Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2025

English Literature

Unit 1

The Study of Prose

GEL11

[GEL11]
MONDAY 12 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.
Examiners can only credit what they can read. Keep your work legible.

stemup.co.uk

Page Index to Questions

Question Number			Page Number
		Section A – Novel	
1	**Golding**	*Lord of the Flies*	3
2	**Hornby**	*About a Boy*	4
3	**Johnston**	*How Many Miles to Babylon?*	5
4	**Lee**	*To Kill a Mockingbird*	6
5	**Steinbeck**	*Of Mice and Men*	7
6	**Doyle**	*Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*	8
7	**Orwell**	*Animal Farm*	9
		Section B – Unseen Prose	
8		Unseen Prose	10

stemup.co.uk

Section A – Novel

Answer **one** question from this section.

1 Golding: *Lord of the Flies*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** Jack, show how far you agree that Jack is a **threat** to the other boys.

(b) With reference to the ways Golding **presents** the conch, show how far you agree that the conch is **important** to 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 faces **difficulties**.

(b) With reference to the ways Hornby **presents** Fiona and Ellie, show how far you agree that Fiona and Ellie are **willing** to change.

stemup.co.uk

3 Johnston: *How Many Miles to Babylon?*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** Alicia, show how far you agree that Alicia **abuses** her power.

(b) With reference to the ways Johnston **presents** friendship, show how far you agree that Alec and Jerry **cannot overcome** the barriers to their friendship.

stemup.co.uk

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

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** Jem, show how far you agree that Jem **understands** the difficulties others face.

(b) With reference to the ways Lee **presents** the people of Maycomb, show how far you agree that courage is **admired** by the people of Maycomb.

stemup.co.uk

5 Steinbeck: *Of Mice and Men*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Steinbeck **presents** Curley's wife, show how far you agree that Curley's wife is **powerless**.

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

stemup.co.uk

6 Doyle: *Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*

Answer either (a) or (b)

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

(b) With reference to the ways Doyle **presents** friendship, show how far you agree that friendship is **important** to the boys in Barrytown.

stemup.co.uk

7 Orwell: *Animal Farm*

Answer either (a) or (b)

(a) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** Boxer, show how far you agree that Boxer deserves to be **respected**.

(b) With reference to the ways Orwell **presents** the pigs, show how far you agree that the pigs' behaviour is **shocking**.

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: *Around the World in Eighty Days* by **Jules Verne**

(Phileas Fogg has placed a bet with his rich friends that he and his butler, Jean Passepartout will travel the entire way around the globe and arrive back at where they started in only eighty days.)

"Round the world!" he murmured.

"In eighty days," responded Mr. Fogg. "So we haven't a moment to lose."

"But the trunks?" gasped Passepartout, unconsciously swaying his head from right to left.

"We'll have no trunks; only a carpet-bag, with two shirts and three pairs of stockings for me, and the same for you. We'll buy our clothes on the way. Bring down my mackintosh and travelling-cloak, and some stout shoes, though we shall do little walking. Make haste!"

Passepartout tried to reply, but could not. He went out, mounted to his own room, fell into a chair, and muttered: "That's good, that is! And I, who wanted to remain quiet!"

He mechanically set about making the preparations for departure. Around the world in eighty days! Was his master a fool? No. Was this a joke, then? They were going to Dover; good! To Calais; good again! After all, Passepartout, who had been away from France five years, would not be sorry to set foot on his native soil again. Perhaps they would go as far as Paris, and it would do his eyes good to see Paris once more. But surely a gentleman so chary of his steps would stop there; no doubt—but, then, it was none the less true that he was going away, this so domestic person hitherto!

By eight o'clock Passepartout had packed the modest carpet-bag, containing the wardrobes of his master and himself; then, still troubled in mind, he carefully shut the door of his room, and descended to Mr. Fogg.

Mr. Fogg was quite ready. Under his arm might have been observed a red-bound copy of Bradshaw's Continental Railway Steam Transit and General Guide, with its timetables showing the arrival and departure of steamers and railways. He took the carpet-bag, opened it, and slipped into it a goodly roll of Bank of England notes, which would pass wherever he might go.

"You have forgotten nothing?" asked he.

"Nothing, monsieur."

"My mackintosh and cloak?"

"Here they are."

"Good! Take this carpet-bag," handing it to Passepartout. "Take good care of it, for there are twenty thousand pounds in it."

Passepartout nearly dropped the bag, as if the twenty thousand pounds were in gold, and weighed him down.

stemup.co.uk

Master and man then descended, the street-door was double-locked, and at the end of Saville Row they took a cab and drove rapidly to Charing Cross. The cab stopped before the railway station at twenty minutes past eight. Passepartout jumped off the box and followed his master, who, after paying the cabman, was about to enter the station, when a poor beggar-woman, with a child in her arms, her naked feet smeared with mud, her head covered with a wretched bonnet, from which hung a tattered feather, and her shoulders shrouded in a ragged shawl, approached, and mournfully asked for alms.

Mr. Fogg took out the twenty guineas he had just won at whist, and handed them to the beggar, saying, “Here, my good woman. I’m glad that I met you;” and passed on.

Passepartout had a moist sensation about the eyes; his master’s action touched his susceptible heart.

Two first-class tickets for Paris having been speedily purchased, Mr. Fogg was crossing the station to the train, when he perceived his five friends of the Reform.

“Well, gentlemen,” said he, “I’m off, you see; and, if you will examine my passport when I get back, you will be able to judge whether I have accomplished the journey agreed upon.”

“Oh, that would be quite unnecessary, Mr. Fogg,” said Ralph politely. “We will trust your word, as a gentleman of honour.”

“You do not forget when you are due in London again?” asked Stuart.

“In eighty days; on Saturday, the 21st of December, 1872, at a quarter before nine p.m. Good-bye, gentlemen.”

Phileas Fogg and his servant seated themselves in a first-class carriage at twenty minutes before nine; five minutes later the whistle screamed, and the train slowly glided out of the station.

The night was dark, and a fine, steady rain was falling. Phileas Fogg, snugly ensconced in his corner, did not open his lips. Passepartout, not yet recovered from his stupefaction, clung mechanically to the carpet-bag, with its enormous treasure.

Just as the train was whirling through Sydenham, Passepartout suddenly uttered a cry of despair.

“What’s the matter?” asked Mr. Fogg.

“Alas! In my hurry—I—I forgot—”

“What?”

“To turn off the gas in my room!”

“Very well, young man,” returned Mr. Fogg, coolly; “it will burn—at your expense.”

Glossary:

guineas – old-fashioned coins
whist – a card game
Reform – a gentlemen’s elite club

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.

GEL11/5
299929

Rewarding Learning

Month and Year | Candidate Number

Centre Number

General Certificate of Secondary Education

ANSWER BOOKLET

Subject

English Literature

Unit | **Component Code**

1 | **GEL11**

GEL11

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

For use in GCSE English Literature Unit 1 only

Read these instructions carefully

Do not write your name on this Answer Booklet or any other material used in this examination.

Complete in black ink only. **Do not write in pencil or with a gel pen.**

Do not use correction fluid to correct errors in your answers.

Enter your Centre Number, Candidate Number and Month and Year in the spaces above.

You must answer the questions in the spaces provided. Do not write outside the box or around each page.

Inside the booklet enter the question number and section number in the left-hand column beside your answer.

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark



Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer

Examiner Only	
Marks	Remark

[Turn over

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only	
		Marks	Remark

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

[Turn over



stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer

Examiner Only	
Marks	Remark

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer

Examiner Only	
Marks	Remark

[Turn over

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

stemup.co.uk

Question Number	Answer

Examiner Only	
Marks	Remark

Question Number	Answer	Examiner Only Marks	Examiner Only Remark

stemup.co.uk

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 Jack as the greatest threat on the island, and I largely agree with the statement. However, Golding is careful to show that Jack does not begin as a monster. He begins as an arrogant, humiliated schoolboy, and the threat he becomes grows out of the freedom of the island and the weakness of the other boys. By the end of the novel he threatens their order, their safety, their consciences and finally their lives, yet Golding's last image of him also shrinks that threat down to the size of a child.

From his first entrance Jack is presented as a figure of control. The choir arrives marching in step, dressed in black cloaks, and they are described as "wearily obedient", an adverb that suggests years of being drilled into submission rather than any loyalty or affection. When one of them faints, Jack dismisses him with "He's always throwing a faint", and the casual tone shows a callous lack of concern that foreshadows his later cruelty. Piggy instantly senses danger in the "uniformed superiority and the offhand authority in Merridew's voice". The word "offhand" is telling: Jack's authority is so natural to him that he does not even need to raise his voice. Golding suggests that the threat Jack poses is rooted in a hierarchy he brings with him from the school, which the island allows him to exaggerate.

