AP® ENGLISH LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION 2008 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

Question 1

(Ted Hughes's "Hawk Roosting" and Mark Doty's "Golden Retrievals")

The score reflects the quality of the essay as a whole—its content, its style, its mechanics. Students are rewarded for what they do well. The score for an exceptionally well-written essay may be raised by 1 point above the otherwise appropriate score. In no case may a poorly written essay be scored higher than a 3.

- 9-8 These essays provide an insightful and persuasive analysis of both poems. They ably explain the characterization of both the hawk and the dog and precisely define their differing world views. Although these essays offer a range of interpretations and choose various poetic techniques for emphasis (imagery, diction, selection of details, puns, or tone, for example), they provide convincing readings of the poems, using apt and specific references to the texts. These essays maintain consistent control over the elements of effective composition, but they need not be flawless. Nonetheless, the best ones will demonstrate the students' abilities to read poetry perceptively and to write with clarity and sophistication.
- 7-6 These competent essays convey coherent understandings of the poems and the characterizations presented in them, yet their assertions about the differing views of the world are less precise than those in the top-scoring group. The interpretations of both poems contain minor errors and may falter in some particulars. These essays demonstrate the ability to express ideas clearly, but they do not exhibit the same level of mastery, maturity, or control as the very best ones. They are likely to be briefer, less incisive, and less well supported than essays in the 9-8 range.
- Although these plausible essays demonstrate awareness of the speakers' characterizations and their differing attitudes toward the world, they are generally more superficial and less convincing than those in the 7–6 category. Discussion, though not inaccurate, tends to be overly generalized and inadequately supported by references to the texts. There may be little analysis of the techniques the poet employs. Although the writing is adequate to convey ideas and is not marred by distracting errors, these essays are not as well conceived, organized, or developed as those in the 7–6 range.
- **4–3** These lower-half essays reveal an incomplete or oversimplified understanding of the poems or of the task itself. They may discuss the characterizations without addressing the attitudes toward the world. They may discuss only one of the poems and ignore the other. Their assertions about characterization and the animals' views of the world may suggest a misreading (that is, the interpretation may be implausible or irrelevant). They may rely almost entirely on paraphrase. Often wordy and repetitious, the writing may reveal uncertain control of the elements of college-level composition and may contain recurrent stylistic defects. Essays that contain some misreading and/or inept writing should be scored a 3.
- **2–1** These essays compound the weaknesses of those in the 4–3 range. They may seriously misread the poems. Often they are unacceptably brief. Although some attempt may be made to answer the question, observations are presented with little clarity, organization, or support from the texts. These essays may be poorly written on several counts and may contain distracting errors in grammar and mechanics. Essays scored a 1 contain little coherent discussion of the poems. Especially inept, vacuous, and/or unsound essays must be scored a 1.
- **0** These essays do no more than make a reference to the task.
- These essays are either left blank or are completely off topic.

1064 Roosting and Golden Retrievals, the the speakers in their poems points of view poem presented, the audience is confronted thinks very highly SUV YOUND MALL YEND! high trees are the runs because it is all assertion that Creation was all he 3 The KIND A aro his self-contened statement himself.

A ag 4

this means that he does not even reasoning kehind Hewk Roostings" hooked phrasl point of view.

a sixt one "a says humans

,
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the exam.
on this page as it is designated in the exam.
13 bounding away to the future. Both an mols le are hermans belings or beneath them.
The speakers to were chanacterized on how
They partrayed to the audience this seperate
points of views through dramatizetion of how
They partrayed to the audience this separate points of views through drama tirestion of how They spoke and their individual skopping
personalities.

Write in the box the number of the question you are answe	ring
on this page as it is designated in the exam.	

