Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2024

English Literature

Unit 1

The Study of Prose

GEL11

[GEL11]
MONDAY 13 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** Piggy, show how far you agree that Piggy **deserves pity**.

(b) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** leadership, show how far you agree that Ralph and Jack show **poor leadership**.

stemup.co.uk

2 Hornby: *About a Boy*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** family life, show how far you agree that Marcus's family life is **difficult**.

stemup.co.uk

3 Johnston: *How Many Miles to Babylon?*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Frederick, show how far you agree that Frederick is **weak-willed**.

(b) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Alec, Jerry and Glendinning, show how far you agree they **lack** a sense of duty.

stemup.co.uk

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

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** intolerance, show how far you agree that the people of Maycomb show **intolerance** to Boo Radley, Tom Robinson and Dolphus Raymond.

stemup.co.uk

5 Steinbeck: *Of Mice and Men*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** the hopes of people on the ranch, show how far you agree that their hopes are **realistic**.

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 father, show how far you agree that Paddy's father is **cruel**.

(b) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** life in Barrytown, show how far you agree that life is **difficult** for those who live in Barrytown.

stemup.co.uk

7 Orwell: *Animal Farm*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** what the animals learn, show how far you agree that the animals **benefit** from what they learn.

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: *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* by **Robert Louis Stevenson**

(Dr Jekyll is a kind, well-respected scientist who meddles with the darker side of science, as he wants to bring out his 'second' nature. He does this through transforming himself into Mr Hyde – his evil alter ego who doesn't accept responsibility for the evil crimes he commits. Jekyll tries to control his alter ego, Hyde, but Hyde grows powerful and takes over.)

I was still so engaged when, in one of my more wakeful moments, my eyes fell upon my hand. Now the hand of Henry Jekyll (as you have often remarked) was professional in shape and size; it was large, firm, white and comely. But the hand which I now saw, clearly enough, in the yellow light of a mid-London morning, lying half shut on the bedclothes, was lean, corded, knuckly, of a dusky pallor and thickly shaded with a swart growth of hair. It was the hand of Edward Hyde.

I must have stared upon it for near half a minute, sunk as I was in the mere stupidity of wonder, before terror woke up in my breast as sudden and startling as the crash of cymbals; and bounding from my bed I rushed to the mirror. At the sight that met my eyes, my blood was changed into something exquisitely thin and icy. Yes, I had gone to bed Henry Jekyll, I had awakened Edward Hyde. How was this to be explained? I asked myself; and then, with another bound of terror—how was it to be remedied? It was well on in the morning; the servants were up; all my drugs were in the cabinet—a long journey down two pairs of stairs, through the back passage, across the open court and through the anatomical theatre, from where I was then standing horror-struck. It might indeed be possible to cover my face; but of what use was that, when I was unable to conceal the alteration in my stature? And then with an overpowering sweetness of relief, it came back upon my mind that the servants were already used to the coming and going of my second self. I had soon dressed, as well as I was able, in clothes of my own size: had soon passed through the house, where Bradshaw stared and drew back at seeing Mr. Hyde at such an hour and in such a strange array; and ten minutes later, Dr. Jekyll had returned to his own shape and was sitting down, with a darkened brow, to make a feint of breakfasting.

Small indeed was my appetite. This inexplicable incident, this reversal of my previous experience, seemed, like the Babylonian finger on the wall, to be spelling out the letters of my judgment; and I began to reflect more seriously than ever before on the issues and possibilities of my double existence. That part of me which I had the power of projecting, had lately been much exercised and nourished; it had seemed to me of late as though the body of Edward Hyde had grown in stature, as though (when I wore that form) I were conscious of a more generous tide of blood; and I began to spy a danger that, if this were much prolonged, the balance of my nature might be permanently overthrown, the power of voluntary change be forfeited, and the character of Edward Hyde become irrevocably mine.

stemup.co.uk

The power of the drug had not been always equally displayed. Once, very early in my career, it had totally failed me; since then I had been obliged on more than one occasion to double, and once, with infinite risk of death, to treble the amount; and these rare uncertainties had cast hitherto the sole shadow on my contentment. Now, however, and in the light of that morning's accident, I was led to remark that whereas, in the beginning, the difficulty had been to throw off the body of Jekyll, it had of late gradually but decidedly transferred itself to the other side. All things therefore seemed to point to this; that I was slowly losing hold of my original and better self, and becoming slowly incorporated with my second and worse.

Between these two, I now felt I had to choose. My two natures had memory in common, but all other faculties were most unequally shared between them. Jekyll (who was composite) now with the most sensitive apprehensions, now with a greedy gusto, projected and shared in the pleasures and adventures of Hyde; but Hyde was indifferent to Jekyll, or but remembered him as the mountain bandit remembers the cavern in which he conceals himself from pursuit. Jekyll had more than a father's interest; Hyde had more than a son's indifference. To cast in my lot with Jekyll, was to die to those appetites which I had long secretly indulged and had of late begun to pamper. To cast it in with Hyde, was to die to a thousand interests and aspirations, and to become, at a blow and forever, despised and friendless.

Glossary

comely – attractive
swart – dark
feint – pretence
hitherto – until now

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

Source

Q8.....Adapted from The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde' by Robert Louis Stevenson (IBSN: 978-0-553-21277-8) Published by Longmans, Green & Co. © Public Domain

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

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

Question number

1a

Golding presents Piggy as the most pitiable figure on the island: physically weak, mocked from the first chapter and finally killed with a casual brutality that shocks the reader. However, pity is not the whole of Golding's design. Piggy is also the novel's voice of reason, and at moments he is naive, self-pitying or even morally evasive. I largely agree that he deserves pity, but I would argue that Golding wants us to admire his intelligence and to recognise his flaws as well, so that our pity is never simply condescension.

From his very first appearance Golding builds sympathy through Piggy's body. He is introduced not by name but as "the fat boy", and the narrator keeps this label for pages, so that even the narrative voice seems to share the boys' dismissal of him. His frailty is stressed through his own dialogue: "Can't catch me breath. I was the only boy in our school what had asthma." The non-standard grammar marks him out from the confident, public-school Ralph and Jack, and the odd pride in "the only boy" is touching, since his illness is the one thing that has made him special. When he reveals that his parents are dead and that he lives with his auntie, the reader begins to see a lonely child who has been rejected before the island ever tests him.

Golding makes the cruelty towards Piggy deliberate and repeated, which deepens our pity. Piggy begs Ralph not to tell the others his nickname, and Ralph announces it at the very first assembly. The detail that "Piggy's glasses were misted again, this time with humiliation" is quietly devastating: the glasses, usually a sign of his clear sight, are clouded by shame, as though his intelligence itself has been blurred by mockery. Even small moments of acceptance are painful, since

Question number

he grins "reluctantly, pleased despite himself at even this much recognition". The phrase "even this much" exposes how little he is used to receiving, so the reader pities a boy grateful for scraps of respect.

As the novel progresses, the mockery turns into violence. After the fire goes out and a ship passes, Piggy "forgot his timidity in the agony of his loss" and criticises Jack, who is "able at last to hit someone" and drives his fist into Piggy's stomach. The words "at last" suggest that Jack's violence has been waiting for a target, and Piggy, the weakest, is chosen. Jack's insult, "You shut up, you fat slug!", reduces him to something less than human, foreshadowing the dehumanisation of the ending. Crucially, one lens of his glasses is broken in this attack, and Golding structures the plot so that Piggy's physical blindness grows as the island's moral blindness grows. When the glasses are finally stolen, he is left almost helpless, led about by Ralph and dependent on others to see.

Golding's presentation of Piggy's death is the climax of this pity. As the rock strikes him, the conch "exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist", and Piggy himself falls to the rocks below. The narrative becomes horribly flat: "His head opened and stuff came out and turned red." The childish, vague noun "stuff" and the simple sentence refuse to dignify his death, and the simile that his limbs twitched "like a pig's after it has been killed" completes the joke of his nickname in the cruellest way. The reader, who has watched the boys hunt pigs throughout the novel, is forced to see that Piggy has become their final prey. Here, surely, he deserves our deepest pity.

Yet Golding complicates this response. Piggy is not merely a victim; he is the boy who first understands the conch's value and tells Ralph to use it to call an assembly. When he stands "cradling the great cream shell", the shouting dies

Question number

down, suggesting that he has real moral authority while order lasts. His shrill accusation, "You and your blood, Jack Merridew", shows courage and insight, since he names the savagery the others refuse to see. In this sense, he deserves admiration more than pity, and Ralph's final tears for "the true, wise friend called Piggy" suggest that Golding wants us to mourn the loss of reason, not just a weak child.

