

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: This scoring guide will be useful for most of the essays that you read; but for cases in which it seems problematic or inapplicable, please consult your Table Leader. The score you assign should reflect your judgment of the quality of the essay as a whole--its content, its style, its mechanics. Reward the writers for what they do well. The score for an exceptionally well-written essay may be raised one point from the score otherwise appropriate. In no case may a very poorly written essay be scored higher than 3.

9-8: With apt and specific references to the excerpt, these well-organized and well-written essays persuasively analyze how the changes in perspective and style reveal the narrator's complex attitude towards [REDACTED]. These essays identify the complexity of that attitude and contrast the literary strategies that create that complexity in the different sections of the passage. Although not without flaws, these papers demonstrate an understanding of the text as well as consistent control over the elements of effective composition. These writers read with insight and express their ideas with skill and clarity. The 9 essays may be especially precise in the diction used in literary analysis.

7-6: These essays also analyze the narrator's complex attitude but are less incisive, developed, or aptly supported than papers in the highest range. They identify accurately some literary techniques by which [REDACTED] conveys the complexities of that attitude, but they are less effective or less thorough in their analysis than are 9-8 papers. These essays demonstrate the writer's ability to express ideas clearly, but they do so with less maturity and precision than the best papers. Generally, 7 papers present a more developed analysis and a more consistent command of the elements of effective college-level composition than do essays scored 6.

5: Although these essays describe the narrator's attitude towards [REDACTED] they may not convey significant understanding of that attitude's complexity. Their analysis of how literary devices are deliberately employed to convey the narrator's attitude is perfunctory or superficial. Often this analysis is vague, mechanical, or overly generalized. Although the writing is adequate to convey the writer's thoughts and is without important errors in composition, these essays are typically pedestrian, not as well conceived, organized, or developed as upper-half papers. Usually, they reveal simplistic thinking and/or immature writing.

4-3: These lower-half papers address the task but reflect an incomplete or oversimplified understanding of the narrator's attitude and/or fail to connect the use of literary devices to the construction and communication of that attitude. The discussion may be inaccurate, unclear, misguided, or undeveloped. These papers may paraphrase rather than analyze. They may not contrast literary strategies used in the different sections of the passage. The analysis of technique will likely be meager and unconvincing; the essays typically lack persuasive reference to the text. Generally the writing demonstrates limited control of diction organization, syntax, or grammar.

2-1: These essays compound the weaknesses of the papers in the 4-3 range. They may seriously misunderstand the narrator's attitude and/or fail to discuss the use of literary devices to convey that attitude. Frequently, they are unacceptably brief. Often poorly written on several counts, they may contain many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics. Although some attempt may have been made to answer the question, the writer's views typically are presented with little clarity, organization, coherence, or supporting evidence. Essays that are especially inexact, vacuous, and/or mechanically unsound should be scored 1.

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

--: Indicates a blank response or an essay that is completely off-topic.