- IB

animals have always states had a significant role
in the human world. Whether friend or food, man has always
had a place for varinals. To look at the world through
an animal's point of view bridge sheds light onto the ways
in which humans wohat the world. The Hughes and Mark
Dity one cable to recover characterize a heart and on
golden retweeter and workey their world views through
the usage of ediction, sentence offructure, and imagery.
Using these techniques, the hawk is portrayed as a dominenter
who wants to be in complete control of Erration and the
golden retriever is pertrayed as larefree, wanting only to
savor wely moment.
The diction wed by Hughes and Dory is what mores a clear offigheador between the heart and
makes a clear chippeants between the house area
the retriever. The Doty uses word with a carefree
a bow-wow" (14) three times anderways "wood" (11).
" bow-wow" (14) three times anderway "woof" (11).
"Thillmyly" is splatest used with the words "devel
Thing" (6). Boty portroged live as a wo Doty's diction
is not meanly so loose. He speaks of air's "buryance" (6)
and the rehearsal of the "perfect kills" (4). The
hawh is certainly particuled as one with anogume
who whears of dominating while the diction used to
speak of the retriever is simple, reflecting his simple
character and lifestyle.

Doty's contenes structure conveys the retriever's
view on the world. "Bunny, tumbling leaf a squirrel
who's - oh/joy - artually scared," (3-4). The sentinces are
not langthy, but nother short and choppy. Hughes
on the other hand, meater sentences that are longer.
"at took the whole of Creation 1 To produce my foot, my
each feather: / Now it wild breation in my foot "(10-12)
These centences are not only longer, but the subject is
the hawh The amorgance of the house is seen as well
as his desire to demo dominate. The short, choppy
sontences used by Doty show the cleane to sower everything
their takes glace.
a dog is most resterily going to have a different
character and a different view of the world than a
bird. Doty and fugher capture these differences in
Their poems through sentence structure and diction
among many other devices. One can reasily see the
care free day and the dominating bird through both
poems.
·

1012

and the world. the have

Write in the box the number of the question you are answering

AP® ENGLISH LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION 2008 SCORING COMMENTARY (Form B)

Question 1

Sample: 1A Score: 7

This competent essay offers a coherent contrast between Ted Hughes's portrait of the "self-centered" hawk, which arrogates to himself a "divine right" to kill "any living thing as he pleases," and the representation of an "energetic and distracted" creature in Mark Doty's poem. The analysis of the Doty poem is less precise than the discussion of Hughes's hawk, and certainly less precise than would be expected of essays in the 9–8 range. And although the essay does not always exhibit mastery over formal or structural features, there is an attempt to discuss the relative brevity of the Doty poem, with its four stanzas, instead of Hughes's six, and Doty's use of alliteration and onomatopoeia to characterize the golden retriever's "'... bronzy gong'" and bark. The essay is a capable and complete argument.

Sample: 1B Score: 5

This essay presents a plausible but ultimately superficial analysis. It opens by saying that the two poets "characterize a hawk and a golden retriever and convey their world views through the usage of diction," but it is not able to say clearly exactly how diction is used in each poem. It is imprecise about the similarities and differences in diction. Although it does refer to the texts, the quotations are not integrated into an analysis of each poem's meaning. The essay plausibly observes that the hawk is arrogant, whereas the dog wants to "savor everything that takes place," but it is unconvincing when it suggests that Doty's "sentence structure conveys the retriever's view on the world" or that the length of the sentences in Hughes's poem indicates the hawk's "desire to dominate." The writing is no more than adequate.

Sample: 1C Score: 3

This lower-half essay is characterized by its oversimplified understanding of the Hughes poem and a fundamental misunderstanding of the Doty poem. It wrongly maintains that the dog in the latter poem "despises his life and feels oppressed." This misinterpretation is compounded as the essay progresses, arguing that Doty "uses alot [sic] of satire and ridicules the perception that animals might be joyful." Still, it gets some things right, such as Doty's use of conversation, which includes the reader and perhaps "even himself." Despite the witty but misguided interpretation that Doty's dog is "'bowing for its master and 'wowing at its pain caused by the world," the student's ability to write saves this essay from falling to a score of 2.