

QUESTION #2: Passage from McCarthy's *The Crossing*

This scoring guide will be useful for most of the essays that you read, but in problematic cases, please consult your Table Leader. The score you assign should reflect your judgment of the quality of the essay *as a whole*. Reward the writers for what they do well. The score for an exceptionally well-written essay may be raised by one point from the score otherwise appropriate. In no case may a poorly written essay be scored higher than 3.

9-8 The writers of these well-constructed essays define the dramatic nature of the experience described in Cormac McCarthy's passage and ably demonstrate *how* the author conveys the impact of the experience upon the main character. Having fashioned a convincing thesis about the character's reaction to the death of the wolf, these writers support their assertions by analyzing the use of specific literary techniques (such as point of view, syntax, imagery, or diction) that prove fundamental to their understanding of McCarthy's narrative design. They make appropriate references to the text to illustrate their argument. Although not without flaws, these essays reflect the writer's ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing to provide a keen analysis of a literary text.

7-6 Developing a sound thesis, these writers discuss with clarity and conviction both the character's response to the death of the wolf and certain techniques used to convey the impact this experience has upon the main character. These essays may not be entirely responsive to the rich suggestiveness of the passage or as precise in describing the dramatic impact of the event. Although they provide specific references to the text, the analysis is less persuasive and perhaps less sophisticated than papers in the 9-8 range: they seem less insightful or less controlled, they develop fewer techniques, or their discussion of details may be more limited. Nonetheless, they confirm the writer's ability to read literary texts with comprehension and to write with organization and control.

5 These essays construct a reasonable if reductive thesis; they attempt to link the author's literary techniques to the reader's understanding of the impact of the experience on the main character. However, the discussion may be superficial, pedestrian, and/or lacking in consistent control. The organization may be ineffective or not fully realized. The analysis is less developed, less precise, and less convincing than that of upper half essays; misinterpretations of particular references or illustrations may detract from the overall effect.

4-3 These essays attempt to discuss the impact of this dramatic experience upon the main character—and perhaps mention one or more techniques used by McCarthy to effect this end. The discussion, however, may be inaccurate or undeveloped. These writers may misread the passage in an essential way, rely on paraphrase, or provide only limited attention to technique. Illustrations from the text tend to be misconstrued, inexact, or omitted altogether. The writing may be sufficient to convey ideas, although typically it is characterized by weak diction, syntax, grammar, or organization. Essays scored three are even less able and may not refer to technique at all.

2-1 These essays fail to respond adequately to the question. They may demonstrate confused thinking and/or consistent weaknesses in grammar or another basic element of composition. They are often unacceptably brief. Although the writer may have made some attempt to answer the question, the views presented have little clarity or coherence; significant problems with reading comprehension seem evident. Essays that are especially inexact, vacuous, and/or mechanically unsound should be scored 1.

- 0** A response with no more than a reference to the task.
 - A blank paper or completely off-topic response

AP[®] ENGLISH LITERATURE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2

At the AP Reading, faculty consultants were given the following **General**

Directions:

The score you assign should reflect your judgment of the quality of the essay *as a whole*. **Reward the writers for what they do well.** The score for an exceptionally well-written essay may be raised by one point from the score otherwise appropriate. In no case may a poorly written essay be scored higher than 3.

The writers of these well-constructed essays define the dramatic nature of the experience described in Cormac McCarthy's passage and ably demonstrate *how* the author conveys the impact of the experience upon the main character. Having fashioned a convincing thesis about the character's reaction to the death of the wolf, these writers support their assertions by analyzing the use of specific literary techniques (such as point of view, **9-8:** syntax, imagery, or diction) that prove fundamental to their understanding of McCarthy's narrative design. They make appropriate references to the text to illustrate their argument. Although not without flaws, these essays reflect the writer's ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing to provide a keen analysis of a literary text.

Developing a sound thesis, these writers discuss with clarity and conviction both the character's response to the death of the wolf and certain techniques used to convey the impact this experience has upon the main character. These essays may not be entirely responsive to the rich suggestiveness of the passage or as precise in describing the dramatic impact of the event. Although they provide specific references to the text, the **7-6:** analysis is less persuasive and perhaps less sophisticated than papers in the 9-8 range: they seem less insightful or less controlled, they develop fewer techniques, or their discussion of details may be more limited. Nonetheless, they confirm the writer's ability to read literary texts with comprehension and to write with organization and control.

These essays construct a reasonable if reductive thesis; they attempt to link the author's literary techniques to the reader's understanding of the impact of the experience on the main character. However, the discussion may be superficial, pedestrian, and/or lacking in consistent control. The organization may be ineffective or not fully realized. The **5:** analysis is less developed, less precise, and less convincing than that of upper half essays; misinterpretations of particular references or illustrations may detract from the overall effect.

**AP[®] ENGLISH LITERATURE
1999 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 2 (cont.)

These essays attempt to discuss the impact of this dramatic experience upon the main character — and perhaps mention one or more techniques used by McCarthy to effect this end. The discussion, however, may be inaccurate or undeveloped. These writers may misread the passage in an essential way, rely on paraphrase, or provide only limited attention to technique. Illustrations from the text tend to be misconstrued, inexact, or omitted altogether. The writing may be sufficient to convey ideas, although typically it is characterized by weak diction, syntax, grammar, or organization. Essays scored three are even less able and may not refer to technique at all.

These essays fail to respond adequately to the question. They may demonstrate confused thinking and/or consistent weaknesses in grammar or another basic element of composition. They are often unacceptably brief. Although the writer may have made some attempt to answer the question, the views presented have little clarity or coherence; significant problems with reading comprehension seem evident. Essays that are especially inexact, vacuous, and/or mechanically unsound should be scored 1.

0: A response with no more than a reference to the task.

— Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.