Jack's treatment of Piggy shows how quickly that authority turns into intimidation. He repeatedly orders him to "Shut up", and the blunt imperative silences the one boy whose intelligence could save them. The intimidation becomes physical after the fire goes out and the ship passes. When Piggy cries, "You and your blood, Jack Merridew! You and your hunting! We might have gone home", the broken final

Question number

sentence captures the scale of what Jack has cost them. Jack's response is that he "smacked Piggy's head", knocking off his glasses so that one lens shatters. Golding makes the threat symbolic as well as literal: the glasses are the boys' only means of making fire, and in damaging them Jack damages their best hope of rescue.

Golding also presents Jack as a threat to democracy. At the assemblies the conch gives each boy the right to speak, but the narrator notes that Jack "had not got the conch and thus spoke against the rules; but nobody minded". The final clause is chilling because it shows that the threat is not Jack alone but the other boys' willingness to accept him. His violent energy is conveyed through aggressive verbs: "Jack slashed at one", and later he "slammed his knife into a trunk". These actions against nature suggest a need to dominate that has no clear limit, and the sudden outbursts, "Suddenly Jack shouted in a rage", make him volatile and unpredictable, a danger to anyone who challenges him.

The mask is perhaps Golding's most powerful method of showing this threat developing. Once Jack paints his face he is "safe from shame or self-consciousness behind the mask", and the word "safe" is deeply ironic, because his safety from conscience makes everyone else unsafe. Even his jokes become frightening. When the boys re-enact the hunt, Jack's suggestion that they use a littl'un in place of the pig reveals a ruthlessness that turns play into a rehearsal for murder. This prepares the reader for the frenzied dance in which Simon is killed, and for Jack's tribe, under whose rule Roger kills Piggy and the conch is destroyed. At the climax, Jack hunts Ralph across the island and sets the forest on fire to smoke him out. In his desire to punish Ralph he is willing to destroy the island that feeds them all, which suggests that by this point he threatens not only individual boys but their very survival.

Question number

However, Golding complicates the view that Jack is simply a threat. Early on he is wounded by losing the vote for chief, and the "blush of mortification" that floods his face reveals vulnerability and wounded pride. He is friendly with Ralph and Simon on the first expedition, calling out "Come on" and announcing that they are "explorers", which shows a boyish camaraderie. When he first has the chance to kill a piglet, he cannot do it, and "Jack's face was white under the freckles". This hesitation shows that the civilised taboo against killing is still strong in him. He even tries to calm the littl'uns, insisting that "fear can't hurt you any more than a dream", which suggests a protective instinct, however brief. Golding seems to want the reader to see that Jack's cruelty is learned and chosen over time, not fixed from the start.

The ending reinforces this. When the naval officer arrives, the narrative perspective shifts abruptly to adult eyes, and Jack is reduced to "a little boy" with the "remains of an extraordinary black cap on his red hair". He "started forward, then changed his mind and stood still". The leader who terrorised the island becomes small, uncertain and almost pathetic. Golding's structure makes the reader realise that the threat was never Jack's size or strength, but the darkness he released in the group.

In conclusion, I agree to a great extent that Jack is a threat to the other boys. Through his commands, his violence, his mask and his destruction of the island, Golding presents him as the force that turns a group of schoolboys into a murderous tribe. Yet Golding also shows his vulnerability and, at the end, his smallness. This suggests that Jack is most dangerous as a symbol of what lies inside all the boys, and that the real threat on the island is human nature itself.

Question number	
1b	Golding presents the conch as enormously important to the boys, but its importance is fragile and conditional. It matters only as long as the boys agree that it matters. For much of the novel it is the symbol and the tool of order, democracy and the civilised world they have left behind, yet as fear and savagery spread, its power drains away, until its destruction marks the death of that order altogether. I agree, then, that the conch is important, but Golding shows that its importance depends on the boys themselves, and that is exactly why it fails. The conch's importance is established at once. Ralph finds it in the lagoon, but it is Piggy who understands its value, remembering that a friend at home "used to blow it and then his mum would come". The memory is domestic and childlike, and it links the shell to the safety of home and to adults who answer when called. When Ralph blows it, boys appear from all over the island, and "By the time Ralph finished blowing the conch the platform was crowded". The deep, booming note acts like a summons, and Golding suggests that the boys respond to it instinctively, as if to a school bell. It is no accident that Ralph is elected chief partly because he holds it: the boys sense that whoever has the conch has authority. Golding then shows Ralph turning that symbolic power into a system. He declares, "I'll give the conch to the next person to speak", and the rule of the conch is born. The boys agree that "Where the conch is, that's a meeting", a short, confident statement that gives the shell almost legal status. Ralph "smiled and held up the conch for silence", and the gesture shows how the object allows him to lead without force. Even Jack, at first, accepts the rule: "Jack held out his hand for the conch". The fact that the most aggressive boy is willing to wait his turn shows how important the conch is in these early chapters as a check on violence.

Question number

The conch is especially important to the weaker boys. For Piggy it is his only protection against being shouted down, and his indignant "You let me speak!" shows how fiercely he clings to its promise of fairness. Simon, who is shy and struggles to speak in public, takes the conch from Piggy, who "was so astonished that he remained on his feet". The conch gives the quietest boys a voice that their personalities and the group's prejudices would otherwise deny them. Golding's description of the boys' "sudden motion towards it" when it is raised suggests a collective longing for the order it represents.

Golding also uses almost religious language to elevate the shell. It is described as "glimmering", and near the end Piggy holds out "the talisman, the fragile, shining beauty of the shell". The word "talisman" suggests a magic charm that protects its owner, while "fragile" warns that its protection can be broken. The light imagery contrasts with the darkness of the boys' savagery, making the conch a symbol of reason and goodness.

However, Golding is equally clear that the conch's power is limited. Even as he sets up the rule, Ralph reserves the right to override it, adding that the speaker "won't be interrupted. Except by me". The small exception reveals that power on the island is already more personal than democratic. Jack begins to undermine it openly, insisting that "The conch doesn't count on top of the mountain", which shows that its authority depends on place and agreement rather than any true force. Eventually he dismisses it entirely, saying that "we don't need the conch any more". As the boys fear the beast, they abandon the assemblies, and the conch becomes a shell that only Ralph and Piggy still respect. When the tribe raids them for Piggy's glasses, Ralph realises that "They didn't come for the conch". The plain statement exposes a bitter truth: what the boys really value now is fire and the power to hunt, not law.

Question number

Its destruction is the turning point. When Roger releases the rock, Piggy is killed and "the conch exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist". The violent verb "exploded" and the final, absolute phrase "ceased to exist" make the moment shockingly complete. Golding places the death of the most rational boy and the end of the conch in the same sentence, suggesting that civilisation and reason die together. Jack's triumphant cry that "The conch is gone" and that Ralph has no tribe confirms that its loss leaves the island with nothing but force.

In conclusion, I agree that the conch is important to the boys, especially to Ralph, Piggy and Simon, and that Golding presents it as the heart of their attempt to build a fair society. Yet the conch has no power of its own. It is "fragile" precisely because it depends on shared belief, and when the boys stop believing, it is shattered as easily as any shell. Golding seems to suggest that democracy and order are only as strong as the people who choose to keep them.

2a

Hornby presents Marcus as a boy surrounded by difficulties: at school, at home and inside his own head. I strongly agree that he faces them, and that many are not of his own making. However, Hornby also presents Marcus as surprisingly resourceful. He is wise beyond his years in some ways, manipulative in others, and by the end of the novel he has found people who help him carry his problems. The novel is not only about the difficulties Marcus faces, but about how a lonely boy learns to survive them.

The first difficulty Hornby establishes is that Marcus is misunderstood. "People quite often thought Marcus was being funny when he wasn't", the narrator tells us, and the dry, matter-of-fact tone captures the gap between Marcus's sincerity

Question number

and the world's reaction to it. He speaks his mind, sings out loud in class without realising it, and wears the clothes and haircut his mother chooses. He is painfully self-aware: "Marcus knew he was weird". The short declarative sentence is almost heartbreaking because he does not know how to be anything else. Hornby's use of a close third-person narrator that moves between Marcus and Will allows us to see Marcus's honest logic from the inside while also seeing how strange he appears to others.

School is presented as a place of real fear. The listing of his experiences, beginning with "That first terrible, frightening day", builds a sense of relentless pressure. He is bullied and mocked by older boys, and even the boys he thought were his friends reject him with "we don't want you hanging around with us any more". The blunt colloquial dialogue makes the rejection sound casual, which only makes it crueller. Teachers do little to help and sometimes make matters worse, dealing with the class while "leaving Marcus out of it for a moment", as if he were the problem rather than the victim. Hornby's repeated use of expletives in Marcus's thoughts suggests a boy whose usual polite vocabulary cannot contain how he feels.

