



AP[®] Spanish Literature 2003 Scoring Commentary

The materials included in these files are intended for use by AP teachers for course and exam preparation; permission for any other use must be sought from the Advanced Placement Program[®]. Teachers may reproduce them, in whole or in part, in limited quantities for noncommercial, face-to-face teaching purposes. This permission does not apply to any third-party copyrights contained herein. This material may not be mass distributed, electronically or otherwise. These materials and any copies made of them may not be resold, and the copyright notices must be retained as they appear here.

These materials were produced by Educational Testing Service[®] (ETS[®]), which develops and administers the examinations of the Advanced Placement Program for the College Board. The College Board and Educational Testing Service (ETS) are dedicated to the principle of equal opportunity, and their programs, services, and employment policies are guided by that principle.

The College Board is a national nonprofit membership association whose mission is to prepare, inspire, and connect students to college and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 4,300 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves over three million students and their parents, 22,000 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[®], the PSAT/NMSQT[®], and the Advanced Placement Program[®] (AP[®]). The College Board is committed to the principles of equity and excellence, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

For further information, visit www.collegeboard.com

Copyright © 2003 College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved. College Board, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Vertical Teams, APCD, Pacesetter, Pre-AP, SAT, Student Search Service, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board.

AP Central is a trademark owned by the College Entrance Examination Board. PSAT/NMSQT is a registered trademark jointly owned by the College Entrance Examination Board and the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. Educational Testing Service and ETS are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. Other products and services may be trademarks of their respective owners.

For the College Board's online home for AP professionals, visit AP Central at apcentral.collegeboard.com.

AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE 2003 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 1: Poetry

Sample: AA1

Score: Content 9 / Language 5

Content

This very well-organized and developed essay clearly and thoroughly analyzes both the content and the poetic devices employed by the poet. Commentary regarding poetic language and devices is skillfully linked to the poem's content. For example, after noting the antagonistic nature of the two worlds in the introduction, the student builds a coherent and very insightful argument on this idea, supporting it with specific textual references that tie form to content: "Habla del 'mundo, sus números, su prisa, sus furias que dan a una su zumba'. . . . El efecto de esta enumeración es dramático y aumenta la totalidad del caos en el mundo." The conclusion goes beyond mere summary by suggesting that the contrast between the two worlds presented in the poem serves to illustrate the search for "paz" and "razón" in this world and the repressive nature of mass media. There are no erroneous or irrelevant commentaries, and the reader is left with the certainty that the student has a superior understanding of the poem and the question.

Language

The excellent command of the language used in this essay effectively communicates an appropriate response to the question and merits a score of 5. There are even examples of linguistic sophistication in the response, as in "La descripción inocente de personas de diferentes orígenes culmina en una imagen grotesca de la muerte en la guerra." The few grammatical errors ("el mundo de Celaya es lleno de paz", "con sí mismo") and occasional spelling mistakes ("internal", "harmonía", "caós") do not detract significantly from the high level of language usage evident in the essay.

Sample: Q

Score: Content 6 / Language 3

Content

This essay merits a score of 6 because it strongly suggests competence in its discussion, with some analysis, of the contrast between the two worlds presented in the poem. The introduction establishes an appropriate premise: "Gabriel Celaya nos pinta un retrato de dos mundos: lo bueno y lo malo". This idea is subsequently expanded, first by reference to a problematic world ("negocios y guerras causa y crea un mundo que él no entiende") and then to one that is "bueno," as implied in "veo un poco de cielo . . . soñar con Dios". It is later affirmed that verse 15 serves to emphasize the existence of a "mundo bueno." The essay addresses poetic devices; for example, "Es más, este verso es un ejemplo de asindeton." It also insightfully suggests that the last verse in each stanza serves to highlight the author's feeling about the two worlds, albeit with an incorrect affirmation that those verses are examples of "aforismo" rather than "estribillo." Had the essay developed the contrast between the outer world and the poet's inner world more explicitly and analytically, it would have received a higher score.

