brother on his back and "looking after him". Even if this is a fantasy, it shows that he sees himself as Sinbad's protector. In the episode where Sinbad loses his shoe, Paddy reflects that he was "supposed to have been looking after him", which shows an awareness of responsibility, and when Sinbad gets stuck in a hedge, he grabs his hand and runs to catch the others. At Christmas, Paddy plays along when his father pretends to be Santy at the chimney, saying "bye bye" so that Sinbad's belief is not spoiled. In these moments, Doyle shows that Paddy's loyalty is instinctive, even if it is not consistent.

Paddy also defends Sinbad against adults. When Mr Hennessey wants Sinbad's ruined copy shown to their mother, Paddy refuses: "I'm not going to show the copy to Ma, I told him". The short, defiant sentence shows that, when an outsider threatens his brother, Paddy closes ranks. At home, he helps Sinbad eat his dinner when their father forces him to sit at the table until the plate is clear. These actions suggest that Paddy's cruelty is something he reserves for himself; he will

Question number

hurt Sinbad, but he resents others doing so.

As the marriage breaks down, Doyle shifts the relationship again. Paddy lies awake listening to the arguments and tries to shield Sinbad, telling him in the morning that he had not woken him. He tries to comfort Sinbad, but finds it was like "hugging a statue". The metaphor is poignant: Paddy reaches out, but Sinbad has withdrawn into silence, perhaps as a way of coping. Paddy wonders whether Sinbad could decide "to hear and not hear things", which shows him beginning to understand his brother's nature rather than simply reacting to him. Near the end, his language becomes more reflective and structured. He admits that, while "pretending to be protecting him", he had wanted Sinbad close, to share and listen together. This confession reveals that his loyalty is also a need: he wants a companion in his fear. Doyle shows that Paddy's love for his brother deepens precisely as Sinbad becomes unreachable.

In conclusion, I only partly agree that Paddy is a loyal brother to Sinbad. Doyle presents a boy who bullies his brother, uses him to impress his friends and admits to hating him. Yet he also protects him from adults, shields him from their parents' fights and, by the end, longs for his company. The episodic, first person narrative captures the contradictions of childhood: Paddy's loyalty is real, but it comes and goes, and it becomes clear to him only when the family is falling apart and Sinbad has stopped responding.

6b

I strongly agree that Doyle presents the marriage between Paddy's parents as an unhappy one, but the power of the novel lies in the way that unhappiness is revealed. Because the story is narrated by a ten year old boy who does not fully understand what he sees, the breakdown of the marriage emerges gradually,

Question number

through hints and fragments, until it becomes impossible for Paddy, or the reader, to ignore. There are moments of happiness, and Paddy clings to them, but Doyle uses them mainly to make the final separation more painful.

In the early part of the novel, Doyle plants small signs of tension. The parents have different attitudes to religion: when Da makes a joke that there is always work for carpenters, Paddy does not understand it but knows it was the sort of thing Ma did not like him saying. The child's confusion is important, since the reader can see a disagreement that Paddy can only sense. Doyle also contrasts their interests: Da reads the paper and watches The News, while Ma reads books, mostly at night. This suggests two people living separate mental lives under the same roof. Even when Paddy notices that his mother was not enjoying herself and "needed a decent day out", the childish phrase hints at a deeper discontent that he cannot name. These details act as foreshadowing for what is to come.

As the novel develops, the arguments become more frequent, and Doyle uses imagery to show how Paddy experiences them. He describes their fights as being "like a train that kept getting stuck at the corner tracks". The simile captures the repetitive, grinding nature of the arguments, which return again and again to the same point without resolution. Paddy begins to stay awake at night, listening from the stairs, as if keeping watch might stop the fighting. Doyle shows the effects of this through his tiredness at school, where his teachers allow him to sleep, which suggests that adults outside the family are aware of the trouble. The unhappy marriage therefore spreads beyond the parents to affect Paddy's whole world.

Doyle also shows the marriage becoming more aggressive. Paddy's father "kept stabbing at her with his face and his words", a violent metaphor which turns speech into a weapon. His moods become unpredictable: Paddy notes that

Question number

sometimes Da "didn't need reasons; he had his mood already". The semicolon creates a pause before the bleak realisation, showing Paddy's growing understanding that his father's anger is not caused by anything they do. The confessional moment "He was drunk. It hit me" is especially striking, because the short sentences mimic the shock of a sudden discovery, and the phrase "It hit me" foreshadows the physical violence to come. When Paddy finally sees his father strike his mother, Doyle uses a sequence of short, plain sentences: "I saw her falling back. He looked at me. He unmade his fist." The verb "unmade" is unusual and suggests guilt, as if Da is trying to undo what Paddy has witnessed. The lack of emotional commentary makes the moment more devastating.