Marcus's greatest difficulty, though, is his mother. Fiona's depression hangs over the household, and Marcus notices that "she cried a lot now, more than she did before". The plain, childlike phrasing shows him trying to measure something he cannot understand. When he comes home on Dead Duck Day to find that she has taken an overdose, Hornby uses a sequence of short sentences: "He couldn't speak. He didn't know what to say. He didn't cry either." The broken rhythm mirrors his shock and numbness, and the final negative, "He didn't cry either", suggests that the trauma is too large even for tears. Afterwards his anxiety pours out in questions: "But what happens when you've finished your tea? What happens when

Question number

I go back to school?" The repetition of "What happens" shows that he can no longer trust the future, and the metaphor that he "really was being taken to pieces" presents his identity as something coming apart.

New relationships bring new difficulties. When Will's lie about having a son brings Marcus into contact with Rachel, her son Ali is openly hostile, and Marcus has to cope with a jealous boy who wants to frighten him away. Ellie, the older girl who becomes his protector, is unpredictable, and Hornby's metaphor that "She could just blow up in his face any time" presents her as a kind of living explosive. Even his friendships, then, demand courage.

However, Hornby shows that Marcus is far from passive. He is the one who uncovers Will's secret, that he has invented a child to meet single mothers, and he uses it to his advantage, threatening "I'm going to tell my mum". He bluntly organises Will's role in their lives: "We're broke. You're not. You pay." The clipped sentences show a strategic, almost adult directness. Hornby notes that "Sometimes Marcus sounded as though he were a hundred years old", and the hyperbole suggests a maturity that helps him accept situations that would overwhelm other children. He can also wound deliberately: in an argument with Fiona he insists "I need a father", using the truth as a weapon to get what he wants.

Most importantly, Hornby shows Marcus building a support network. Ellie and her friend Zoe announce "We're adopting him", and in one tender scene Marcus and Ellie "sat on the pipes together" and waited until they felt ready to go back into the world. As his confidence grows in talking to adults, Hornby writes that he wished he could buy this feeling in bottles and "sip from it throughout the day". The metaphor captures how new and precious confidence is to him. By the end, after the trip to Cambridge and the crisis at the police station, Marcus has

Question number

changed: he dresses like other boys and understands that relying on just one person, his mother, was never enough.

In conclusion, I agree that Marcus faces great difficulties, from bullying and isolation to his mother's suicide attempt, and Hornby makes the reader feel their weight through short sentences, questions and painful honesty. Yet Hornby also presents him as resilient and resourceful. His difficulties do not disappear, but by the end he is no longer facing them alone, and that, the novel suggests, is what makes them bearable.

2b

Hornby presents Fiona and Ellie as two very different characters, a depressed, idealistic mother and a fierce, rebellious teenager, yet both are, in their own ways, stubbornly fixed in who they are. I would argue that both are willing to change, but only partly, and usually only when a crisis forces them to look at themselves. Fiona changes more deeply because she has more to lose, while Ellie's change is mostly in how she treats Marcus rather than in her attitude to the world.

At the start, Fiona seems unwilling to change at all. Her views on modern culture are delivered through a relentless list in which television, music and computer games are all "rubbish", and the repetition of the word reveals a closed mind. She imposes her tastes on Marcus, from his haircut to his clothes to his music, without realising how much this isolates him at school. She insists that "Marcus is doing fine", and the dramatic irony is painful because the reader knows exactly how badly he is being bullied. Hornby suggests that Fiona's refusal to adapt is a kind of blindness, a way of protecting her own beliefs at her son's expense.

Fiona's suicide attempt is the turning point that begins to change her. Afterwards

Question number

she is more honest about her illness than before, telling Will plainly: "I'm depressed. It's an illness. It just started." The short, frank sentences strip away any self-pity and show a new willingness to name what is happening to her. To Marcus she admits, "I don't feel the same as I did on Saturday, if that's any help", and the tentative final phrase shows her trying, awkwardly, to reassure him. She also apologises for a distressed call, "I am sorry about yesterday", showing that she is learning to take responsibility for the effect of her moods on others.

However, Fiona's willingness has limits. When she discovers how much time Marcus is spending with Will, she forbids it: "you're not to go round any more". The flat, commanding tone shows how threatened she feels by a relationship that she does not control, and how hard it is for her to accept that Marcus needs more than her. Even so, the climax at the police station after the trip to Cambridge pushes her to a painful admission: "I haven't been a good mother to him". This is perhaps the most important moment of change for Fiona, because she finally sees herself through Marcus's eyes. In Will's concluding summary we learn that Fiona has lost "a big chunk of Marcus" but has managed to "stay away from the casualty ward". The balance of loss and survival in this sentence suggests that her change is real but costly: she must let Marcus grow away from her in order to stay well.

Ellie, by contrast, is introduced as defiantly unwilling to change. Her refusal at school is absolute: "I'm not changing the sweatshirt", she declares, and the sweatshirt, with Kurt Cobain's face on it, becomes a symbol of her identity. Even when Marcus repeatedly asks her about dancing, she replies "Of course I wouldn't like to dance! I couldn't think of anything worse!" The exclamatory sentences show her contempt and her pleasure in shocking people. When Marcus, drawing on what happened to his mother, tries to tell her the truth about Kurt Cobain's talk of suicide, she "laughed her low nobody-understands-me laugh". Hornby's compound

Question number

adjective is gently satirical: it exposes Ellie's self-dramatising pose as the misunderstood outsider.

Yet Hornby shows Ellie changing in her attitude to Marcus. At first she finds him ridiculous, but soon she greets him warmly with "Marcus! My man!", and the exclamation signals genuine affection. Hornby uses a striking image to show her commitment: "Ellie was like a guided missile in school", and Marcus comes to see her as his personal guided missile. The simile is comic, but it suggests that Ellie's aggression, once turned against him, is now aimed at protecting him. When she realises that she has forgotten his mother's illness, her apology is full of repetition: "I don't know anything about this stuff. I don't know...why your mum feels like she does." The repeated "I don't know" shows a new humility in a girl who usually acts as if she knows everything. She also offers to go with him to Cambridge, asking "you don't want to go up there on your own, do you?", and the rhetorical question shows her quietly taking care of him. At times her voice becomes "a small voice that didn't sound like her", which suggests that tenderness is so unfamiliar to Ellie that it almost changes her identity.

Nevertheless, Ellie does not abandon her rebellion. After Kurt Cobain's death, it is Ellie who smashes the shop window displaying his cardboard image, an act of grief and anger that leads to her arrest. This shows that her emotions remain volatile and her defiance of authority remains intact.

In conclusion, I agree to a considerable extent that Fiona and Ellie are willing to change, but Hornby presents their change as partial and hard won. Fiona moves from denial to honesty and finally to letting Marcus go, while Ellie becomes kinder and more protective but stays the same fierce rebel. Hornby seems to suggest that people rarely transform completely; instead, through their connections with others,

Question number

especially Marcus, they learn to bend.

3a

Johnston presents Alicia Moore as a beautiful, cold and manipulative woman who uses every form of power available to her: her status as mistress of the house, her hold over her husband and, above all, her authority as Alec's mother. I strongly agree that she abuses that power. Yet Johnston also suggests that her power is narrower and more fragile than it first appears, and by the end of the novel Alec has escaped it, even if the cost of escape is his own life.

Alicia's abuse of social power is shown early in her treatment of Mr Cave, Alec's tutor. She demands his dismissal not because of his teaching but because he is ill and poor, complaining of him "Dragging his disease and poverty into my drawing-room". The possessive "my" reveals her sense of ownership over the house, and her sneering alliteration reduces a sick man to an inconvenience. Her request, "You will write, won't you", is followed by Alec's comment that "It was a command more than a question". Johnston's first-person retrospective narration lets the adult Alec expose how even her politeness is a disguise for control.

Her power over the household extends to the doctor. Frederick accuses her directly: "You know perfectly well that Dr. Desmond will say anything you want him to say". Alec is labelled delicate and kept at home, educated by tutors rather than sent to school, which isolates him from other boys and makes his secret friendship with Jerry all the more precious. Johnston suggests that Alicia shapes her son's whole childhood to suit her own need for control and company.

The most painful abuse is emotional. Alicia gives affection only as a reward for obedience: "She caressed my cheek briefly with a finger". The adverb "briefly" and

Question number

the single "finger" make the gesture cold and rationed, as though love were a currency she spends carefully. At other times she dismisses him: she "snapped her fingers at me, rather as if I were a dog". Alec's simile shows how small and degraded he feels, an animal to be summoned rather than a son to be loved. She also places the burden of her happiness on him, telling him "You are old enough now to be a good companion. To take good care of me". The short second sentence reverses the natural order of parent and child, so that Alec must protect his mother instead of being protected. When she decides that she has "always wanted to travel", Alec is simply taken with her, and his narration becomes flat and passive: "We went to Europe. We looked at classical antiquities." The plain sentences suggest a boy carried along by another person's will.

