



## **AP<sup>®</sup> Spanish Literature 2005 Scoring Commentary**

### **The College Board: Connecting Students to College Success**

The College Board is a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 4,700 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves over three and a half million students and their parents, 23,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges through major programs and services in college admissions, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Among its best-known programs are the SAT<sup>®</sup>, the PSAT/NMSQT<sup>®</sup>, and the Advanced Placement Program<sup>®</sup> (AP<sup>®</sup>). The College Board is committed to the principles of excellence and equity, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

Copyright © 2005 by College Board. All rights reserved. College Board, AP Central, APCD, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Vertical Teams, Pre-AP, SAT, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board. Admitted Class Evaluation Service, CollegeEd, Connect to college success, MyRoad, SAT Professional Development, SAT Readiness Program, and Setting the Cornerstones are trademarks owned by the College Entrance Examination Board. PSAT/NMSQT is a registered trademark of the College Entrance Examination Board and National Merit Scholarship Corporation. Other products and services may be trademarks of their respective owners. Permission to use copyrighted College Board materials may be requested online at: <http://www.collegeboard.com/inquiry/cbpermit.html>.

**Visit the College Board on the Web: [www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com).**  
**AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program and Pre-AP: [apcentral.collegeboard.com](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com).**

**AP® SPANISH LITERATURE  
2005 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Note: Student responses are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors.

**Question 1: Poetry Analysis**

**Overview**

This question assesses the student's ability to write an essay analyzing the way in which a given theme is treated in a poem that is not on the required reading list for the course. On this year's exam, the selection was a four-stanza poem from José Martí's collection titled *Versos sencillos*. Students were asked to analyze the theme of friendship in the poem and discuss how poetic language and devices communicate that theme.

**Sample: X**

**Content Score: 8**

**Language Score: 5**

**Content:** This well-developed essay demonstrates competence. It is well organized, and textual analysis outweighs any description. The essay discusses how poetic language and devices are used to communicate the theme presented in the poem. The comments include some insightful observations on how the comparisons in the poem gradually increase in importance and scope to illustrate the value of friendship over all things: "*las comparaciones en cuales la amistad domina ascienden en gradación.*" All commentary is supported with specific textual references: "*A través del poema sirve la comparación y paralelismo entre lo que los demás tienen y lo que el autor tiene,*" "*El autor crea una relación entre las pertenencias suyas y las del leopardo, la 'mushma,' etc.,*" and "*El poema termina con una epifonema, 'Tengo más, tengo un amigo.'*" Occasionally, some errors intrude, and the reader must make some inferences: "*reduplicación*" is used instead of *repetición*, and "*estribillo*" and "*conversión*" instead of *anáfora*. However, these errors do not undermine the overall quality of the essay. Had the essay been more thorough in its treatment of the theme of friendship and had fewer errors, it would have received a higher score.

**Language:** This essay demonstrates very good command of the language. It has infrequent grammatical errors: "*la importancia de amistad,*" "*en cuales,*" "*a través de el estribillo.*" The vocabulary is varied and accurate ("*exaltar,*" "*las pertenencias,*" "*reiterando*") with very occasional exceptions ("*comodez*" instead of *comodidad*). The student demonstrates very good control of the conventions of the written language.

**Sample: V**

**Content Score: 6**

**Language Score: 5**

**Content:** This essay suggests competence because it demonstrates that the student basically understands the question and the poem. The essay is not well focused or developed, and description outweighs analysis. The essay repeats the statement of the poem's theme, "*la amistad,*" and paraphrases what the poet says: "*el poeta piensa que un amigo es mejor que el poder,*" and "*El poeta indica que la amistad vale más que las cosas materiales.*" The student addresses some poetic devices and language, but the essay neither discusses how they communicate the theme ("*en la primera estrofa se ve prosopopeya en el primer verso cuando dice 'Tiene el leopardo un abrigo'*") nor illustrates the use of the devices with specific examples ("*En los versos 9-11 se ve el uso de anáfora*"). This forces the reader to make inferences. Had the essay developed and integrated the discussion of how the poetic devices and language help convey the poem's theme, it would have merited a higher score.