Ma's unhappiness is shown more quietly. She looks thinner and cries a lot, and on one occasion she does not get up in the morning. Doyle presents these details through the eyes of a child, so they are reported rather than explained, but the reader recognises signs of depression and despair. The silence between the parents becomes as telling as their fights: Paddy listens for words from downstairs and finds that there is still no talking. Doyle shows that the absence of communication is a sign that the marriage has reached a point beyond repair.

However, there is some evidence that the marriage was not always unhappy. Paddy remembers his father pretending to be Santy at Christmas, speaking in a deep voice to delight Sinbad, and the family has days out in the new car, including the trip to Dollymount. Paddy also insists that his mother made lovely dinners and that the house was clean and the grass cut. Yet these memories feel defensive, as if Paddy is trying to prove that his family was normal and that nothing should have gone wrong. The list of ordinary domestic details suggests his desperate search for a reason the marriage failed, and his inability to find one. Doyle uses these happy moments as a contrast, so the ending is more painful.

Question number	
	The final breakdown is stated with stark simplicity: Da left, and he was not coming back. The novel's episodic structure, moving between games, school and home, has gradually narrowed until the family dominates everything, and the gang's chant that gives the novel its title turns Paddy's private grief into public humiliation. In the final scene, when his father visits and greets him formally as "Patrick", the distance between them is clear; Paddy has grown up too soon.
	Overall, I agree that the marriage between Paddy's parents is an unhappy one. Doyle allows a few glimpses of affection and family life, but the novel is structured as a slow and painful process of discovery. Through Paddy's limited, confessional narration, Doyle shows that the unhappiness was there long before the boy could understand it, and that its effects fall most heavily on the children.
7a	I largely agree that Napoleon is selfish. In fact, Orwell presents selfishness as the very centre of his character: every apparent act of service to the farm turns out, on closer inspection, to serve his own appetite for comfort and, above all, for power. What makes him so chilling is that his selfishness is rarely open. Orwell shows it working quietly, through silence, delay and other animals' voices, so that the reader recognises it long before the animals do.
	From his first introduction, Orwell plants doubts. Napoleon is "a large, rather fierce-looking Berkshire boar", "not much of a talker, but with a reputation for getting his own way". The phrase "getting his own way" is a mild, almost comic understatement, yet it quietly establishes his defining trait: he wants things for himself and he gets them. The contrast with Snowball, who is "more vivacious" and full of ideas, is important, because Orwell builds much of Napoleon's character

Question number

through what he does not do. He does not speak, argue or explain; he waits.

The episode of the milk soon after the Rebellion is a small but deliberate piece of foreshadowing. As the animals look at the five buckets, Napoleon, "placing himself in front of the buckets", urges them to go to the harvest, telling them the milk will be "attended to". The physical act of standing in front of the milk is a visual image of selfishness: he literally blocks the others from what they have produced. Orwell's understated ending to the chapter, noting simply that by evening the milk had disappeared, invites the reader to draw the conclusion that the animals cannot. When Squealer later explains that milk and apples are "absolutely necessary to the well-being of a pig", the selfishness becomes policy, disguised as scientific concern for the common good.

Napoleon's selfishness becomes more dangerous in his handling of the puppies. Orwell writes that he "took them away from their mothers, saying that he would make himself responsible for their education". The phrase sounds generous, even fatherly, but the reality is a private army. When the "nine enormous dogs wearing brass-studded collars" burst out and chase Snowball from the farm, Orwell structures the chapter so that the reader shares the animals' shock: we, too, had forgotten the puppies. The selfish aim is now clear. Napoleon does not want to win the debate about the windmill; he wants to end debate altogether, and he immediately announces that the Sunday Meetings will come to an end. His later adoption of the windmill, which he had urinated over in contempt, shows that he cares little about ideas, only about who owns them.