There are also moments where Piggy invites criticism. Some readers might argue that by revealing his nickname he hands the others a weapon, and that his frequent silences, as when he "opened his mouth to speak, caught Jack's eye and shut it again", show passivity. More seriously, after Simon's murder he insists "It was an accident" and that Simon "asked for it". Golding uses Piggy's frantic, broken speech here to show his refusal to face the truth of what the boys, including himself, have done. This denial suggests that even the rational Piggy shares in the darkness of human nature, and it makes him less innocent than he first seems.

Overall, I strongly agree that Piggy deserves pity, because Golding consistently presents him as isolated, bullied and finally destroyed by the boys' savagery. However, our pity is complicated by his flaws and enriched by his wisdom. Golding seems to suggest that Piggy's tragedy is that intelligence and reason, without physical power or social acceptance, are too fragile to survive, and it is this wider loss that makes his fate so moving.

1b

Golding presents leadership as a struggle between two kinds of power: Ralph's democratic authority, symbolised by the conch, and Jack's tribal rule, built on hunting, fear and spectacle. I agree that both boys show poor leadership in

Question number

important ways, but not in the same way or to the same degree. Ralph fails because he cannot make his good intentions matter, while Jack succeeds in commanding the boys precisely because his leadership is destructive. Golding seems to suggest that the leader the boys need is not the leader they want.

At the start of the novel, Ralph appears to be a natural and effective leader. He is elected partly for his appearance and the "stillness" about him, and partly because he holds the conch, which Golding turns into a powerful symbol of order. When Ralph speaks, the assembly is "lifted toward safety by his words", a phrase which suggests that his leadership gives the frightened children physical comfort. His practical priorities are sensible: he insists on shelters and, above all, a signal fire. "We've got to have special people for looking after the fire. Any day there may be a ship out there." The direct, inclusive "we" and the urgency of "any day" show a leader thinking about the group's survival rather than his own pleasure. He also delegates, giving Jack's choir the role of hunters, which shows an early attempt at compromise.

However, Golding quickly shows the limits of Ralph's leadership. He complains, "All day I've been working with Simon. No one else. They're off bathing, or eating, or playing." The short, clipped sentences convey his frustration, and the list of childish activities shows that he cannot motivate the others. Later he admits, "We have lots of assemblies. We decide things. But they don't get done." The repetition of simple statements exposes the gap between talk and action, and Golding hints that democracy without enforcement becomes empty ritual. Ralph also struggles to think clearly as the novel progresses, and Golding describes a "curtain" flickering in his mind, a metaphor for his confusion that leaves him relying more and more on Piggy.

Question number

Ralph is also drawn into the savagery he tries to resist. After the hunt he "accepted a piece of half-raw meat and gnawed it like a wolf", and the animal simile shows that even the chief is losing his civilised identity. Most disturbingly, he takes part in the frenzied dance that ends in Simon's murder. A good leader, the reader might argue, would have prevented this, so Ralph's inability to control even himself shows how fragile his authority is.

Jack's leadership is presented as poor for very different reasons. From his first entrance, leading the choir in a disciplined line, he is a figure of control: "he shouted an order and they halted", and the choir obey him "wearily". This shows he can command, but through fear and habit rather than consent. His priorities are clearly selfish. Piggy warns that "If Jack was chief he'd have all hunting and no fire. We'd be here till we died", and Golding proves him right when Jack's hunters let the fire go out just as a ship passes. Jack's dismissive cry "Sucks to the littluns!" shows that he has no sense of responsibility for the weakest members of the group, which is surely one of a leader's most important duties.

As Jack's power grows, Golding presents his rule as tyranny. He announces, "We don't need the conch any more. We know who ought to say things." The pronoun "we" is cleverly used: it pretends to speak for everyone, but really it means Jack and the hunters, so democracy is replaced by the rule of the strongest. At his feast he sits "painted and garlanded" like an idol, and the religious imagery suggests that he leads through worship and spectacle rather than reason. After Piggy's death he screams "That's what you'll get! I meant that!", revealing a leadership based entirely on violence and threat. The boys follow him, but the society he creates hunts Ralph across the island and sets it on fire.

Yet it could be argued that, in narrow terms, Jack is a more effective leader than

Question number

Ralph. He gives the boys meat, excitement and a sense of belonging, and his tribe is unified while Ralph's group shrinks to a handful. Golding may be making the uncomfortable point that people are drawn to leaders who satisfy their appetites and fears, not to those who ask them to keep a dull signal fire burning. Ralph, meanwhile, shows real courage, saying "I'm chief. I'll go" when the beast must be faced, and he clings to the belief that "the rules are the only thing we've got". These moments suggest that his values are right even when his leadership fails.

In conclusion, I agree that both Ralph and Jack show poor leadership, but Golding presents their failures very differently. Ralph's leadership is morally good but practically weak, unable to stop the descent into savagery, while Jack's is practically powerful but morally disastrous. The irony of the ending, where Ralph weeps and Jack is reduced to "a little boy" in the remains of his cap before the naval officer, suggests that neither could truly lead, because the darkness Golding explores lies within all of the boys, and no leader on the island could hold it back for long.

2a

Hornby presents Will Freeman as a man whose whole lifestyle is built on selfishness: he has no job, no family and no responsibilities, and at first he treats other people as either entertainment or inconvenience. I agree that Will is selfish for much of the novel, and Hornby's satirical narration makes this unmistakable. However, the structure of About a Boy charts a gradual change, and by the end Will's relationship with Marcus has drawn him into genuine care for others. The novel is therefore less a portrait of a selfish man than the story of how a selfish man is reluctantly made less so.

Hornby's opening chapters establish Will's self-absorption through a mocking

Question number

narrative voice. The rhetorical question "How cool was Will Freeman?" sounds like Will's own thoughts, but the third-person narration exposes how shallow his values are: he measures his life in clothes, music and haircuts. He lives off the royalties from his father's Christmas song, so he contributes nothing to society, and Hornby shows him filling his empty days by dividing them into units of time, as though life were simply a problem of boredom to be managed. Will even congratulates himself on his own emptiness, and his self-mocking exclamation "He was dry ice! He was Frosty the Snowman! He would die of hypothermia!" suggests that he knows he is cold towards others, but finds this more amusing than troubling.

Will's selfishness is especially clear in his attitude to commitment and children. When his friends John and Christine ask him to be godfather to their daughter Imogen, he replies, "I'm touched that you asked. But I can't think of anything worse." The polite opening collapses into brutal honesty, and the humour of the line comes from its total lack of tact. His cynical belief that the only reason to have children is so they can look after you "when you were old and skint" shows that he imagines every relationship in terms of what he might get from it. Hornby makes the reader laugh, but also judge.

The most obvious example of Will's selfishness is his invention of a son. After his fling with Angie, he realises that single mothers might be the ideal partners for a man who wants romance without responsibility, and he joins the single parents' group SPAT pretending to be the father of a two-year-old called Ned. The narrator describes this as finding "the ideal solution to this unexpected dearth of prey". The predatory noun "prey" presents Will as a hunter and the vulnerable women as targets, which makes his deception seem calculating rather than merely foolish. This is how he meets Suzie, and through her, Marcus and Fiona.

Question number

Even after Fiona's suicide attempt, Will's first reactions are centred on himself. The narrative bluntly states, "He had no interest in good works. He had no interest in Marcus and Fiona", and the repetition of "no interest" leaves no room for doubt. His question, "But how can you contemplate dating a woman who might top herself at any moment?", treats Fiona's despair as a problem for his love life, and the slang "top herself" shows how lightly he takes something so serious. When he sees Marcus truanting, Hornby notes that his affection was "not acute enough to make him stop the car, or even toot", a comic anticlimax that shows how limited his concern still is.

However, Hornby's alternating chapters between Will and Marcus slowly bring the two lives together, and Will begins to change. At first he lets Marcus visit after school only because it is easier than refusing, but he starts to notice how badly Marcus is being bullied. Hornby shows him buying Marcus a pair of trainers and, at Christmas, a Nirvana CD that helps Marcus connect with Ellie. When Will confronts Fiona, telling her "Marcus is being eaten alive at school", he is acting for someone else's benefit, even at the cost of an awkward argument. Will's realisation that "Marcus needed help to be a kid, not an adult" is important, because Will, who has never grown up himself, discovers that his knowledge of pop culture and trainers is exactly what Marcus needs.

Falling in love with Rachel at the New Year's Eve party also exposes Will to the risks of real feeling, and the narrator's comment that the experience "took him completely by surprise" suggests that emotional commitment has entered his life almost against his will. By the climax, when Marcus and Ellie are in trouble with the police in Cambridge, Will is drawn into helping resolve the crisis, and the narrative remarks that "the neutrality had gone now", as he finds himself "more worried about poor Marcus". He is no longer the detached observer peeking over the

Question number

fence at other people's lives; he is involved.