**AP® SPANISH LITERATURE  
2005 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 1: Poetry Analysis (continued)**

**Language:** This essay demonstrates very good command of the language because it has very infrequent, random errors in grammar: “*con lo que tiene el conde, el mendigo y el ave*” and “*vemos que al poeta la amistad vale más que cualquier cosa.*” The use of vocabulary is generally varied and accurate, and there are very few spelling errors (“*cualquier,*” “*simil,*” “*silabas,*” “*el,*” “*ultima,*” and “*mas*”). The conventions of the written language are generally correct.

**Sample: Y**

**Content Score: 4**

**Language Score: 4**

**Content:** This essay suggests lack of competence. Although the student appears to understand the question, it is not clear that the student adequately understands the poem (“*preseta el tema de la amistad como algo que tiene un valor a las cosas materiales, reales, e indispensables*”). The focus wanders and erroneous comments appear. For example, “*El cojin es de arce del Japon, entonces es muy raro y dificil de encontrar. Lo usa para dormir y le encanta a la muchacha*” is sketchy and irrelevant. Other comments include unsubstantiated claims about the use of poetic language and devices (“*Su uso de rima y representación nos ayuda a ver esto en el poema*” and “*El narrador no dice esto indirectamente via el uso de simbolismo, logica, representacion y realismo*”) without providing textual examples or explanations. This detracts from the overall quality of the essay and requires that the reader make significant inferences. Had the essay been more focused and more explicit in its analysis of the poetic language and devices, it would have merited a higher score.

**Language:** This essay demonstrates good command of the language that supports an on-task response to the question. It has few grammatical errors: “*preseta el tema de la amistad*” and “*con la lagrimas.*” The use of vocabulary is appropriate with very few exceptions (for example, “*externalidades,*” instead of *medio ambiente*). With the exception of missing accent marks (“*posesion,*” “*cojin,*” “*Japon,*” “*dificil,*” “*lagrimas*”), the conventions of the written language are generally correct.

**AP® SPANISH LITERATURE  
2005 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 2: Thematic Analysis**

**Overview**

In the thematic analysis, two types of questions are possible: one type involves comparison of a given theme or topic in two works from the required reading list; the second type is an analysis of a given theme in one work from the reading list. This year's question 2 was of the latter type. Students were asked to write an essay treating the theme of how an individual grapples (*lucha*) with life's obstacles in one work chosen from a list of five titles.

**Sample: M**

**Content Score: 8**

**Language Score: 5**

**Content:** This well-developed essay convincingly analyzes the theme of the individual who grapples with life's obstacles. The essay deals quite competently with *San Manuel Bueno, mártir* and Don Manuel's struggle with his faith. It reveals insight in making two main points about the novel: Don Manuel's anguish at his own lack of faith ("*sufre de una vida llena de angustia por su propia falta de fé en su religión*") and an internal struggle with both his faith in life and his desire to help the townspeople ("*logró a salvarse de su dolor interno cuando aprendió a tener fé en la vida y dar paz a su vida por ayudar y consolar a la gente*"). The essay also analyzes Don Manuel's solitary troubles and supports this idea with specific references to the text (the mountain and the lake as symbols of the extremes of this internal struggle). Had the essay elaborated on all these ideas more clearly and thoroughly, it would have earned a higher score.

**Language:** This essay shows a very good command of written Spanish. Vocabulary is varied and used accurately ("*angustia*," "*espíritu luchador*," "*renacimiento simbólico*," "*predicando*"), though an occasional error does appear ("*isolación*"). There are some grammatical errors ("*la renacimiento*," "*él murió mientras predicando al pueblo*") but they are infrequent and do not detract from the readability of the essay. The essay shows very good control of the conventions of the written language with a few spelling errors ("*desesperenza*" and "*verguënza*").