Alicia's treatment of Frederick is equally cruel. She humiliates him in front of their son: "Oh, Frederick, you do become so boring when you talk on about nothing like that." The repetition of "nothing" and the mocking "On and on" make him sound empty and pointless, even when he is agreeing with her. She tells him, "You have always been an ineffective man", using her intimate knowledge of him as a weapon. Frederick's quiet reply, that he hopes Alec never experiences "the humiliation of living with someone who is completely indifferent to you", reveals years of damage. Alicia also uses her power to divide father and son, insisting that she has "no intention of remaining alone in this house with you".

Her ultimate abuse of power comes when war breaks out. She wants Alec to enlist and believes she can decide for him, claiming that "Here he has no choice". When Frederick resists, saying "Ponder deeply before you take away my son", she produces her most devastating weapon. "Suppose he were not your father?" she asks Alec, and Johnston describes her as "half frightened, half triumphant, very much alive". The balanced phrasing suggests that cruelty energises her, and the

Question number

phrase "very much alive" is chilling in a novel so full of death. She uses a secret, true or false, to destroy Alec's sense of who he is and so push him into the army, and ultimately to his death.

However, Johnston complicates the view of Alicia as all-powerful. Alec's opening narration distances him from her: "My heart doesn't bleed for her". The flat idiom suggests that her power over his feelings has already gone. Frederick's apparent weakness also enables her: his voice shows "little emotion", yet he twists his hands "in a gesture of incredible violence", a detail that implies suppressed rage that he never turns into action. Johnston hints that Alicia's cruelty may come from jealousy and fear: it "angered her more and more" to watch the affection between Alec and Frederick, and Frederick observes that a beautiful woman must always have "in front of you the prospect of decay". Her power is based on beauty, which will fade. Finally, Alec rejects her completely. When she touches his face, "I shook it away as I would a fly", and his last words to her, "I don't believe you. I never will believe you", deny her any control over his identity.

In conclusion, I agree that Alicia abuses her power, over her son, her husband and those beneath her, and that this abuse drives Alec towards the war that will kill him. Yet Johnston presents her power as hollow at its core. It depends on beauty, on Frederick's passivity and on Alec's obedience, and once Alec refuses to believe her, she becomes no more than a fly to be brushed away.

3b

Johnston presents the friendship between Alec and Jerry as one surrounded by barriers: class, family, nationality, politics and finally the brutal hierarchy of the army. In one sense I agree that they cannot overcome these barriers, because society never allows their friendship to exist openly, and it ends with one friend

Question number

dead and the other awaiting execution. Yet Johnston also presents a friendship that refuses to be destroyed. In the final scene Alec chooses Jerry over every rule and every barrier, so the tragedy is not that the friendship fails, but that the world around it does.

The first barrier is class. Alec is the only child of the Anglo-Irish landowners at the big house, while Jerry is a village boy whose family depends on work and wages. Jerry is aware that he is being pushed early into adulthood: "I'll not be a child much longer". He also sees that if he worked on the Moore estate the friendship would become impossible: "I'd be working for you. It would be different." The short final sentence is quietly devastating, because Jerry understands, more clearly than Alec, that economic dependence would turn equals into master and servant.

Alicia is the most forceful embodiment of this barrier. Alec describes how "My mother's mouth would purse up with disapproval, her voice rise alarmingly", and the physical detail turns her prejudice into something almost grotesque. When she discovers the friendship, her commands are absolute: "Well, no more Jerry. No Jeremiah", and later "I forbid it. Absolutely." The use of Jerry's full name sounds mocking, and the one-word sentence "Absolutely" leaves no room for argument. Even Frederick, who loves his son, fails to support him, admitting that "your mother's right. It's an unsuitable relationship". The adult world speaks with one voice, and the boys are left to meet in secret, swimming in the lake and racing horses in the hills.

Nationality and politics form another barrier. Jerry echoes the rhetoric of men who say "We are going to fix the British", and he intends to use the military training he receives to fight for Ireland. Later his politics harden: "I know the only way to

Question number

get them out is to shoot them out". The blunt, repetitive phrasing contrasts sharply with Alec's detached refusal to commit to any cause. When Jerry's links with the Shinners come up, Alec warns him to "Keep your bloody mouth shut", and the harsh imperative shows the danger of such talk, but also the strain it places on their friendship.

The army makes the barriers formal and enforceable. Alec is an officer and Jerry a private, and Jerry jokes that he must leave "before they court-martial me for hob-nobbing with an officer". The humour hides a real threat. In public they must act as strangers: "He saluted. I turned and walked away as fast as I could." The short sentences convey Alec's discomfort, and the image of Jerry "almost running to keep up" is poignant, as though he is still trying to be close to Alec while the system drags them apart. In anger, the old divisions come out in their insults: "Damn your bloody peasant habits", and "damn your bloody landlord manners". The parallel structure shows that class can never be completely forgotten, even between friends. Major Glendinning is the most uncompromising barrier of all. Johnston describes his "eyes becoming thin angry slits in his grey face", and the description makes him seem cold and almost inhuman. Even a moment of tenderness is checked by an officer's remark that "it would have been more sensible to call your orderly". Finally, when Jerry is condemned for leaving his post to search for his missing father, Glendinning orders: "You will command the firing squad at eight o'clock tomorrow morning". The cold precision of the time suggests that Glendinning aims to destroy both Jerry and the friendship in one act.

However, Johnston presents a friendship that keeps overcoming these barriers. From their first meeting, Jerry is welcoming: "There's lots of room for both of us". When he "held out his hand" and Alec "clasped it", the gesture establishes an equality that society denies them. Alec imagines a future together, "We'll go and

Question number

be heroes together", a romantic hope that shows how central Jerry is to his life. Simply looking at Jerry comforts him: "I felt better as I looked at him than I had felt for some time". When Jerry returns from his search, Alec defies Glendinning's disapproval: "I put an arm round him and pulled him tight to me". The physical closeness openly challenges army hierarchy.

The ending is the friendship's greatest victory and its greatest tragedy. Rather than let Jerry face the firing squad, Alec visits him in his cell and shoots him himself, while Jerry is singing. Johnston writes that "He fell slowly away from me, his fingers pulling slowly out of my hand". The repetition of "slowly" stretches out the final moment of touch, and the hands that met in friendship at the start now part in death. Alec knows that he will be executed for this, and the novel's circular structure, which opens and closes with him awaiting his own death, frames the whole story as the cost of that loyalty.

In conclusion, I agree that Alec and Jerry cannot overcome the barriers to their friendship in the outside world: class, family, politics and the army defeat them. Yet in their personal loyalty they overcome every barrier. Johnston seems to suggest that true friendship can survive anything except a society determined to destroy it, and Alec's final act shows that he values his friend more than his own life.

4a

Lee presents Jem as a boy who learns to understand the difficulties others face, but his understanding is earned slowly and painfully rather than given to him from the start. I largely agree with the statement, but only for the Jem of the later chapters. At the beginning of the novel his sympathy is real but limited, and his treatment of Boo Radley and Mrs Dubose shows a child who sees other people as

Question number

characters in his own games. Through Scout's retrospective first-person narration, Lee lets us watch Jem grow into understanding, while also suggesting that the more he understands, the more it hurts him.

Even early on, Jem shows flashes of an instinctive understanding of other people's hardship. When Scout rubs Walter Cunningham's nose in the dirt, it is Jem who stops her and offers, "Come on home to dinner with us". The simple, generous invitation shows that Jem grasps something Scout does not: that Walter's poverty is not his fault, and that humiliating him for it is cruel. Lee places this kindness beside Scout's hot temper so that the contrast between the siblings is clear, and the reader senses that Jem is already a step ahead of his sister in reading the feelings of others.

However, Lee is careful not to make Jem a saint, and his treatment of Boo Radley shows how little he first understands. His description of Boo as "about six-and-a-half feet tall" and a man who "dined on raw squirrels" is a gothic fantasy built from gossip. Lee makes it clear that the source is unreliable: Jem gets most of his information from Miss Stephanie Crawford, "a neighbourhood scold". The exaggeration is comic, but it is also unkind, because it turns a lonely and damaged man into a monster for the children's entertainment. Jem's games, acting out the Radley story and daring each other to touch the house, show that at this stage he does not consider Boo's feelings at all. His idea that coaxing Boo out is "sort of like making a turtle come out" reduces a human being to an animal to be poked.

The turning point in Jem's understanding of Boo comes through the gifts in the knot-hole. When Nathan Radley fills it with cement, Jem realises that the gifts were Boo's attempt at friendship and that it has been brutally cut off. Scout

Question number

notices that he has been crying, and that "his face was dirty in the right places". This detail is a brilliant example of Lee's narrative method: Scout reports the evidence without fully interpreting it, so the reader understands Jem's grief before she does. Jem's silence about the incident suggests that he has begun to see Boo not as a ghost but as a prisoner.