In conclusion, I agree that Will is selfish, particularly in the first half of the novel, where Hornby uses satire and Will's own cynical thoughts to expose his self-interest. Yet Hornby does not leave him there. The structure of the novel moves Will from isolation to connection, and while he never becomes a saint, he learns that other people make demands which are worth meeting. Hornby seems to suggest that no man can live entirely for himself, and that Will's selfishness is less a fixed trait than a defence he gradually lets go of.

2b

Hornby presents Marcus's family life as fragile, lonely and often frightening: his parents have separated, his mother is depressed, and at twelve he is forced to worry about her more than she worries about him. I strongly agree that his family life is difficult, and Hornby uses Marcus's own innocent, puzzled perspective to make these difficulties both funny and painful. However, the novel does not present family as a hopeless case. Through Will and a wider network of people, Hornby suggests that Marcus's family life becomes less difficult once it is no longer just "two of them".

From the start, Hornby establishes the instability of Marcus's home. Fiona's relationships come and go, and Marcus reflects that he "had quite liked Roger" but now, apparently, would never see him again. The casual "apparently" shows that adults make decisions over his head and leave him to absorb the consequences. His parents split up when he was eight, and the move from Cambridge to London cuts him off from his father, Clive, and from everything familiar. In the narrative, the reader sees this upheaval through Marcus's literal, slightly baffled thoughts, which makes his helplessness more striking: he does not complain, he simply tries to

Question number

understand.

Fiona's depression is at the centre of Marcus's difficulties. Hornby shows Marcus noticing that she cries in the mornings, and his anxious questions, "What could be wrong with her?" and "What kind of sick?", capture a child trying to make sense of an illness that no one explains to him. The climax of this strand is Fiona's suicide attempt, which Marcus discovers on the day of the SPAT picnic. Hornby later calls it the Dead Duck Day, mixing the absurd death of a duck in Regent's Park with the horror of coming home to find his mother collapsed after an overdose. The comic label is a defence: Marcus, like the novel, uses humour to cope with something unbearable. The reader feels the weight of a family where the child has to become the carer.

Hornby also presents Marcus as terribly isolated within his family. The anaphora in "He couldn't say it to his Mum, he couldn't say it to his Dad, he couldn't say it to Suzie" builds a sense of walls closing in, as each possible source of support is ruled out in turn. Marcus's logical conclusion is that the problem is numbers: there are only two of them, and if one of them is unwell, there is no one left. This is why he tries to set Fiona up with Will, hoping to add another adult to the family. His scheme is comic, but it reveals a deep insecurity.

Fiona's well-meaning parenting adds to his problems, especially at school. She imposes her own tastes on him: vegetarianism, Joni Mitchell, and clothes such as "a disastrous pair of canary-yellow cords". The adjective "disastrous" is ironic, because it reflects Will's or the narrator's view rather than Fiona's, and it shows how her values make Marcus a target for bullies. When Will finally tells her, "You haven't got a clue, have you?" and that Marcus is "being eaten alive at school", the violent metaphor exposes the gap between Fiona's ideals and her son's reality. Even

Question number

Marcus bursts out, "If you can't look after me properly then you'll have to find someone who can", a line which is both funny in its directness and painfully honest.

Hornby widens the theme by showing that difficult family life is not unique to Marcus. Ellie's parents have split up and she refuses to talk about it, and Rachel's son Ali resents Will's presence in his mother's life. These parallels suggest that the traditional nuclear family is no longer the norm, and that many children in the novel are dealing with absence and change.

However, Hornby also shows moments of love and recovery. Fiona clearly adores Marcus, and she recalls that after Clive left she took him to Glastonbury, an attempt, however eccentric, to give him a happy experience. She admits, "I haven't been a good mother to him", which shows self-awareness rather than indifference. The Christmas scenes, where several adults come together, suggest that a less conventional family can still be warm: Marcus feels it was "more like a party", with the extra people filling up the room. Most importantly, Will gradually takes on a role in Marcus's life, giving him the practical, childish help he needs.

By the end of the novel, Marcus's family life seems partly mended. Marcus does end up going to stay with his dad, Fiona says she feels "less worn down by everything", and Marcus has friends and the ability to look after himself. Hornby's structure moves from a closed, anxious two-person household to a looser but stronger network of relationships.

Overall, I agree that Marcus's family life is difficult, perhaps more so than he himself realises. Hornby presents a boy burdened with adult worries, isolated at home and bullied at school because of it. Yet the novel ends with hope, suggesting

Question number

that what Marcus needed was not a perfect family, but more people around him. As Hornby seems to argue, family life is difficult when it is too small, and becomes bearable when it is shared.

3a

Johnston presents Frederick Moore as a quiet, withdrawn man who seems to have surrendered control of his home, his marriage and finally his son to his formidable wife, Alicia. In many scenes he appears weak-willed: he avoids confrontation, retreats into small rituals and fails to stop Alec going to war. However, Johnston's first-person narration, filtered through Alec's memory, also reveals the suppressed anger and strong convictions beneath his silence. I largely agree that Frederick is weak-willed in action, but I would argue that Johnston presents him less as a man without will than as a man whose will has been crushed and trained into restraint.

The strongest evidence for Frederick's weakness lies in his relationship with Alicia. She openly humiliates him, calling him an "ineffective man" and then, more cruelly, "Ineffective and old". The repetition and the addition of "old" turn a criticism into a dismissal, and Frederick's failure to answer back suggests that he has accepted her verdict. Alec observes that his father's face "would show little emotion" and his voice "would show little emotion", and this repeated phrase captures a man who has learned to hide himself. Johnston adds, however, that he would sometimes "twist his hands together in a gesture of incredible violence". The contrast between the calm face and the violent hands is telling: the will is there, but it is turned inward, against himself, rather than outward against his wife.

Johnston also uses Frederick's pipe as a recurring device to show his avoidance. During tense conversations he is "scraping furiously at something inside the bowl of the pipe", blowing into the stem or tapping it sharply. The adverb "furiously"

Question number

shows strong feeling, but the action is absurdly small, a displacement of anger into a domestic ritual. The pipe becomes a symbol of his retreat: instead of confronting Alicia, he busies his hands. Alec notes that he talks "without any enormous conviction", which suggests that even his words lack force.

Frederick's weakness matters most when Alec's future is decided. Frederick clearly opposes the war and wants his son to stay and learn to run the estate, yet he cannot impose his view. At times he even seems to echo Alicia, as in "We think it's time you stretched your wings a bit", where the pronoun "we" shows his own voice dissolving into hers. Frederick himself admits that where he has "no possible influence a terrible lethargy sets in", and the word "lethargy" is an honest confession of a will that has gone slack through long defeat. Johnston also captures Frederick's hunger for company through a painful analogy: he is glad of it "in the same sort of way that a man on a desert island must be glad to see and talk to his own shadow". The simile is deeply sad: Frederick is so isolated in his own house that his son is merely a shadow of companionship.

The most revealing moment comes when Frederick speaks of his marriage, hoping Alec will never experience "the humiliation of living with someone who is completely indifferent to you". Here, his weakness is presented as the result of emotional starvation. He has stayed in a loveless marriage, perhaps out of duty, perhaps out of fear, and this choice has worn him down. Alicia's later revelation to Alec that Frederick is not his real father makes his position even more tragic, since he has given his love to a son his wife has used against him.

Yet Johnston does not allow us to see Frederick as simply weak. In private with Alec, and sometimes with Alicia, he speaks with force. He dismisses her doctor sharply, saying Dr Desmond "will say anything you want him to say", which shows

Question number

he sees through her manipulation. His outbursts, such as "Have you taken leave of your senses?" and "No is what I say. No", use repetition and short sentences to convey real strength of feeling. His views on the war are firm and scornful, and his angry "Damn bloody fools" suggests a man with clear moral judgement about the waste of young lives. When his "hand was trembling" and he "banged the door behind him", the reader sees a will struggling against its own restraint.

Frederick also shows strength through love and tradition. He buys Alec a fine mare and gives him a gold watch, calling it "a traditional gesture". These acts reveal a father who expresses deep feeling through ritual rather than words, perhaps because, as he says, "We have all been too well trained in behaviour". This line is crucial. Johnston suggests that Frederick's apparent weakness is partly the product of his class and upbringing, which value composure over confrontation. His silence may be a form of dignity, even a kind of strength, rather than a lack of will.