As the novel progresses, Orwell shows Napoleon gathering every privilege for himself and the pigs. They move into the farmhouse, sleep in beds, drink whisky and trade with humans. The rewritten Commandments, such as "No animal shall

Question number

sleep in a bed with sheets", are a clever narrative device: the original principle survives, but a few added words bend it to the pigs' convenience. Napoleon eats alone, from the best dinner service, and is surrounded by titles such as "Father of All Animals". Orwell's irony here is sharp, since a true father provides for his children, whereas Napoleon feeds on them. His selfishness also turns murderous. In the purges, animals who confess to imagined crimes are killed and "the dogs promptly tore their throats out", a brutally plain phrase which shows that even life itself is subordinate to his security. The hens who resist giving up their eggs are starved until nine of them die.

The clearest proof comes with Boxer, the most loyal animal on the farm, whose mottoes "I will work harder" and "Napoleon is always right" sum up total devotion. When Boxer collapses, he is sold to the knacker, and soon afterwards the pigs acquire "another case of whisky". Orwell places these two details side by side without comment, and the juxtaposition is devastating: Napoleon has literally exchanged his most faithful worker for drink.

There is some evidence for a more complicated reading. Early on, Napoleon helps to develop Animalism with Snowball and Squealer, and he takes part in expelling Jones. At times he appears to look after the animals, serving out "a double ration" of corn after Snowball's expulsion, and in the windmill debate he argues that food production matters more. Squealer constantly insists that Napoleon has made a "sacrifice" in taking on the burden of leadership. However, Orwell presents each of these moments ironically. The double ration comes straight after the terror of the dogs and buys the animals' quiet; the argument about food is quickly abandoned; and Squealer's talk of sacrifice is exactly the kind of propaganda that reveals how much needs hiding. Some readers might argue that Napoleon is less selfish than power hungry, since he shares luxuries with the other pigs. Yet even this sharing is

Question number

a way of building a loyal class around himself.

Ultimately, Orwell presents Napoleon as selfish in the deepest sense: he turns a revolution intended for "all animals" into a system that exists to feed and protect one pig. The final image of the animals looking "from pig to man, and from man to pig" suggests that his selfishness has completed the circle, making him indistinguishable from the farmer he replaced. I therefore agree strongly with the statement, while recognising that Orwell makes this selfishness more frightening by disguising it, for so long, as care.

7b

For most of the animals, Orwell presents life on the farm as miserable, and what makes it so painful is that the misery returns after a brief, genuine moment of hope. The novel is structured as a circle: it begins with suffering under Jones, rises to the joy of the Rebellion, and then sinks slowly back into hunger, fear and exhausting labour, until the animals are arguably worse off than when they started. I largely agree with the statement, although Orwell is careful to show that happiness was possible, and that the animals' hope never quite dies.

Old Major's speech establishes misery as the starting point. His tricolon, "our lives are miserable, laborious, and short", is blunt and rhythmic, giving the animals, and the reader, a clear summary of their condition. He insists that "No animal in England is free", and his description of animals worked until their strength is gone, then slaughtered "with hideous cruelty", foreshadows exactly what will happen to Boxer. Orwell's list of the instruments the animals destroy after the Rebellion, "the bits, the nose-rings, the dog-chains, the cruel knives", turns the misery into physical objects, so that throwing them on the fire feels like a real liberation.

Question number

That liberation is presented with real joy. The animals "gambolled round and round" in their excitement, and the verb suggests the carefree movement of young creatures. Orwell's description of the first harvest is one of the warmest passages in the novel: "Every mouthful of food was an acute positive pleasure, now that it was truly their own food." The adverb "truly" and the possessive "their own" show that happiness here comes from dignity and ownership, not just from food. Snowball's committees and his windmill, which he claims will allow them to work only three days a week, hold out the promise of an even better life. At this point, the statement is clearly untrue.

However, Orwell undermines this happiness almost immediately. The disappearance of the milk at the end of the second chapter, and the later decision that milk and apples belong to the pigs, show inequality from the very start. The narrative voice often reports events from the animals' limited viewpoint, so the reader notices what they do not. When Squealer asks, "Surely, comrades, you do not want Jones back?", the rhetorical question silences all complaint, and this becomes the pattern for the rest of the novel: misery is endured because the animals are told the alternative would be worse.

Once Napoleon seizes power, misery is created through fear as much as hardship. After Snowball is chased out by the dogs, the animals creep back "Silent and terrified", and the debates that gave them a voice are abolished. Orwell then describes their labour in harsh terms: "all that year the animals worked like slaves". The simile is bitterly ironic, since the Rebellion was meant to end slavery. In winter, "Starvation seemed to stare them in the face", a personification which makes hunger a watching presence. The climax of this misery is the purge, where "the dogs promptly tore their throats out" and, afterwards, "the air was heavy with the smell of blood, which had been unknown since the expulsion of Jones." The

Question number

final clause is crucial: Orwell explicitly links the present to the old regime, showing that life has come full circle. Clover's sad reflection on the hillside, that this was not what they had hoped for on the night of Major's speech, gives the reader a moment of quiet grief.