Mrs Dubose provides the clearest test of whether Jem can understand another person's suffering. At first he cannot. Scout recalls that Jem would say she "must not be very sick, she hollered so", which shows how literally he reads her behaviour. When she insults Atticus, he takes violent revenge and does not calm down until he has cut the tops off every camellia bush she owns. Lee presents this as a loss of control, the destruction of something beautiful in a burst of fury. Yet the reading sessions which follow become a kind of education. After her death, Atticus reveals that she was fighting a morphine addiction and calls her "the bravest person I ever knew". When she leaves Jem a single camellia, his first reaction is anger, but Scout later sees him "fingering the wide petals". The symbol of the flower, which he once destroyed and now holds gently, suggests that he is beginning to understand that a person can be both unpleasant and admirable, and that suffering can hide behind bad temper.

The trial deepens Jem's understanding but also shows its limits. He is so certain of Tom Robinson's innocence that the verdict shatters him, and his face is "streaked with angry tears" as he says "It ain't right". Lee shows that Jem understands Tom's difficulty, in the sense that he sees the injustice clearly, but he cannot yet understand the town that produced it. His simile afterwards, comparing his old self to "a caterpillar in a cocoon", captures how protected he had been, and how painful it is to emerge into an adult world where good people fail to act.

Question number	
	In the later chapters Jem tries hard to make sense of Maycomb's divisions. His theory of the "four kinds of folks" and his belief that it is about "how long your family's been readin' and writin'" are earnest, if over-confident, attempts to explain class and prejudice. The most moving moment comes when he says he is beginning to understand why Boo has stayed shut up in the house: "it's because he wants to stay inside." This is a profound reversal of the opening chapters. The boy who once wanted to drag Boo out now accepts that Boo's isolation may be a sensible response to a cruel world. Lee also gives Jem small gestures of compassion, such as telling Scout not to squash a roly-poly bug, which echoes the novel's central idea that it is a sin to harm the harmless. Overall, I agree that Jem comes to understand the difficulties others face, and Lee's structure, which follows him from careless games to painful insight, makes this growth the backbone of the novel. Yet his understanding is never complete or comfortable. Lee suggests that genuine understanding of others comes at a cost, and that for Jem, growing up means learning that the world is more unjust, and people more complicated, than he ever imagined.
4b	Lee presents a town that admires courage, but only certain kinds of courage. Physical bravery and quiet endurance are celebrated by almost everyone in Maycomb, yet the moral courage to challenge the town's racial and social codes is admired by a small and often silent minority, while many resent it. I therefore agree only partly with the statement. Through Scout's retrospective narration, Lee exposes the gap between the courage Maycomb claims to value and the courage it is prepared to honour when it matters. The clearest example of admired courage is Atticus shooting the mad dog, Tim

Question number

Johnson. Lee builds tension through the eerie stillness of the street and the slow, staggering approach of the dog, so that Atticus's single shot feels like a moment of almost mythic heroism. The response of the townspeople is immediate. Heck Tate, grinning at Jem, begins "Didn't you know your daddy's" before stopping himself, and Miss Maudie reveals that Atticus was once known as the deadest shot in Maycomb County. Her challenge, "still think your father can't do anything?", shows how quickly the children's view of him is transformed. Earlier, Scout complained that Atticus was "feeble" and never went hunting; Lee uses this contrast to show how easily people, including children, admire visible displays of strength. Significantly, though, Miss Maudie explains that Atticus has chosen not to use this talent, hinting that the courage Lee values most is not the courage of a gun.

Lee develops this idea through Mrs Dubose. To the children she is a monster, and Jem's destruction of her camellias shows their contempt for her. Only after her death does Atticus reveal that she was fighting to free herself from morphine before she died, and he calls her "the bravest person I ever knew". The superlative is deliberately surprising, because it is attached to the least likeable character in the street. Atticus defines courage as "when you know you're licked before you begin but you begin anyway", and the idiomatic, almost folksy phrasing makes this a lesson the children can carry with them. Crucially, though, it is Atticus who admires her, not Maycomb. The town sees only a bad-tempered old woman, which suggests that the private, unglamorous courage of endurance goes largely unrecognised.

The trial of Tom Robinson is where Lee tests Maycomb's admiration most severely. Atticus's decision to defend Tom properly is an act of moral courage, and for the Black community it is deeply admired. As Atticus leaves the courtroom after the

Question number

verdict, the people in the balcony rise to their feet, and Reverend Sykes tells Scout, "Miss Jean Louise, stand up. Your father's passin'." Lee places this silent tribute straight after the injustice of the verdict, so that the dignity of the gesture shines all the more brightly. The next morning the Finch kitchen is filled with gifts of food, and Atticus is moved to tears. This community, which has the least power in Maycomb, is the one which most openly honours courage.

Among the white townspeople, admiration is far more limited and often hidden. Miss Maudie insists that Atticus keeping the jury out so long was a sign of progress, and at the missionary tea she quietly but sharply defends him against Mrs Merriweather. Mr Underwood, who claims to despise Black people, guards the jail with a shotgun and writes an editorial condemning Tom's death. Lee seems to suggest that some people admire Atticus's courage without being brave enough to say so publicly. Even Heck Tate's final decision to protect Boo Radley, arguing that dragging a shy man into the limelight would be a sin, shows a sheriff who admires Boo's courage in saving the children and is prepared to bend the law to honour it.

Yet Lee makes it equally clear that much of Maycomb despises moral courage when it threatens the established order. The lynch mob at the jail sees Atticus's stand not as admirable but as an obstacle, and the tension is only broken by Scout's innocent conversation with Mr Cunningham. Throughout the novel Atticus and his children are taunted with racist insults by people such as Mrs Dubose and Cousin Francis, which shows that his defence of Tom is regarded as a betrayal. At the missionary tea, Lee's satire is sharp: Mrs Merriweather describes those who supported Tom as people who thought they were doing the right thing but who only stirred things up, condemning Atticus while sitting in his own house. Bob Ewell's attack on the children is the most extreme response, revealing that for some, moral courage provokes hatred rather than admiration.

Question number

Scout herself learns to admire courage by the end. At the missionary tea, after the news of Tom's death, she watches Aunt Alexandra regain her composure and decides that if Aunty could be a lady at a time like this, so could she. This quiet moment shows that Scout has absorbed Atticus's lesson about courage as endurance. The novel's final act of courage, Boo Radley's rescue of the children, is acknowledged most simply by Atticus's words, "Thank you for my children, Arthur."

In conclusion, Lee presents courage as admired in Maycomb only selectively. Physical bravery is praised, and a few individuals, especially in the Black community, honour moral courage openly. But the town as a whole cannot bring itself to admire courage that challenges its prejudices, which is perhaps Lee's most powerful criticism of Maycomb: it admires bravery most when it costs the town nothing.

Sa

Steinbeck presents Curley's wife as a woman who is fundamentally powerless, trapped by her marriage, her gender and her isolation on the ranch. She does have moments of power, most frighteningly over Crooks, but these are brief and cruel, and they come from her place in the ranch's hierarchy rather than from any real control over her own life. I therefore largely agree with the statement, while recognising that Steinbeck deliberately makes her both a victim and, at times, a victimiser.

The most striking sign of her powerlessness is that she is never given a name. She is only ever "Curley's wife", a label which defines her entirely through her husband and reduces her to a possession. Steinbeck reinforces this before she even appears, through the gossip of the men. Candy introduces her by spreading rumours that

Question number

she has "the eye", claiming "I seen her give Slim the eye", so her reputation is formed before she speaks a word. His crude reference to the glove "fulla vaseline" suggests that Curley's interest in her is purely physical. She is presented to the reader as an object of suspicion and desire, and she has no power over the story the men tell about her.

When she does appear, Steinbeck frames her in a way that both emphasises and limits her. The light in the bunkhouse doorway is suddenly cut off, and she stands there with "full, rouged lips" and red fingernails. The colour red suggests danger and sexuality, and George immediately labels her "jail bait" and a "rattrap". Her repeated excuse that she is looking for Curley sounds false, yet it is also revealing: she has no reason to be anywhere except as an extension of her husband. Steinbeck places her in doorways throughout the novel, never fully inside the men's world, which structurally suggests her exclusion.

Her loneliness is the clearest evidence of her powerlessness. In the barn scene, she tells Lennie that she is not allowed to talk to anyone except Curley, or "he gets mad". Her question, "Think I don't like to talk to somebody ever' once in a while?", is defensive and desperate at once. As the only woman on the ranch, she has no allies; the men avoid her because they fear Curley, so her isolation is enforced by the very marriage that was supposed to give her a place. Steinbeck uses her long, unpunctuated outpouring to Lennie, who barely listens, to show how starved she is of being heard. She admits that she does not like Curley, and that her marriage was a reaction to disappointment rather than love.