In conclusion, I agree to a considerable extent that Frederick is weak-willed, because he repeatedly fails to act against Alicia and cannot prevent the decision that leads Alec to war and, finally, to a cell where his future can be counted in hours. However, Johnston presents him with great sympathy. His strong opinions, his flashes of anger and his quiet love show that his will has not disappeared but has been suppressed by an unhappy marriage and a culture of restraint. Frederick is perhaps best seen not as weak, but as defeated, and his tragedy foreshadows Alec's own: both are men who cannot escape the roles that others have chosen for them.

3b

Johnston presents duty as a central and deeply troubled idea in How Many Miles to Babylon? Alec, Jerry and Glendinning are all bound by obligations, but to very

Question number

different things: family, friendship, Ireland, the Army. I would argue that only in a narrow sense do any of them lack a sense of duty. Alec and Jerry certainly lack duty to the British war effort, while Glendinning has almost too much of it. Johnston's real point seems to be that duty to an institution and duty to other human beings pull in opposite directions, and the tragedy of the novel lies in that conflict.

Alec, the first-person narrator, openly declares that he is "committed to no cause", and Johnston presents his enlistment as something that happens to him rather than something he chooses out of conviction. His mother, Alicia, pressures him with the cold remark that "Cowards are not very nice people", and the understated, almost polite phrasing makes the manipulation more chilling. Alec does not go to war for King and country but because he is pushed by his mother, and because he has lost his sense of belonging at home. In this sense, Alec seems to lack any sense of duty to the war.

However, Johnston shows that Alec does feel duty, but it is personal rather than public. He feels bound to his mother's demands, and above all to Jerry. The friendship formed in the lake and on horseback in Wicklow becomes the moral centre of his life. Jerry's challenge, "You won't renege, Alec, will you", shows that their bond carries a sense of promise, and the simple arrangement "We'll meet on the train" shows how Alec's decision to serve is tied to his loyalty to Jerry. At the front, when Jerry returns after going missing, Alec urges him, "You have to get out of here." The urgent modal "have to" reveals that Alec's real sense of duty lies with his friend, even against military law.

The climax makes this conflict unbearable. Ordered to command the firing squad, Alec instead shoots Jerry himself in the cell, while Jerry is singing, so that his

Question number

friend will not suffer the long ordeal of execution. Jerry's broken, rapid speech, "It's the waiting. Hours. Minutes", shows his terror, and Johnston juxtaposes the "slight click" of the gun with the song to make the moment both tender and horrifying. Alec breaks his duty to the Army, but he fulfils what he sees as a higher duty of mercy. Johnston's structure, opening and closing with Alec awaiting his own death, invites the reader to judge which duty truly matters.

Jerry, by contrast, is frank about his motives for enlisting. "Cash, Alec. That's what is driving me," he says, and the blunt short sentence rejects any romantic notion of patriotism. He also plans to gain military training so that he can later fight for Ireland, repeating the words of older men about how they will "fix the British". So Jerry lacks duty to the British Army, but he has a strong sense of duty to his own country, even if it is borrowed rhetoric. He disobeys orders, most importantly when he leaves his post to search for his missing father.

Yet this act of disobedience is itself driven by duty. His mother wants his father found so that she can keep receiving the war pension, and Jerry obeys her, even though his father was "rare and quick with the fists". He also cares for the horses at the front, and is appalled by the screaming of a dying soldier, showing a humane sense of responsibility that the war itself lacks. Jerry, then, is full of duty, but to his mother, to living creatures and to Ireland, rather than to the Army that ends up killing him.

Major Glendinning seems at first to be the very image of duty. He insists on the chain of command and tells Alec, "I neither know nor care what your views are. You are here to fight." The harsh, clipped sentences show his refusal to allow individual conscience any place in war. When Alec suggests that the soldiers are men, Glendinning answers with chilling repetition: "Not to me. Not to the General

Question number

Staff, not to the War Office." The list grows outward, suggesting that the whole military system has erased the humanity of ordinary soldiers. In this sense, Glendinning has a powerful sense of duty to the war machine, but almost none to the men under his command, whose safety and lives he treats as expendable.

Johnston complicates even Glendinning, however. When Alec mocks the uniform as "Some sort of fancy dress", Glendinning's "face went white", suggesting that he believes deeply in what the uniform represents. He swears when he sees the extent of a wounded soldier's injuries, revealing a flicker of human horror he must suppress. Most strikingly, he advises Alec to make sure the firing squad shoots straight "In the interests of humanity". This shows a limited compassion within the brutal rules he serves.

In conclusion, I disagree with the view that Alec, Jerry and Glendinning simply lack a sense of duty. Johnston presents three men who are each fiercely bound to something. Alec and Jerry lack duty to the British war effort, but they are bound to each other, to family and to their own ideals, while Glendinning's devotion to the Army leaves little room for duty to individuals. Johnston seems to suggest that the war forces a terrible choice between institutional duty and human loyalty, and through Alec's final act, the novel quietly argues that the second matters more.

4a

I largely agree that Mayella is powerless, but Lee presents her powerlessness as something more complicated than simple helplessness. Trapped by poverty, by her father and by her isolation, Mayella has almost no control over her own life. Yet in the courtroom she discovers one terrible kind of power, the power of a white woman's word against a black man's, and she chooses to use it. Lee therefore

Question number

makes her a figure who is pitiable and culpable at once: powerless in almost every sense except the one that destroys Tom Robinson.

Lee first establishes Mayella's powerlessness through setting. The Ewells live "behind the town garbage dump", and the placement is symbolic: the family is literally positioned among what Maycomb has thrown away. Mayella's status is decided before she ever speaks. Atticus's remark that when a man spends his relief checks on whiskey "his children have a way of crying from hunger pains" shows that the family's suffering is caused by Bob Ewell's choices, not Mayella's. She is powerless to change her circumstances because the person who controls the money controls everything.

Inside that setting, however, Lee places one detail that complicates the picture: the "red geraniums" that Mayella grows in old jars. Scout notes that they are cared for as tenderly as if they belonged to Miss Maudie, and the comparison is telling, because Miss Maudie stands for order, dignity and self-respect in the novel. The flowers suggest a small, stubborn effort to exercise control over her world. Similarly, in court she appears to have "tried to keep clean". These details do not give her real power, but they show a person resisting her circumstances in the only way she can, which makes her powerlessness more poignant.

Lee develops this sense of vulnerability through Scout's first impression of her on the stand: "A young girl", "somehow fragile-looking". Mayella "burst into tears" when questioned and gives Atticus a "terrified glance", and Judge Taylor tries "unsuccessfully" to speak in soothing tones. The patronising instruction that she is "a big girl" and should sit up straight treats her like a child. Her answers about her home life are especially revealing. She explains that she left school after only a short time because her father needed her at home, and when she begins to say

Question number

her father is "tollable" except when he drinks, she breaks off. The unfinished sentence is one of Lee's most effective narrative techniques here: what Mayella cannot say suggests that Bob Ewell is violent towards her, and the reader later learns that the injuries on the right side of her face were almost certainly inflicted by her left-handed father. Lee implies that she is powerless even within her own body.

Lee makes this powerlessness most moving through Mayella's loneliness. When Atticus asks about her friends, she repeats the word "Friends?" as though it is foreign to her, and she even mistakes his ordinary courtesy for mockery: "Won't answer a word you say long as you keep on mockin' me". The fact that politeness is so unfamiliar to her shows how little respect she has ever received. Scout's realisation that Mayella "must have been the loneliest person in the world" is the emotional centre of the presentation. The superlative is unusually mature for Scout, and it marks a moment of growth in which she begins to stand in another person's shoes, as Atticus has taught her. Lee explains that Mayella belongs nowhere: rejected by white society because of how her family lives, and kept apart from the black community because she is white.

However, Lee also challenges the idea that Mayella is entirely powerless. Scout's first impression of fragility gives way to a sharper perception that she is "a thick-bodied girl" used to hard physical work, and the contrast warns the reader not to trust appearances. Jem observes that "She's got enough sense to get the judge sorry for her", implying that her tears may be calculated. Lee's simile describing her as "like a steady-eyed cat with a twitchy tail" suggests watchfulness and even menace. As Atticus's questions expose the gaps in her story, her fragility turns to fury, and her outburst calling the court "stinkin' cowards" reveals a force and resentment that undermine any image of a passive

Question number

victim.

Most importantly, Mayella holds power over Tom Robinson's life and refuses to use it justly. Her stubborn insistence that she will say no more is a refusal to tell the truth, and Lee makes clear that she knows the consequences. In his closing speech Atticus says she is "the victim of cruel poverty and ignorance", yet he also insists that she "knew full well the enormity" of what she was doing in accusing Tom. Lee is careful here: Mayella's power comes entirely from a racist system that will believe a white woman over a black man, so even her power is borrowed. Ironically, Tom's admission that he "felt right sorry for her" is what condemns him in the eyes of the jury, because a black man pitying a white woman is seen as an insult. The one person who showed Mayella kindness is the one she destroys.