Boxer's fate shows that an animal's life has value only while it can work. Despite his mottoes, "I will work harder" and "Napoleon is always right", he is sold to the knacker when his lung gives way, and Orwell has Benjamin read aloud the words on the van, "Horse Slaughterer", so that the cruelty is made unmistakable. Years later, Benjamin's view that "hunger, hardship, and disappointment" are "the unalterable law of life" suggests that, for ordinary animals, nothing has truly changed.

It is important, though, to note that life is not miserable for everyone. The pigs enjoy the farmhouse, beds, whisky and freedom from physical labour, and Squealer even insists that the beds are very comfortable. Their misery is therefore a matter of class: the farm is a paradise for some because it is a prison for the rest. Orwell also complicates the idea that the animals feel miserable. Many of them believe the statistics Squealer reads out, and they feel pride that the farm is owned by animals. Orwell writes that "the animals never gave up hope", and the song "Beasts of England" lingers among them. Yet this hope is itself presented with irony, because it depends on the animals forgetting how much better they were promised.

Overall, I agree that Orwell presents life on the farm as miserable for the animals, but the misery is made more powerful by contrast with the brief happiness after the Rebellion. The final image, in which the animals look "from pig to man, and from man to pig" and cannot tell which is which, confirms that the circle is

Question number

complete. The animals have gained nothing but a new master, and the reader is left to feel the misery more sharply than they themselves can.

8 Wells engages the reader by slowly turning an apparently ordinary event into something terrifying. He begins with calm, almost scientific reporting, then narrows the focus to one lonely man and one strange object, so that by the end we share Ogilvy's dawning horror at the moment he realises the "meteorite" is something made.

The opening paragraph builds credibility. The narrator lists witnesses and experts, such as Albin and Denning, "our greatest authority on meteorites", and gives precise measurements of "ninety or one hundred miles". This factual, documentary style makes the story feel real. Yet the vivid image of "a line of flame high in the atmosphere" and the "greenish streak" that glowed hint at something unusual. The contrast with the crowd who took it "for an ordinary falling star" creates dramatic irony, since the reader already suspects it is not ordinary.

The first-person narrator adds a personal, slightly regretful note. He was writing in his study with the blind up, yet "saw nothing of it". His description of "this strangest of all things that ever came to earth from outer space" is a superlative that hooks the reader, revealing the enormity of the event before we understand it. The detail that "No one seems to have troubled to look" emphasises human complacency, which makes the reader uneasy.

The phrase "poor Ogilvy" is an ominous hint that something bad will happen to him, encouraging us to read on. Wells then describes the impact with violent language: "An enormous hole", sand and gravel "flung violently in every direction",

Question number

and a fir tree "shivered to fragments". The quiet image of "a thin blue smoke" rising against the dawn adds an eerie beauty. Calling the object "The Thing", with capital letters, makes it nameless and mysterious, as though ordinary language cannot describe it.

Ogilvy's reactions guide the reader's feelings. He is "surprised at the size and more so at the shape", and he explains the "stirring noise" as "unequal cooling", clinging to a rational explanation. The narrator's comment that it had not occurred to him "that it might be hollow" creates suspense, because the reader now knows what he does not. Wells heightens tension through an unnatural stillness: there was "no breeze stirring", he heard no birds, and the only sounds came from the "cindery cylinder". The short sentence "He was all alone on the common" isolates him and makes him vulnerable.

The pace then quickens through connectives such as "Then suddenly", "And then" and "Even then", which mark each stage of the discovery. The idiom "brought his heart into his mouth" conveys his fright vividly, and his decision to climb down into the pit despite the heat makes the reader fear for him. The slow rotation of the lid, noticed only through a moving "black mark", is deliberately gradual, which makes the sudden "jerk forward" all the more startling.

Finally, the structure builds to a climax. The dashes in "artificial", "hollow" and the exclamation marks in "Something within the cylinder was unscrewing the top!" mimic Ogilvy's racing thoughts as understanding comes "in a flash". The extract ends on a cliffhanger, leaving the reader desperate to know what is inside. Through this careful movement from calm to shock, Wells engages us completely.