Her dream of Hollywood shows that even her hopes have been controlled by others. She believes a man told her she "coulda been in the movies" and promised to write, but the letter never came, and she suspects her mother stole it. The

Question number

pathos lies in the gap between her belief and the reader's understanding that she was almost certainly deceived. Like George and Lennie's dream of the farm, her dream is presented as something that will never come true, which links her to the powerlessness of all the ranch's outsiders.

However, Steinbeck does give her one terrifying moment of power. In Crooks's room, when Crooks tells her to leave, she turns on him with the threat, "I could get you strung up on a tree so easy it ain't even funny." The casual, almost conversational phrasing makes the threat more chilling, because she knows it is true. Steinbeck describes Crooks reducing himself to nothing, and she also mocks Candy, laughing at him and dismissing his talk as "Baloney". In this scene she exploits the only power available to her, the power of a white woman over a Black man in a racist society. Yet this power is borrowed from a system that also oppresses her, and it is significant that it can only be used against someone even weaker. Some readers might also argue that she chose to marry Curley, though her own account suggests the choice was made in disappointment and haste.

Her death is the final and most complete expression of her powerlessness. Lennie, frightened by her screams, shakes her until "her body flopped like a fish". The simile is brutal, reducing her to a helpless creature, and it echoes the way Lennie has unintentionally killed mice and the puppy, placing her among the small, soft things destroyed by his strength. Steinbeck then describes her face after death as peaceful, with the meanness and the ache for attention gone, so that she looks "very pretty and simple". It is as if she can only be seen sympathetically once she can no longer speak. Even then she is denied respect: Candy, blaming her for ruining the dream, calls her a "God damn tramp" and a "lousy tart", and Curley's response is not grief but a desire for revenge on Lennie.

Question number

In conclusion, I strongly agree that Curley's wife is powerless. Her brief cruelty to Crooks shows that she can wound others, but Steinbeck presents it as a symptom of her desperation rather than real power. Nameless, isolated, deceived and finally killed, she is one of the novel's most tragic figures, and Steinbeck seems to use her to show how a harsh world crushes those who have no one to stand beside them.

5b

Steinbeck presents a ranch on which cruelty is everywhere, but I would argue that much of it is not deliberate. Curley and, at moments, Crooks and Candy are deliberately cruel, taking pleasure in hurting those weaker than themselves. Far more often, however, the workers' cruelty is careless, born of loneliness, insecurity and a hard life that has left little room for kindness. I therefore only partly agree with the statement, and Steinbeck balances the cruel men with figures such as Slim and George who show that compassion is possible even here.

Curley is the clearest example of deliberate cruelty. From his first appearance, Steinbeck describes his glance as "at once calculating and pugnacious", and the adjective "calculating" makes it plain that his hostility is planned rather than instinctive. Candy explains that Curley picks fights with big men because he is small, and that the ranch hands feel he "ain't givin' nobody a chance". He targets Lennie precisely because Lennie is large and harmless. When he finally attacks him, Steinbeck writes that Curley stepped over to Lennie "like a terrier", a simile that presents him as small, snapping and aggressive. The fight itself is narrated in the punchy language of a boxing report: Curley "slashed at Lennie with his left, and then smashed down his nose with a right." The violent verbs and the rhythm of the sentence show how deliberate and practised his cruelty is, while Lennie, terrified, does not even defend himself until George tells him to.

Question number

Crooks's treatment of Lennie is another moment of deliberate cruelty, though Steinbeck makes it more complex. When Lennie wanders into his room, Crooks torments him by suggesting that George might never come back. Steinbeck writes that "Crooks' face lighted with pleasure in his torture." The word "torture" is shockingly strong, and "lighted" suggests a kind of glow of satisfaction. Yet Steinbeck immediately reveals the cause: Crooks has been forced to live alone because he is Black, and he explains that a man goes crazy if he has nobody. His cruelty is deliberate, but it is the cruelty of a man who has been made to suffer and wants, for once, to see someone else feel the same fear. Steinbeck invites us to understand him even as we condemn what he does.

Carlson's insistence on shooting Candy's old dog shows a different kind of cruelty, one that is insensitive rather than malicious. He complains about the smell and argues that the dog is old and suffering, offering to shoot him in the back of the head so he would never feel it. In a sense Carlson believes he is being kind. However, Steinbeck's structure exposes his lack of feeling: during the long, unbearable silence after Carlson leads the dog away, the men try to fill the space with small talk while Candy lies on his bunk staring at the ceiling. Carlson's later act of cleaning his gun shows he has not considered Candy's grief at all. The cruelty here lies in thoughtlessness, and it foreshadows the ending, when George must kill Lennie in exactly the same way.

The workers' treatment of Curley's wife shows how casually cruel their language can be. They call her a "tart" and joke about her, and even Whit mocks both her and Curley, saying that Curley spends half his time looking for her and the rest of the time she is looking for him. Most shocking is Candy's outburst after her death, when he calls her a "God damn tramp" and says she is no good now. Steinbeck

Question number

shows this as deliberate, vicious anger, but again it grows from grief: Candy has just realised that his dream of the farm has died with her. Curley's response, by contrast, is coldly vengeful, as he vows to shoot Lennie himself, and his concern is for revenge rather than his dead wife.

Steinbeck clearly does not present all the ranch workers as cruel. Slim's "very gentle" voice and his quiet authority make him a moral centre on the ranch. He understands Lennie immediately, recognising that he is not mean, and he is the only man who comforts George at the end. When Curley's wife is found dead, Slim goes quietly over to her and feels her wrist, a small and respectful gesture that contrasts sharply with Candy's insults. George, too, is not cruel. He admits that he once played tricks on Lennie, telling him to jump into a river even though he could not swim, but he says he stopped because he felt ashamed. His final act, shooting Lennie in the back of the head, is the opposite of deliberate cruelty; it is a desperate act of love, intended to spare his friend from Curley's mob.

Finally, Steinbeck's closing line, Carlson's puzzled question about what is eating George and Slim, captures the problem perfectly. Carlson is not deliberately cruel at this moment; he is simply incapable of understanding grief. Steinbeck suggests that the greatest cruelty on the ranch is this emotional blindness.

In conclusion, I agree that some of the ranch workers, especially Curley, are deliberately cruel, and Steinbeck uses powerful animal imagery and violent verbs to show it. Yet most of the cruelty in the novel is careless or born of suffering, and the kindness of Slim and George proves that cruelty is not inevitable. Steinbeck seems to suggest that a world of isolated, rootless men breeds unkindness, rather than that these men are simply cruel by nature.

Question number

6a

Doyle presents Sinbad as a character who deserves a great deal of sympathy, because he is the main victim of his older brother's cruelty and is caught, like Paddy, in the slow collapse of his parents' marriage. However, Doyle complicates our response. As the novel progresses, Sinbad grows stronger, learns to resist Paddy and withdraws into a silence that Paddy cannot reach, and by the end it is arguably Paddy, not Sinbad, who seems the lonelier of the two. I largely agree with the statement, but Doyle's use of Paddy as narrator means that our sympathy for Sinbad is always filtered through someone who often refuses to feel it himself.

The first reason Sinbad deserves sympathy is the physical pain inflicted on him. Doyle's account of the lighter fuel incident is horrifying because it is told in Paddy's matter-of-fact voice. The flame "went like a dragon", a childish simile that makes the moment sound almost like an adventure, which only highlights the gap between Paddy's excitement and Sinbad's agony. Later Paddy remembers that "His face had gone red, then purple, and one of the screams went on for ever". The colour sequence and the hyperbole of a scream that lasts "for ever" convey the intensity of the pain, while the image of his mother who "started to untie his hands" afterwards emphasises how helpless and trapped he was. The reader feels a sympathy that Paddy, at the time, seems unable to express.

Doyle also makes us sympathise with Sinbad because Paddy is so openly cruel to him. Paddy admits, without shame, "I loved getting him into trouble". The verb "loved" is chilling in its honesty. Paddy's tormenting is often petty, as when he squashes Sinbad's hand and makes him smash his biscuits "into crumbs that were too small to rescue". The precise detail of crumbs too small to rescue shows how carefully Paddy denies his brother even the smallest pleasure. The suitcase episode is even more disturbing: Paddy wants to hear Sinbad "kicking, crying, scratching his hands on the lid" before letting him out. The list of verbs builds a picture of

Question number

panic that Paddy actively wants to create. Because Paddy narrates these moments so casually, Doyle invites us to judge him, and our sympathy shifts towards the brother who has no voice of his own in the novel.

Sinbad is also humiliated by others. Martin and Terence make him walk home wearing glasses, with a stick they have painted white, mocking him as if he were blind. At school, Henno picks on him for crying, and even Paddy recognises that "something really unfair was happening; something nearly mad." The phrase "nearly mad" is revealing, because it is one of the rare moments when Paddy steps outside his own cruelty and sees Sinbad clearly. His recognition that Henno "didn't know him" and "just picked on him" makes Sinbad seem small and defenceless in an adult world that is as harsh as the world of the boys.