In conclusion, I agree that Mayella is powerless in almost every area of her life: economically, socially and within her own family. Lee uses setting, Scout's developing perception and Mayella's broken speech to make the reader pity her deeply. However, Lee refuses to let pity excuse her. By showing that Mayella does have power at the trial and uses it to protect herself at Tom's expense, Lee suggests that powerlessness can make people cruel, and that a society built on prejudice gives even its weakest members the means to harm someone weaker still.

4b

I strongly agree that the people of Maycomb show intolerance to Boo Radley, Tom Robinson and Dolphus Raymond, although Lee presents that intolerance as taking different forms: fearful gossip towards Boo, violent and institutional racism towards Tom, and social exclusion towards Dolphus. What unites them is that each man is judged by a town that refuses to understand him. However, Lee does not present Maycomb as wholly intolerant. Through Atticus, Miss Maudie, Heck Tate

Question number

and the slowly maturing narrator, she shows that tolerance exists, even if it is in a minority and arrives too late to save Tom.

Lee introduces intolerance through Boo Radley, and she presents it at first as something children absorb from adults. Scout's early description of the Radley house, where "lived a malevolent phantom", is built from rumour: the neighbourhood whispers that he creeps out at night, eats raw animals and is responsible for small crimes. The Gothic vocabulary turns a reclusive man into a monster, and Lee's use of the adult Scout's retrospective narration lets us see how foolish these stories are even while the child Scout believes them. Miss Stephanie Crawford's gossip spreads the myth, so the community's fear of difference becomes a kind of shared entertainment. Even Boo's own family is intolerant: when Nathan Radley fills the knot-hole with cement, he cuts off Boo's only way of reaching out, and Jem's tears at this moment suggest that he is beginning to understand the cruelty involved.

Against this, Miss Maudie offers a corrective voice. Her simple statement "His name's Arthur and he's alive" restores his humanity by replacing a nickname with a real name, and she places the blame on religious extremism rather than on Boo. Structurally, Lee ends the novel by overturning the town's view. Boo, the supposed monster, saves Jem and Scout from Bob Ewell, and when Scout stands on the Radley porch she sees the street from his point of view, fulfilling Atticus's lesson that "You never really understand a person until you consider things from his point of view". Her final words that he "was real nice", and Atticus's reply that most people are when you finally see them, suggest that intolerance is a failure of seeing.

The intolerance shown to Tom Robinson is far more dangerous because it is backed

Question number

by power. The mob that arrives at the jail intends to punish him before any trial has taken place, assuming his guilt simply because he is black. Lee uses dramatic tension here: Atticus sits alone under a light, reading, as if he has been "expecting them", and the cars arrive in the darkness. Ironically, the mob is shamed into leaving by Scout, who talks innocently to Mr Cunningham about his son, reminding him that he is a father and a neighbour. Lee suggests that intolerance depends on treating people as a group rather than as individuals, and that it can be broken by a personal connection.

At the trial, however, intolerance wins. Bob Ewell's crude, animalistic language about Tom reveals how racist thinking dehumanises black people, and Mr Gilmer's contemptuous cross-examination, calling Tom "boy", shows the same attitude in a more respectable form. Tom's honest testimony that he felt sorry for Mayella causes visible offence in the courtroom, because the idea of a black man pitying a white woman threatens the town's hierarchy. The guilty verdict, despite Atticus proving Tom could not have caused Mayella's injuries, is Lee's clearest presentation of intolerance built into the legal system. Tom's death, shot seventeen times while trying to escape, completes the tragedy. Mr Underwood's editorial comparing it to "the senseless slaughter of songbirds" links Tom to the mockingbird motif, and Atticus's earlier warning that "it's a sin to kill a mockingbird" makes the town's guilt explicit: Tom was harmless and was destroyed anyway.

Dolphus Raymond experiences a quieter intolerance. Because he lives with a black woman and has mixed-race children, white Maycomb rejects him, and his children are rejected by both communities: "They don't belong anywhere." Lee's presentation of Dolphus is especially interesting because he manipulates the town's prejudice. He pretends to be drunk, carrying a paper bag that turns out to contain only Coca-Cola, so that people can explain his choices as the result of drink. Lee uses

Question number

this revelation to show how intolerant communities need simple explanations for difference. His emotional comment about the "simple hell people give other people" speaks for the novel's whole moral argument, and it is significant that he says it to children, who have not yet hardened.

Yet Lee complicates the idea that everyone in Maycomb is intolerant. Atticus defends Tom knowing he will lose, and teaches his children empathy throughout. Judge Taylor appoints Atticus deliberately, Heck Tate protects Boo at the end by insisting Bob Ewell fell on his knife, and Scout recognises that exposing Boo would be "sort of like shootin' a mockingbird". Miss Maudie notes that the jury "took a few hours", when such juries usually take minutes, which she sees as a small step forward. Lee also exposes hypocrisy among the supposedly respectable: the women of the Missionary Circle pity distant African people while speaking with contempt about their own black servants, which reveals how intolerance can hide behind piety.

In conclusion, I agree to a very great extent. Lee presents Maycomb's treatment of Boo, Tom and Dolphus as deeply intolerant, and the death of Tom shows that intolerance is not merely unkind but lethal. However, by framing the story through Scout's growing understanding and by giving voice to characters such as Atticus and Miss Maudie, Lee suggests that tolerance can be taught. The novel's hope lies in the next generation, even if it cannot save the mockingbirds of the present.

Sa

I agree to a large extent that Lennie deserves sympathy, because Steinbeck presents him as a man who causes harm without ever intending it, and who is punished by a world that has no place for him. However, Steinbeck does not make Lennie simply innocent. He is physically dangerous, at times deceptive, and his

Question number

treatment of Curley's wife is genuinely disturbing. Steinbeck's achievement is to make the reader feel sympathy and fear at the same time, so that the ending feels both inevitable and tragic.

From the opening chapter, Steinbeck uses animal imagery to shape our response. Lennie walks "the way a bear drags his paws" and drinks from the pool with his "big paw" in the water. These images present him as powerful but instinctive, more like a creature than a man, which suggests that he cannot be judged by normal moral standards. His childlike speech and his constant need to be reminded of where they are going make him seem vulnerable. When he admits "I forgot again" and hides his face against his knees in embarrassment, Steinbeck shows that Lennie is aware of his own limitations and ashamed of them, which makes his situation painful to watch.

Steinbeck also creates sympathy through Lennie's dependence on George. George's angry outbursts, calling him a "crazy bastard", and his fantasy about the easy life he could have alone, reduce Lennie to tears: "Lennie's lip quivered and tears started in his eyes". Yet it is Lennie's simple joy in their friendship that is most moving. When he joins in with the words of the dream, "because I got you to look after me, and you got me to look after you", he "laughed delightedly". The repeated ritual of the dream, almost like a bedtime story, shows how completely Lennie trusts George, and Steinbeck's structure ensures that this trust is the last thing we see.

Slim's verdict that Lennie is "jus' like a kid" both expresses and creates sympathy, because Slim is presented as the moral authority of the ranch. George's confession to Slim that he once told Lennie to jump into a river, and that Lennie nearly drowned but was grateful to him for pulling him out, shows that Lennie has no

Question number

sense of how others may exploit him. His innocence makes him a target, and the ranch is full of people who might take advantage of it.

This is clearest in the fight with Curley. Steinbeck's simile that Curley approaches "like a terrier" makes Curley seem small, yappy and aggressive, and the violent verbs as he "slashed" and "smashed" Lennie's face emphasise that the attack is unprovoked. Lennie does not fight back until George tells him to, and afterwards his repeated cry, "I didn't wanta hurt him", reveals his remorse. Steinbeck shows that Lennie's strength is a danger to him as much as to others: he is punished for a power he does not understand. Earlier, his anxious plea that the ranch is no good place and that he wants to leave foreshadows the tragedy, and his instinct proves right.

However, Steinbeck complicates our sympathy. Lennie is capable of deceit, as when he hides a dead mouse and makes "an elaborate pantomime of innocence", asking "What mouse, George?" At times he even manipulates George, offering to go off and live in the hills, having "sensed his advantage". More troubling is the death of the puppy. Lennie's anger at the dead animal, "Why do you got to get killed? You ain't so little as mice", and the fact that he "hurled it from him", shows a flash of violence and self-pity. His first concern is not the puppy but the fact that George might not let him tend the rabbits, which suggests that his fear of punishment matters more to him than the harm he has done.