**Sample: DD**

**Content Score: 5**

**Language Score: 4**

**Content:** This essay suggests competence. It attempts to analyze the theme of the individual who grapples with life's obstacles and suggests that the student understands the question and "Dos palabras." Although the essay appears to be well structured, its ideas are not well organized, and it contains errors that detract from the overall quality of the analysis. For example, the second paragraph mistakenly suggests that Belisa sold words to earn a living before she learned how to read and that a man on horseback found her on the beach holding a newspaper and then taught her how to read. The essay's focus is not well maintained and includes some unexplained elements, such as an unexpected shift from Belisa to the Colonel near the end. It also provides examples from the text to back its ideas, but they are mostly erroneous or unclear. Had the ideas in the essay been more organized and more precise, it would have earned a higher score.

**AP® SPANISH LITERATURE  
2005 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 2: Thematic Analysis (continued)**

**Language:** The language usage in this essay shows a good command of written Spanish to support an on-task response to the question. There are a few errors in grammatical structures (“*en su obras*”) but these do not detract from the overall readability of the essay. Vocabulary is used appropriately and occasionally is advanced (“*afán*,” “*superarse*”). Spelling and accent placement are generally correct, with infrequent errors (“*ganarce*,” “*hacerca*,” “*atemorisada*,” “*obstaculo*,” “*oido*,” “*unico*”).

**Sample: V**

**Content Score: 4**

**Language Score: 3**

**Content:** This essay suggests a lack of competence. It consists almost entirely of plot summary, and there is no attempt to analyze the theme of the individual’s struggle in *Naufragios*, which suggests that the student is unable to deal competently with the question and the text. The obstacles are presented merely as a list. This shows that the student basically understands the text, but the lack of discussion of how Cabeza de Vaca grapples with these obstacles suggests that the student has not adequately understood the question. Written in two long paragraphs, the essay suffers from a lack of organization, and its discussion has only a limited connection to the question. Had the essay attempted analysis and been better organized, it would have earned a higher score.

**Language:** This essay shows adequate command of the language. Although sentence structure is generally correct, and vocabulary usage is somewhat varied (“*retos*,” “*temor*,” “*convivir*,” “*brindaban*,” “*leña*”), the essay abounds in errors in spelling and other conventions of the written language (“*elejir*,” “*author*,” “*hasí*,” “*condicciones*,” “*huyir*,” “*brindarón*,” “*tribú*,” “*tunás*”) that interfere with its readability.

**AP® SPANISH LITERATURE**  
**2005 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 3: Text Analysis**

**Overview**

Question 3 has two possible variations: one involves an analysis of a critical commentary about one work from the required reading list; the other is the analysis of an excerpt from a work on the reading list with two separate questions to answer. This year's question 3 was of the latter type. It was based on Juan Rulfo's "No oyes ladrar los perros." In part (a) of the question, students were asked to analyze the characteristics of the dialogue in the fragment of the short story printed in the exam booklet. Part (b) asked students to discuss the significance of the work's title in relation to the passage cited and the rest of the story.

**Sample: N**

**Content (a) Score: 5**

**Content (b) Score: 4**

**Language Score: 5**

**Content (a):** This response provides a clear and accurate analysis of the characteristics of the dialogue as they appear in the passage cited, and the organization contributes to the quality of the response. From the onset the student notes that the dialogue distinguishes the inner thoughts of the father and Ignacio. The response then proceeds to elaborate on this idea systematically, contrasting the characteristics of Ignacio's dialogue ("*mandatos cortos*") with those of the father ("*discursos mucho más complejos*," "*oraciones largas e ideas complejas*") and explaining how they reveal the characters. The response also analyzes the father's use of *tú* and *usted* and shows insight when it states the contrast in what the father thinks, says, and does. The response ends with a well-stated conclusion that synthesizes the ideas presented: "*el padre tiene ideas complejas, mientras el hijo tiene ideas simples, y sólo piensa en sí mismo.*" This response clearly demonstrates superiority.

**Content (b):** This response provides a competent explanation of the title's meaning as it relates to the passage and the rest of the story ("*representa el conflicto entre el padre y el hijo*," "*verdaderamente no puede oír a los perros, porque está muerto*"). The response also shows insight ("*Su muerte física es sólo el resultado, el final, de su muerte espiritual*"). However, at times the analysis is ambiguous ("*ignora lo que quiere el padre*," "*el hijo nunca hace lo que le pide el padre*") and repetitious. With better organization and a more concise explanation, the response would have merited a higher score.