Sinbad's home life adds to the sympathy we feel. Their father loses patience with him at mealtimes, threatening that if the plate is not empty when he comes back he will let him have "what for". As the parents' arguments grow worse, Paddy, who understands more than his brother, uses that knowledge to taunt him, telling him that their mother "won't care". This is perhaps the cruellest moment of all, because Paddy exploits the family's breakdown, which is the deepest fear of both boys, to wound someone who cannot yet understand what is happening.

However, Doyle does not allow Sinbad to remain simply a victim. As he grows, he becomes harder to control: Paddy notices that when he pushes Sinbad's face towards the gas, Sinbad pushes back and "wasn't as easy to control as he used to be". Sinbad is also good at sport, and even a reluctant Paddy admits that he was "brilliant". Most strikingly, he develops a way of withdrawing from pain altogether. Paddy says that he could beat him in fights, but that Sinbad would simply let him and then go away, and that "He could stop everything happening, and I couldn't."

Question number

When Paddy tries to hug him, it is like "hugging a statue". The metaphor suggests a boy who has made himself hard and unreachable, a kind of strength, but also a sign of how deeply he has been hurt. At times Sinbad even turns the tables, mocking his brother by drawing out his name as "Pah-trick".

By the end of the novel, Doyle seems to reverse the balance of sympathy. Paddy admits that he was "frightened and lonely, more, than he was", and feels that it was as if Sinbad "had become me and I was him." This reversal suggests that Sinbad's silence protects him in a way that Paddy's anxious watchfulness cannot.

In conclusion, I agree that Sinbad deserves sympathy, because Doyle shows him suffering at the hands of his brother, other children, teachers and a fractured family. Yet Doyle's structure, which moves from Sinbad's helplessness to his withdrawn resilience, makes our sympathy more complicated. Sinbad survives by shutting himself off, and the novel suggests that this, too, is a kind of damage that deserves our compassion.

6b

Doyle presents friendship as enormously important to the boys in Barrytown, especially to Paddy, for whom belonging to the gang offers excitement, identity and an escape from the growing tension at home. Yet Doyle also shows that this friendship is fragile, competitive and frequently cruel, held together as much by shared hatred as by affection. I agree that friendship is important to the boys, but Doyle suggests that what they value is less true friendship than the security of belonging, and that this security can disappear overnight.

Doyle conveys the importance of friendship through the collective voice of Paddy's narration. In the boys' games, Paddy constantly slips into the first-person plural:

Question number

"We were being chased... We laughed. We roared through the gap." The repetition of "We" and the short, energetic sentences make the group feel like a single, breathless body. Paddy's identity seems to dissolve into the gang, and that is exactly what he enjoys. The same energy fills the Grand National episode, when the boys race through back gardens jumping hedges. Paddy's verdict, "It was mad; it was brilliant", with its balanced clauses and childish superlatives, captures the thrill that friendship gives them: freedom, danger and noise. Doyle's episodic structure, moving from one game to the next without chapters, reflects the way the boys' world is made up of these shared adventures.

Their friendship also gives them a sense of heroism. When they play at war around a fire, Kevin's call of "Come on, men" turns a group of ten-year-olds into soldiers, and Paddy describes how "we followed him and danced around the fire". The mixture of real risk and imaginary glory shows how much the boys need one another to transform ordinary Barrytown into a place of adventure. Paddy's loyalty is shown in small moments too. He keeps Kevin's embarrassing secret, saying simply "I didn't tell him about his underpants", and after one game he describes how Liam carried his shoe and he "leaned on Kevin all the way home". These quiet images of physical support show genuine affection beneath the boys' toughness.

For Paddy, friendship with Kevin in particular is central. He repeatedly refers to "The two of us", and Doyle shows how far he is prepared to go to keep this bond. Paddy admits that "I always gave him a chance to answer first", sacrificing his own cleverness so as not to threaten Kevin's leadership. This shows that friendship matters so much to Paddy that he is willing to shrink himself to keep it. It even outweighs family: when the gang is watching, Paddy feels that he cannot look after Sinbad, saying "in front of the others, I couldn't sort out my little brother". The importance of friendship here is presented critically, because it leads Paddy to

Question number

abandon the brother who needs him.

However, Doyle makes it clear that the boys' friendship is built on uncomfortable foundations. Paddy admits that the O'Connell brothers "were our friends because we hated them; it was good to have them around". The paradox is startling and reveals that the group needs someone to look down on. Even more revealing is Paddy's belief that to be best friends with Kevin "you had to hate a lot of other people, the two of you, together. It made you better friends." Doyle exposes the way friendship among the boys is bound up with exclusion and power. The boys also fail to empathise with Liam and Aidan, whose mother has died; Paddy recalls them talking about how it would be brilliant to have a dead ma. Kevin's claim that Liam's da howls at the moon "like a werewolf" shows that friendship does not stop him from exploiting another boy's grief.

Violence is also part of the boys' friendship. Paddy and Kevin work together to attack James O'Keefe, and Paddy describes getting his jumper round his neck to choke him. Kevin, too, injures an unsuspecting Paddy, leaving him with "two bloodshot eyes and one black one". Doyle presents these moments without comment from the narrator, which makes the reader more aware than Paddy is of how much cruelty lies within their friendship.

The importance of friendship is shown most powerfully when Paddy loses it. As his home life falls apart, Paddy becomes more isolated, and the gang turns against him. His fight with Kevin marks the end of their friendship, and Doyle captures its finality in short, stark sentences: "I had Kevin's blood on my trousers. I was on my own." The bluntness of "on my own" is devastating after all the earlier uses of "We". Paddy admits that "There was a hole inside me for a bit", a metaphor that shows how central friendship had been to his sense of self. When the boys chant

Question number

the title rhyme, mocking him because his father has left, Paddy claims he did not listen because "They were only kids". This dismissal suggests that he has been forced to grow up, and that losing his friends is part of losing his childhood.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that friendship is important to the boys in Barrytown, and particularly to Paddy, for whom it provides excitement, identity and refuge. Yet Doyle presents this friendship as conditional and often cruel, held together by shared enemies and Kevin's dominance. Its collapse at the end of the novel, alongside the collapse of Paddy's family, reveals just how much it had meant, and how little it could protect him.

7a

I largely agree that Boxer deserves to be respected. Orwell presents him as the moral and physical backbone of Animal Farm: loyal, selfless, gentle and astonishingly hard working. However, Orwell also makes us uneasy about him, because the very qualities that earn our respect, his trust and his obedience, are the ones the pigs exploit. By the end, I think Orwell wants us to respect Boxer deeply while recognising that his blind faith helps to build the tyranny that destroys him, so our respect is mixed with pity and frustration.

From his introduction Orwell signals that Boxer is admirable. He is described as "universally respected for his steadiness of character and tremendous powers of work", and the adverb "universally" suggests that no animal doubts his worth. Orwell immediately balances this, however, by noting that he was not of first-rate intelligence. This early juxtaposition is important structurally, because it sets up the tension that runs through the whole novel: Boxer's strength of body and goodness of heart are never matched by the ability to question what he is told. Even his struggle with the alphabet, where he never gets beyond the letter D, is

Question number

presented with gentle sympathy rather than mockery. The image of him trying "with all his might" to remember what comes next suggests that he gives everything, even when he fails, and I find that worthy of respect.

Boxer's work rate after the Rebellion is presented almost as heroic. Orwell writes that he now "seemed more like three horses than one", and the hyperbole makes him seem a near mythical figure on whom the whole farm depends. His personal motto, "I will work harder!", is repeated throughout the novel as his answer to every setback, whether the windmill collapses or rations are cut. The repetition is touching because it shows complete dedication to the ideals of Animalism, yet it also becomes increasingly painful, since the more he works, the more the pigs take.

Orwell also presents Boxer as willing to make personal sacrifices. When the animals burn the symbols of human oppression, Boxer throws his own small straw hat, which kept the flies from his ears, on to the fire. The small, domestic detail of the hat makes the gesture more moving, since he gives up a comfort simply because he believes in the cause. Similarly, at the Battle of the Cowshed he rears up on his hind legs and strikes out with his iron-shod hoofs, and Orwell's simile comparing him to a stallion presents him as a terrifying warrior. Yet immediately afterwards he is distressed, believing he has killed the stable lad, and he says "I have no wish to take life, not even human life" with tears in his eyes. Orwell contrasts this with Snowball's brutal response that the only good human being is a dead one. This contrast makes Boxer the most humane character in the novel: his strength is never cruel, and his conscience is genuine. For me this is the strongest reason he deserves respect.