This self-centred fear drives the killing of Curley's wife. Steinbeck shows Lennie's panic rising as she screams, and his repeated thoughts about George saying he has done "a bad thing" reveal that he is thinking of himself. The description that "he shook her then, and he was angry with her" is shocking because anger replaces confusion, and the flat, simple sentence makes the violence seem almost casual.

Question number

Steinbeck does not let the reader forget that a young woman has died. Yet even here, Lennie does not understand what he has done; he covers her with hay and goes to the hiding place as George told him, like a child obeying instructions.

The final chapter restores sympathy powerfully. Steinbeck returns to the peaceful pool from the opening, creating a circular structure that suggests Lennie's fate was always waiting for him. The hallucinations of Aunt Clara and the giant rabbit express Lennie's deepest fear, that George will leave him. George's gentle reassurance that he is not mad with him, and his retelling of the dream, give Lennie a peaceful death. Lennie's eager "Le's do it now" is heartbreaking because the reader knows what George is about to do. Steinbeck suggests that a quick death at the hands of the person who loves him is kinder than the lynching Curley intends.

In conclusion, I agree that Lennie deserves sympathy, but not without reservation. Steinbeck makes clear that Lennie is dangerous and that his victims are real. However, because he never intends harm, cannot understand it and depends entirely on others, Steinbeck presents him as the clearest victim of a harsh world. Our sympathy is strongest not because Lennie is blameless, but because he is helpless to be anything other than what he is.

Sb

I largely disagree that the hopes of people on the ranch are realistic. Steinbeck presents hope as something the characters need in order to endure their lonely lives, but he structures the novella so that every hope is raised only to be crushed. There is a moment, after Candy offers his savings, when the dream of the farm seems genuinely possible, and Steinbeck allows the reader to believe in it too. Yet the ending suggests that on the ranch hope is less a plan than a story people tell

Question number

to make the present bearable.

The central hope is George and Lennie's dream of a small farm. Steinbeck presents it through repetition, as George retells it in almost ritual language and Lennie joins in with the parts he knows. The phrase "live off the fatta the lan"' conveys a vision of abundance and independence, and George's hope for "our own place where we belonged" expresses a longing for belonging rather than just wealth. Most importantly, the dream is built on companionship. The inclusive pronouns in "We got a future. We got somebody to talk to that gives a damn about us" show that George and Lennie's partnership is the most real part of their hope. In this sense their hope is realistic: their friendship exists, even if the farm does not.

However, Steinbeck hints from the start that the dream may be a fiction. The way George recites it to calm Lennie, and the way Lennie demands it like a child asking for a favourite story, suggest it functions more like a fairy tale than a plan. George's instruction that Lennie should hide in the brush if he gets into trouble "like you always done before" shows that George expects failure even as he describes success. Steinbeck's circular structure, beginning and ending at the same pool, quietly suggests that nothing will change.

The hope becomes briefly realistic when Candy joins in. His offer of "three hunderd an' fifty bucks" transforms the dream from fantasy into arithmetic, and Steinbeck marks the change with a moment of stillness: "They fell into a silence. They looked at one another, amazed." The idea that "This thing they had never really believed in was coming true" is a turning point, as even George admits he had not truly believed before. For Candy, the hope is especially poignant. Having watched his old dog shot because it was useless, he fears the same fate for himself, and his regret that he ought to have shot the dog himself shows his

Question number

sense of powerlessness. The farm offers him security and dignity, and his willingness to leave his share to the others shows how much he invests in it.

Crooks's response exposes the dream's weakness. As an outsider who has seen many men pass through, he declares that "Nobody never gets to heaven, and nobody gets no land". The double negatives give his speech a weary, conversational authority, and the comparison of land with heaven suggests the dream is a kind of religious faith that never comes true. Yet even Crooks is tempted: when he hears that Candy has money, he offers to work for nothing but his keep. Steinbeck shows how powerful hope is, since it can briefly overcome the cynicism of the most isolated man on the ranch. This makes it all the more painful when Curley's wife threatens him with a lynching, and he retreats, saying he was "Jus' foolin'". His hope is crushed not by reason but by the racial power others hold over him.

Curley's wife's hopes are perhaps the least realistic of all. She believes a man once promised to put her "in pitchers", and her indignation that her letter never arrived reveals how much she has clung to the idea. Steinbeck presents her dream as naive, since she blames her mother for stealing the letter rather than questioning the man's promise. Her statement that "I coulda made somethin' of myself" is tragic because she is speaking to Lennie, who is not listening, moments before her death. Steinbeck suggests that she, like the men, has no one to share her hopes with, and that loneliness itself makes hope fragile.

The death of Curley's wife destroys every dream at once. Steinbeck uses a sombre, simple sentence as Candy realises: "Candy dropped his head and looked down at the hay. He knew." The bluntness of "He knew" shows how quickly hope collapses. George's admission, "I think I knowed from the very first", is perhaps the most important line about hope in the novella, because it reveals that even the dream's

Question number

narrator never fully believed it. In the final scene George retells the dream one last time, but now as a way to give Lennie peace before he dies. The hope has become a mercy rather than a future. Even so, Slim's quiet support for George at the end suggests that one realistic hope, friendship, may survive in a smaller form.

In conclusion, I largely disagree that the hopes of people on the ranch are realistic. Steinbeck allows the dream to come close enough to feel real, which makes its collapse more painful, but he presents the ranch as a world where powerlessness, prejudice and loneliness make such hopes impossible. The title itself suggests that the best plans tend to go wrong. Steinbeck's point seems to be that hope is necessary for survival even when it is unrealistic, and that the tragedy lies not in having dreams but in living in a world that will not let them come true.

6a

I agree to a considerable extent that Paddy's father is cruel, but Doyle presents his cruelty gradually and through the limited eyes of a ten-year-old, which makes the portrait more unsettling and more complex. At first, Da is a mixture of warmth and menace, a man whose moods dominate the house. As the marriage collapses, the menace takes over: he drinks, he hits Paddy's mother and finally he leaves. Yet Doyle also shows moments of tenderness, humour and pride, so that the reader, like Paddy, is left trying to make sense of a father who is not simply a villain but a man whose failures do real harm.

Doyle's choice of first-person narration from a child's perspective is central to how Da is presented. Paddy does not analyse his father; he records what he sees and feels in short, factual sentences, and the reader must interpret them. From early in the novel Paddy is wary: "I could never run to him; I had to check first." The semi-colon separates the instinct to run to his father from the caution that

Question number

overrides it, and the line reveals a child who has learned to read his father's face before approaching. Similarly, Paddy notes that his father "sometimes liked these questions, and sometimes he didn't", which suggests that Da's unpredictability is a form of control. The relief Paddy expresses when tension breaks, "It was alright. Normal again. He'd cracked a joke", is telling because it shows how much the family's mood depends on him.

Doyle presents Da's cruelty first through threats and possessiveness. His warning that if Paddy's plate is not empty when he returns he will "let you have what for" uses an idiom of punishment that sounds almost casual, which makes the threat more normal and therefore more disturbing. Paddy's account of his father's record, "It was his", and the fact that the television stayed off when he played it, shows a man who expects the household to arrange itself around him. When he accuses Paddy of damaging the record, his impulsiveness is clear, and Paddy's sense that his father "was going to wallop me from the look on his face" shows the fear behind ordinary family life.

As the novel progresses, Doyle charts the breakdown of the marriage through Paddy's growing awareness of the fights. He tells us "They were fighting all the time now", and the time phrase "now" marks a change that Paddy can feel but not explain. His conclusion that "My da won because my mum cried" reveals both Paddy's childish logic, which treats arguments as contests, and his recognition that his father causes his mother pain. Most shocking is the moment of physical violence, conveyed through sound rather than sight: "Then I heard the smack." The onomatopoeic "smack" is brutally simple, and the fact that Paddy hears rather than sees it places the reader in his position, outside the room and powerless. Doyle also shows Paddy trying to stay awake at night to listen, as if by keeping watch he can prevent the fights, which is heartbreaking because it shows a child

Question number

taking on responsibility for his father's behaviour.

Doyle develops Da's cruelty through his drinking and his coldness. Paddy's realisation, "He was drunk. It was new", is expressed in the same flat style as the rest of the narration, but the short sentences suggest a shock that he cannot put into words. Da's dismissive "Do what you want" shows his withdrawal from his son, and Paddy's observation that sometimes his father "didn't need reasons, he had his mood already" captures the arbitrary nature of his anger. By the end, Paddy has chosen a side, deciding that his da "had more wrong with him than my ma". Da's final act, leaving the family, is presented quietly. Paddy notices that he did not slam the door, and understands from this that he was not coming back. The restraint of the moment makes it more painful than any outburst.