**Language:** Very good language usage effectively supports on-task responses. The essay shows very good command of sentence structures ("*Cuando le habla a su hijo, también cambia entre language íntimo y language formal*," "*muestra que el padre tiene ideas complejas, mientras el hijo tiene ideas simples*"), and the vocabulary is varied and accurate: ("*el comportamiento*," "*los esfuerzos*"). Notwithstanding very few errors ("*oraciones*," "*aún*," "*language*"), the student demonstrates very good command of the conventions of written language.

**AP<sup>®</sup> SPANISH LITERATURE  
2005 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 3: Text Analysis (continued)**

**Sample: A**

**Content (a) Score: 3**

**Content (b) Score: 3**

**Language Score: 4**

**Content (a):** This response suggests competence. The student basically understands the question and addresses the characteristics of dialogue in the passage cited. The response appropriately points out how the dialogue communicates the poor relationship between father and son (“*la mala relación*,” “*Hay una tensión*”) as well as the son’s personality (“*demuestra quien realmente el hijo es*”). There is an attempt to analyze the characteristics of dialogue in the passage, but the reader is forced to supply inferences because the response is incomplete. This response would have received a higher score had the student explained the ideas more clearly.

**Content (b):** This response suggests competence. The student demonstrates familiarity with the rest of the story (“*suelta a Ignacio*” and “*no le ayudó ni en eso*”) and establishes a connection between the title, the passage, and the story. The response notes Ignacio’s ingratitude and the father’s struggle as represented in the title (“*Parece que al final Ignacio muere*” and “*el padre claramente puede escuchar los perros ladrar*”); however, the discussion is incomplete and forces the reader to make several inferences. Had the response been less general and explained more clearly the link between the title and the passage/rest of the story, it would have merited a higher score.

**Language:** Good language usage in this essay supports an on-task response to the questions. Even though the vocabulary is repetitious at times (“*demuestra*,” “*ayuda*,” “*oír*”), both responses are comprehensible and demonstrate good control of grammatical structures and written language conventions.

**AP<sup>®</sup> SPANISH LITERATURE  
2005 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 3: Text Analysis (continued)**

**Sample: J**

**Content (a) Score: 1**

**Content (b) Score: 1**

**Language Score: 3**

**Content (a):** This essay demonstrates lack of competence. The response fails to address the question in any meaningful way. It consists entirely of plot summary. Although the word *dice* appears throughout the response, there is no relation to the characteristics of dialogue as they appear in the passage (“*por lo que dice en el texto*,” “*Dice que el vive*,” “*porque dice que si fuera*,” “*tambien le dijo*”), and the essay contains erroneous statements (“*el niño no fue maleducado porque la madre todavia lo quiere*,” “*lo dejaria tirado embez de ir a buscarlo y traerlo al pueblo otra vez*”). Had the student addressed the question in a meaningful way, the response would have merited a better score.

**Content (b):** This response demonstrates lack of competence. It fails to address the question in any meaningful way. Although the student has understood the question, the commentary is based on information that is incorrect (“*lo debe hacer denoche*,” “*la gente oyen los perros ladrar capas que crean que es el niño*,” “*el niño no esta en el pueblo entonces el pueblo esta tranquilo porque saben que esta noche el niño no esta robando*”). The response would have received a higher score had the student addressed the question.

**Language:** Adequate language usage in this essay supports on-task responses. The vocabulary is appropriate. The response is comprehensible despite some grammatical errors (“*esta texto*,” “*podes*,” “*lo fue a buscarlo*,” “*de el*,” “*lo perros*,” “*gente oyen*,” “*lo va ha robar*”), some errors in spelling (“*hico*,” “*valla*,” “*denoche*,” “*capas*,” “*embez*,” “*entonce*,” “*tranquillo*”), and the almost complete absence of accent marks.