However, Orwell does not let us admire Boxer uncritically. His second maxim,

Question number

"Napoleon is always right", shows how completely he surrenders his judgement. Interestingly, there is a moment where Boxer does resist. When Squealer claims Snowball was a traitor from the start, Boxer says he does not believe it, and for a moment he seems to be the one animal strong enough to challenge the lies. But he collapses as soon as Squealer says that Napoleon has stated it categorically, replying "If Comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right." Orwell structures this exchange to show how quickly honest doubt is crushed by authority. Shortly afterwards, during the purges, the dogs attack Boxer, and he pins one beneath his hoof but then looks to Napoleon to know whether to crush it or let it go. The image is chilling: Boxer has the power to resist, but he chooses obedience. A reader may feel that his loyalty, although sincere, makes him complicit in Napoleon's terror.

Orwell also shows Boxer refusing to look after himself. Clover warns him not to overstrain himself, but he will not listen, and after splitting his hoof he refuses to take a day off and hides the fact that he is in pain. On one level this selflessness is noble, but on another it is tragic, because he dreams of retirement while working himself into the ground for a regime that has no intention of rewarding him.

The ending is where Orwell most powerfully forces us to respect Boxer and to condemn those who do not. When his lung fails and he collapses, the other animals immediately abandon work and race to him without waiting for orders from the pigs, which shows how much they love him. As the van takes him away, Benjamin reads that it belongs to a horse slaughterer, and Clover cries out to Boxer to get out. Orwell describes a drumming of hoofs inside the van as he tries to kick his way out, but he is too weak. The structural irony is devastating: the horse who was once worth three horses can no longer break a wooden van. The

Question number

pigs then use the money from his death to buy whisky, while Squealer invents a touching deathbed scene in which Boxer praises Napoleon.

Overall, I strongly agree that Boxer deserves respect. Orwell presents him as honest, brave, compassionate and utterly committed to the good of others. His flaw is not selfishness or cruelty but trust, and Orwell seems to suggest that the tragedy of Animal Farm is that such goodness can be so easily exploited. We respect Boxer most precisely because he was betrayed.

7b

I agree that the pigs' behaviour is shocking, and that Orwell intends it to be. Through the simple, fable-like form of the novel, he presents greed, lies and finally mass murder as things done by creatures who were meant to be leading a revolution for equality. However, I would argue that the most shocking quality of the pigs is not any single act but the gradual, almost reasonable way in which they betray everything. Orwell structures the novel so that the signs are there from the beginning, which may make each step less surprising, but this sense of inevitability is itself disturbing.

The allegorical form is central to the shock. Orwell writes in the plain, gentle style of a children's story, with talking animals and a farmyard setting, so that when violence arrives it seems all the more grotesque. The innocent narrative voice rarely comments directly; it simply records what happens, and the reader is left to feel the horror that the animals themselves cannot fully name.

Even early on, Orwell plants hints of the pigs' self-interest. After the first milking, the cows' milk simply disappears, and the chapter ends with the quiet observation that it was noticed in the evening that the milk had gone. The understatement is

Question number

unsettling: nothing is said, yet the reader suspects the pigs. Soon afterwards Squealer justifies the pigs taking the milk and apples by claiming they are necessary for the brainwork of running the farm, and he ends with the threat that if the pigs failed, Jones would come back. This rhetorical question, "Surely, comrades, you do not want Jones back?", shows how fear is used to silence objection. Some readers might argue that because the pigs' greed is visible so soon, their later behaviour is predictable rather than shocking, and Orwell does tell us that Napoleon and Snowball "disagreed at every point where disagreement was possible", hinting at a power struggle to come.

Nevertheless, Napoleon's seizure of power is genuinely shocking in its suddenness. During the windmill debate he lifts his leg and urinates over Snowball's plans before walking out without a word, an act of contempt that is crude, childish and unexpected. Then, at the decisive meeting, "nine enormous dogs wearing brass-studded collars" burst into the barn and chase Snowball off the farm. The adjective "enormous" and the detail of the collars make the dogs seem like a private army, and the reader realises with horror that these are the puppies Napoleon had taken away to educate himself. Orwell's delayed revelation is a powerful structural technique, as it shows that Napoleon has been planning this for months. The animals are left too amazed and frightened to speak, and their silence mirrors the reader's shock.

The most shocking episode is the purges. After the hens rebel against having their eggs sold, Napoleon stops their rations and decrees that any animal who gives them food will be punished by death, and nine hens die. This prepares us for the confessions, where animals admit to imaginary crimes and the dogs promptly tear their throats out, until there is "a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet". Orwell's blunt, factual narration refuses to soften the violence, and the image of

Question number

corpses piled at the leader's feet suggests worship turned into slaughter. What makes this so disturbing is that it breaks the commandment that no animal shall kill any other animal, and the animals later find the words "without cause" added to it. The pigs do not just kill; they rewrite the truth to make killing lawful.

The pigs' treatment of Boxer is perhaps the cruellest act of all. Boxer has given his strength to the farm, yet when he collapses Napoleon sells him to the knacker. Orwell describes the animals' horror as they read the side of the van, and then Squealer smoothly invents a story of Boxer dying peacefully in hospital. The final betrayal is quietly reported: the pigs acquire money for another case of whisky. The contrast between the loyal horse's suffering and the pigs' drunken celebration is shocking because it shows that they no longer even pretend to care.

By the end, the pigs have become indistinguishable from humans. Clover's terrified neighing when Squealer and then Napoleon walk on their hind legs, Napoleon carrying a whip in his trotter, marks a turning point, and the sheep's new chant of "Four legs good, two legs better" reverses the founding principle of Animalism. The single commandment that replaces all seven, "ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS", is a paradox that exposes how language has been twisted until it means nothing. The capital letters make it look like an official law, which makes the absurdity even more chilling. In the final scene the animals look "from pig to man, and from man to pig" and find it impossible to say which is which. The repetitive, circular structure of this sentence reflects the circular structure of the novel itself: the farm has returned to exactly where it began, only worse.

Overall, I strongly agree that the pigs' behaviour is shocking. Although Orwell gives early warnings, and some readers may feel the pigs' corruption is inevitable, I think

Question number

this gradual escalation is the point. The reader, like the animals, watches small betrayals grow into murder and tyranny. Orwell shocks us not only with what the pigs do, but with how easily they get away with it.

8 Verne engages the reader by building a sense of urgency and adventure around a comic contrast between master and servant. Phileas Fogg is calm, precise and almost machine-like, while Passepartout is emotional, flustered and easily overwhelmed. By making us see the beginning of this extraordinary journey largely through Passepartout's reactions, Verne makes the scale of the challenge feel exciting and slightly absurd.

The extract opens in the middle of a conversation, which plunges the reader straight into the action. Passepartout's murmured exclamation "Round the world!" conveys disbelief, while Fogg's reply, "So we haven't a moment to lose", establishes the theme of time that drives the whole passage. Fogg's list of what to pack, "two shirts and three pairs of stockings", is comically small for such a huge journey, and the short imperative "Make haste!" shows his decisive authority. In contrast, Passepartout "gasped" and sways his head "unconsciously", suggesting that he is too shocked even to control his body.

Verne then moves into Passepartout's mind through free indirect thought. The series of questions, "Was his master a fool? No. Was this a joke, then?", creates humour as he argues with himself, and the clipped exclamations "good!" and "good again!" as he imagines Dover and Calais show him trying to talk himself into the adventure. The irony that he had "wanted to remain quiet" makes him sympathetic: the reader understands that he has been swept into something he never chose.

Question number

The money adds both tension and comedy. Fogg calmly slips "a goodly roll of Bank of England notes" into the bag and mentions there are "twenty thousand pounds" inside, and Passepartout "nearly dropped the bag" as if the notes were heavy gold. The exaggeration of his reaction, against Fogg's indifference, keeps the reader amused. Verne also surprises us with Fogg's generosity. The vivid description of the beggar-woman, with "naked feet smeared with mud" and "a tattered feather", evokes pity, and Fogg's quick gift of his whist winnings reveals unexpected kindness beneath his cold exterior. Passepartout's "moist sensation about the eyes" shows how easily he is moved.

Structurally, Verne uses precise times to quicken the pace: they reach the station at "twenty minutes past eight", board at "twenty minutes before nine", and five minutes later "the whistle screamed". The personification of the whistle creates a dramatic moment of departure. Fogg's exact statement of his return date to his friends of the Reform reinforces both his confidence and the stakes of the bet, making the reader wonder whether such precision can possibly succeed.

The setting then darkens, as "a fine, steady rain was falling", and Fogg sits "snugly ensconced" while Passepartout clings to the carpet-bag. This calm moment sets up the final comic twist. Passepartout's broken speech, "In my hurry", followed by stammering hesitation, builds suspense about what disaster has happened, only for it to be the gas left burning. The bathos is funny, and Fogg's cool, dry reply that it will burn at his servant's expense ends the extract on a witty note.

Overall, Verne engages the reader through lively pace, sharp characterisation and gentle humour. The contrast between the unflappable Fogg and the excitable Passepartout makes us eager to follow them, and to see whether this unlikely pair

Question number

can really travel around the world in eighty days.