However, Doyle does not present Da as wholly cruel. There are scenes of genuine affection: he puts on a deep voice to be Santy, he puts his arms around Paddy's shoulders, and when Paddy comes second he encourages him warmly: "Second's good though. Put it there". He buys the family a car and takes them on outings, and he takes an interest in teaching Paddy, explaining world events and checking his spellings. These moments matter because they show why Paddy loves and longs for his father's approval. Doyle also reminds us that Paddy is an unreliable narrator. He does not understand adult pressures, and the reader sees only fragments of his parents' marriage. Interestingly, Paddy himself is often cruel to his younger brother Sinbad, and Doyle may be suggesting that cruelty is learned and passed on, rather than simply a feature of one man's character.

The ending reinforces this ambiguity. When Da visits at Christmas, Paddy greets him with stiff, formal politeness, as though speaking to a stranger. Doyle's choice to end on this cool exchange suggests that the deepest effect of Da's behaviour is

Question number

not a single act of violence but the loss of a relationship. In conclusion, I agree that Paddy's father is cruel, particularly in his violence towards Paddy's mother, his unpredictable moods and his abandonment of the family. However, Doyle's child narrator and episodic structure create a portrait that is fragmented and human. Da is not a monster but a father who sometimes shows love and increasingly fails to, and Doyle presents his cruelty most powerfully through its effect on a boy who is forced to grow up too quickly.

6b

I agree to a large extent that life is difficult for those who live in Barrytown, although Doyle's presentation is more layered than a simple portrait of hardship. Seen through the eyes of ten-year-old Paddy, Barrytown is a place of building sites, gangs, money worries, violence and broken families. Yet because Paddy is a child, much of this difficulty is filtered through excitement, play and humour, and Doyle also shows kindness, community and moments of real happiness. The difficulty, then, is most powerful when it reaches into the home, and Doyle suggests that it is the adults who carry it most heavily, even if the children feel its effects.

Doyle presents Barrytown as a place in the middle of change. Fields are being turned into new housing, and Paddy notes that "There was no proper road outside our house for months". The detail is ordinary, but it captures the unfinished, unsettled feeling of the area. For Paddy and his friends, the building sites and pipes are a playground, and Doyle's episodic structure, moving from one adventure to the next, makes the place seem lively and exciting. However, the reader recognises the dangers the boys ignore, and the gradual loss of the fields suggests that the freedom of Paddy's childhood is disappearing along with the landscape.

Question number

Money is a constant pressure. Paddy's casual instruction to tell the shopkeeper to "put it on ma's list" reveals that families live on credit, and Doyle's choice to include it without comment shows how normal this is. The O'Connell family offers a starker image. After the death of their mother, Mr O'Connell drinks and does not cook, and the children are given a can of Ambrosia Creamed Rice each day to eat straight from the can. The brand name gives the detail a strange, comic precision, yet it reveals neglect. When Mr O'Connell "howled at the moon", the boys find it funny, but the reader understands that it is an expression of grief and breakdown. Doyle's child narrator thus allows us to see difficulty that Paddy himself cannot fully grasp.

Violence is woven into everyday life in Barrytown. The boys' games are often cruel, such as the threat that whoever ended up with the fewest sticks would have to eat a lump of tar, and fights in the playground and on the street establish a rough hierarchy. Paddy's relationship with his younger brother Sinbad is full of bullying, and teachers such as Henno use physical punishment in school. Doyle presents this violence in Paddy's matter-of-fact tone, which makes it seem normal but also suggests how deeply it has shaped the children. The final fight with Charles Leavy, in which Paddy is beaten, marks the end of his place in the gang and his growing isolation.

The greatest difficulty Doyle presents is within families. Paddy's account of his parents' arguments grows darker as the novel progresses, until he realises "There were only gaps" between the fights. This short sentence is devastating because it shows that conflict has become the normal state of the household and peace only a pause. Doyle reveals that such problems are not unique to Paddy's family. He mentions that his uncle hit his auntie, and other families suffer separation and abandonment. Paddy's mother is shown under severe strain, and Paddy's alarm

Question number

when she "didn't get up one morning" shows how quickly a child's security can be shaken. His father's drinking and eventual departure turn private difficulty into public shame, as the other boys chant at Paddy that he has no da. Even gossip adds to the hardship: Paddy repeats stories about neighbours, such as Mr Kilmartin supposedly being locked in the attic, which suggests that in a close community there is little privacy for those who are struggling.

However, Doyle does not present Barrytown as wholly bleak. There is a strong sense of community, and some figures offer comfort. Father Moloney visits the class for a chat, and Paddy says simply, "We liked him. He was nice." Even Henno, often harsh, notices that Paddy's eyes are red and that he has not had enough sleep, suggesting some awareness and concern. Paddy's mother shows warmth and resilience, able to turn crying into laughter within seconds. There are also times of genuine happiness, such as the family's day out to Dollymount, when Paddy's memory is full of light and fun. Not every family is poor: the Swanwicks are comparatively well off and their son attends a private school, which shows that Barrytown contains a range of fortunes.

Moreover, much of the novel conveys the joy of childhood. Paddy's fascination with words, facts and games, his friendship with Kevin and the gang, and his sense of adventure give Barrytown energy and humour. Doyle's use of a child's voice, with run-on sentences and leaps between subjects, captures this exuberance. It is significant that difficulty creeps in gradually: the early chapters are largely playful, while the later ones are dominated by his parents' marriage. Structurally, Doyle shows childhood innocence being eroded by adult problems.

In conclusion, I agree that life is difficult for those who live in Barrytown, especially for families facing poverty, drinking, violence and breakdown. Doyle's

Question number	
	child narrator makes these difficulties more poignant because Paddy often reports them without fully understanding them. However, Doyle balances hardship with community, humour and moments of happiness, suggesting that Barrytown is not a place of unrelieved misery but an ordinary community in which, for Paddy, childhood happiness gives way to painful understanding.
7a	I largely agree that Snowball is heroic, but Orwell presents his heroism as real yet limited: it is the heroism of the battlefield and the speech, not of the political struggle that actually decides the fate of the farm. Orwell builds Snowball up in the early chapters as brave, inventive and selfless, then exposes his weaknesses, and finally shows how his heroism is rewritten out of existence by Napoleon and Squealer. In this way Snowball's heroism becomes less a fixed quality than a story that the pigs control.
	From the start Orwell presents Snowball as the most gifted of the pigs. The narrator's aside that "it was Snowball who was best at writing" uses a superlative to mark him out, and it is Snowball who paints out MANOR FARM and replaces it with ANIMAL FARM. This is a symbolic act of liberation: he gives the farm its new identity. His rousing call, "Now, comrades, to the hayfield!", uses an imperative and the inclusive address "comrades" to unite the animals, and his wish to make it "a point of honour" to beat Jones's harvest suggests a noble pride in the animals' own labour. Unlike Napoleon, who quietly disappears while the milk vanishes, Snowball seems to lead from the front in work as well as in war.
	His heroism is most vivid at the Battle of the Cowshed. Orwell tells us that he had "studied an old book of Julius Caesar's campaigns", which presents him as a thoughtful strategist rather than a reckless fighter, and the phrase "Snowball at

Question number

the head of them" positions him literally in front of his followers. The graphic image of pellets which "scored bloody streaks along Snowball's back" is followed by the detail that, "Without halting for an instant", he "flung his fifteen stone against Jones's legs". The verb "flung" suggests total physical commitment, and the pace of the sentence mirrors his refusal to pause. Even his harsh words to Boxer, "No sentimentality, comrade!", spoken while "the blood was still dripping" from his wounds, show a soldier who has suffered for the cause. The animals' unanimous decision to create the decoration "Animal Hero, First Class" confirms that, at this point, his heroism is recognised by everyone.

Snowball is also presented as a visionary. His reduction of the Commandments to "Four legs good, two legs bad" shows a desire to make Animalism accessible to the less intelligent animals, and the windmill scheme is meant to bring electric light, heat and a shorter working week. Orwell notes that "At the Meetings Snowball often won over the majority by his brilliant speeches", which presents him as a leader who persuades rather than threatens. This is a crucial contrast with Napoleon, whose power comes from the nine dogs he has secretly raised.

However, Orwell carefully undermines this heroic image. The narrator's comparison that Snowball was "more vivacious" and "quicker in speech" than Napoleon, but "not considered to have the same depth of character", hints that his brilliance may be surface energy rather than strength. More damning is the episode of the milk and apples: "All the pigs were in full agreement on this point, even Snowball and Napoleon." The word "even" is telling, because it shows that on the very first test of equality the supposed hero sides with pig privilege. A truly heroic leader might have resisted this, and Orwell suggests that the corruption of the revolution begins with a decision Snowball shares.

Question number

Snowball's committees also reveal a certain naivety. Orwell's flat comment, "On the whole, these projects were a failure", gently mocks his enthusiasm for schemes such as the Wild Comrades' Re-education Committee. Similarly, while Snowball is lost in his plans, Napoleon "was better at canvassing support for himself in between times". Snowball does not see the threat growing beside him, and when Napoleon "urinated over the plans" he does nothing in reply. His heroism belongs to open combat; he seems unable to fight the quieter battle of manipulation, and when the dogs attack he simply "slipped through a hole in the hedge and was seen no more". The anticlimactic, almost comic verb "slipped" contrasts sharply with the forceful "flung" of the battle, suggesting that his flight is the moment his heroism ends.

Structurally, the second half of the novel shows Snowball's heroism being destroyed through propaganda. Napoleon's question about who destroyed the windmill ends in the capitalised cry "SNOWBALL!", and from then on he becomes a scapegoat: "Whenever anything went wrong it became usual to attribute it to Snowball." Squealer later tells the animals that Snowball had never received the order of Animal Hero, First Class, and that his wounds were inflicted by Napoleon's teeth. Orwell makes the reader see that heroism can be manufactured or erased by whoever controls memory. The animals' hesitant protest, "He fought bravely at the Battle of the Cowshed", is quickly crushed. By the final chapter, "Snowball was forgotten", a short, bleak sentence that shows how completely his reputation has been wiped away.

Overall, I agree that Snowball is heroic, especially in his courage, intelligence and early loyalty to the ideals of the rebellion, and Orwell clearly invites the reader to admire him more than Napoleon. Yet he is a flawed hero: complicit in the pigs' first privilege, blind to danger and unable to defend himself or the other animals

Question number

when it matters most. Perhaps Orwell's point is that personal bravery is not enough to protect a revolution, and that even a genuine hero can be turned into a villain when the truth is controlled by those in power.

7b

I only partly agree that the animals benefit from what they learn. Orwell presents learning as a source of hope and power at the start of the novel, but as the story develops he shows that knowledge is unequally shared, and that what most animals are "taught" is not understanding but obedience. The real beneficiaries of education are the pigs, and Orwell suggests that learning only frees those who are able to question and remember.

At first, learning clearly transforms the animals' lives. Old Major's speech gives them a vocabulary for their suffering and a vision of change. His call for "perfect unity, perfect comradeship in the struggle" uses repetition and the emotive abstract nouns "unity" and "comradeship" to raise their hopes beyond mere survival, and the song he teaches, "Beasts of England", becomes an anthem that binds them together. The narrator tells us that his speech had given the more intelligent animals "a completely new outlook on life", and the adjective "completely" stresses how radical this new knowledge is. Without it, the Rebellion would never have happened, so in this sense the animals benefit enormously.

The early success of the farm also depends on learning. The pigs hold secret meetings to expound the principles of Animalism, and after the Rebellion they study from Jones's old books. The harvest is described as "the biggest harvest that the farm had ever seen", a superlative which links knowledge directly to prosperity. Snowball's literacy allows him to paint out MANOR FARM and replace it with ANIMAL FARM, a symbolic act of ownership, and the narrator reports that the

Question number

reading and writing classes "were a great success", with almost every animal "literate in some degree" by autumn. At this point Orwell presents learning as a shared, democratic achievement.

However, the qualifying phrase "in some degree" begins to expose the limits of this education. Orwell carefully ranks the animals by what they can learn. The pigs master reading perfectly, while Boxer "could not get beyond the letter D", and the sheep and hens can manage little more. Boxer's failure is presented with pathos: he works hard at the alphabet but cannot hold more than a few letters at once. Orwell suggests that learning creates a hierarchy, and the line that the work of teaching and organising "fell naturally upon the pigs" is quietly ominous. The adverb "naturally" makes their superiority seem inevitable, which is exactly how the pigs later justify their privileges.

The most disturbing lesson in the novel is the one Napoleon gives the puppies. He declares that the education of the young is more important than anything that can be done for the grown animals, which sounds wise, but Orwell reveals that he has secretly raised the dogs as his private army. When they return to chase Snowball off the farm, education has become a weapon of terror. In the same way, the sheep are taught to bleat "Four legs good, two legs bad" at crucial moments in Snowball's speeches. What they learn is not an idea but a noise that drowns out debate, and by the end of the novel they have been retrained to chant "Four legs good, two legs BETTER!" The capitalised "BETTER" marks the complete reversal of Animalism, and shows how learning by rote leaves the animals defenceless against propaganda.

Squealer's speeches make this point repeatedly. He blinds the animals with figures and with mysterious work on "files", "reports", "minutes" and "memoranda". The

Question number

inverted commas suggest that these words mean nothing to the other animals, and Orwell satirises a bureaucracy which uses the language of learning to hide idleness. Because the animals cannot remember accurately or read the Commandments well, they cannot challenge the changes painted on the barn wall. Their limited education actually makes them easier to control.

Benjamin offers a different perspective. He can read as well as any pig but refuses to use this skill, saying there is nothing worth reading. His cynicism protects him from false hope, yet it does not help the others. When he finally reads the side of the van and cries "Fools! Fools!", the repeated exclamation conveys anguish, but it is too late to save Boxer. Orwell perhaps implies that knowledge which is hoarded or withheld is almost as useless as ignorance.

Overall, I agree only to a limited extent. The animals benefit from what Old Major teaches them, because it gives them the courage to rebel and a brief period of pride and plenty. Yet as the novel moves towards its circular ending, where the animals look from pig to man and cannot tell which is which, Orwell shows that most of them have learned too little to recognise that they have been betrayed. Learning benefits the pigs, who use it to dominate, far more than the ordinary animals, and Orwell's warning seems to be that education only protects a society when it teaches people to think rather than to obey.

8 Stevenson engages the reader by placing us inside the mind of a man who discovers, with mounting horror, that he is losing control of his own identity. The first-person narration makes Jekyll's confession feel intimate and urgent, and the extract moves from a single shocking image to a moment of terrible choice.

Question number

The opening focuses on one physical detail, which creates immediate suspense. Jekyll's own hand is "large, firm, white and comely", a calm list of positive adjectives, but the hand he now sees is "lean, corded, knuckly, of a dusky pallor". The harsh, sinewy sounds of "corded" and "knuckly" and the oxymoron "dusky pallor" make Hyde's hand seem unnatural, almost animal, especially as it is "thickly shaded with a swart growth of hair". The short final sentence, "It was the hand of Edward Hyde", delivers the revelation bluntly, shocking the reader just as it shocks Jekyll.

Stevenson then traces Jekyll's reactions closely. He is at first "sunk" in "the mere stupidity of wonder", before "terror woke up in my breast as sudden and startling as the crash of cymbals". The simile is loud and jarring, mirroring the sudden jolt of panic, and the verb "bounding" conveys frantic movement. His physical response, that his blood "was changed into something exquisitely thin and icy", suggests a fear so intense it feels like a chemical transformation of its own. The balanced sentence "I had gone to bed Henry Jekyll, I had awakened Edward Hyde" sums up the horror with chilling simplicity.

The reader is drawn further in by Jekyll's rhetorical questions: "How was this to be explained?" and "how was it to be remedied?" These show his mind racing. The long sentence listing the route to his drugs, "down two pairs of stairs, through the back passage, across the open court", builds tension by stressing how far he must travel without being caught. The sudden "overpowering sweetness of relief" then releases that tension, though the brief image of Bradshaw who "stared and drew back" reminds us how close he comes to discovery. Jekyll even narrates himself in the third person, "Dr. Jekyll had returned to his own shape", which suggests a self already splitting in two.

Question number

In the second half the pace slows and becomes reflective, which is just as unsettling. The allusion to "the Babylonian finger on the wall" spelling out "my judgment" gives the incident a sense of biblical doom. Jekyll's fear that Hyde "had grown in stature" and that his "better self" is being lost builds to the frightening possibility that Hyde's character might "become irrevocably mine". The word "irrevocably" stresses that the change could be permanent.

Finally, the extract ends with a dilemma. The vivid simile of Hyde remembering Jekyll as "the mountain bandit remembers the cavern" shows Hyde's cold indifference, while the balanced contrast between "more than a father's interest" and "more than a son's indifference" exposes how unequal the two selves have become. The parallel phrases "To cast in my lot with Jekyll" and "To cast it in with Hyde" present both choices as a kind of death, leaving the reader gripped by the question of which nature will win, and by the uncomfortable admission of "appetites which I had long secretly indulged".