Language

Language usage in this essay adequately supports the response to the question and earned a score of 3. Although the essay is comprehensible, it does contain frequent grammatical errors: "Cuando leo el periódico, sabe lo que pasa, pero no entiendo los ideas," "cuando sueño del Dios," "es una anáfora porque hay en estrofas uno y dos." The conventions of the written language are generally correct, but vocabulary is limited ("la pintura grande") and somewhat repetitive.

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2003 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Question 1: Poetry (cont'd.)

Sample: O

Score: Content 3 / Language 2

Content

This exam merits a 3 because it suggests lack of competence. The student reveals an awareness of the difference between the contrasting worlds presented in the poem, but fails to analyze that difference. Frequent irrelevant and ambiguous comments further suggest a lack of understanding of the poem and the question; for example: “En el otro mundo hay sonrisas y belleza que el narrador no cree que existe.” In the treatment of poetic devices the essay incorrectly affirms the presence of polysindeton, and mistakenly confuses verbs with adjectives: “. . . usa adjetivos que el hace, como escuchar, entender, contar, veer. . . .” Had the student more accurately described the contrasting worlds and correctly identified some poetic devices, the essay would have merited a higher grade.

Language

In this essay language usage merits a 2 because it fails to support effectively an appropriate response to the question. Errors in verb conjugation (“cosas que pasa”, “el narrador . . . no entienden”), limited and repetitive use of vocabulary, and numerous missing accents (“esta observando”, “ultimo”, “tambien”) sometimes require sympathetic inferences and confirm weak control over the written language.

Question 2: Análisis Temático

Sample: AA

Score: Content 8 / Language 5

Content

This is a well-developed essay that leaves no doubt that the student has both described the commingling of reality and fantasy in the “El ahogado más hermoso del mundo” and has explained its meaning, thereby earning a score of 8. In statements such as “la ‘fantasia’ de la gente del pueblo solo es otra forma de la realidad — su realidad” and “a lo largo del tiempo una ‘fantasia’ o leyenda como esta se puede convertir en la ‘realidad’ o la historia que se transmite de generación a generación,” the essay demonstrates competence through its explicit elaboration of the significance of “la línea sutil” that makes reality and fantasy, or imagination, such fluid concepts in García Márquez’s story. Pithy statements such as “el amor y la imaginación amorosa pueden transformar algo prosaico (la ‘realidad’ concreta y a veces aburrida) en algo totalmente diferente y maravilloso” show good insight. Less reliance on plot summary and the sharpening of focus would have earned this essay a higher score.

Language

This essay demonstrates very good language usage to effectively support an appropriate response to the question and merits a score of 5. Errors in grammatical structures are infrequent (“ellos lo convierte,” “es posible que había”). There is obvious control of paragraphing and punctuation. With the exception of a few spelling errors (“verrán,” “dirrán”) and the rare omission of accents (“actuan,” “hipotetico”), conventions of the written language are used with precision. Vocabulary is varied and accurate. Language usage in this essay is an example of both effective communication and expressive power.

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2003 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Question 2: Análisis Temático (cont'd.)

Sample: E

Score: Content 5 / Language 4

Content

This essay suggests competence and thus earned a score of 5. The student essentially understands the question and the story by Borges, and there is an attempt to describe the commingling of reality and fantasy, although commentary is superficial. There are references to some of the more profound aspects of the story (duplicity, mirror images), but these lack development. Plot summary and repetition abound. There is virtually no treatment of the meaning of the commingling of reality and fantasy. A greater degree of cohesion and focus, coupled with some treatment of the significance of the mixing of reality and fantasy in “La muerte y la brújula,” would have earned this essay a higher score.

Language

In this essay the language appropriately supports the response to the question and merited a score of 4. Grammatical structures (pronouns, agreement, subjunctive) are generally correct. There are some spelling errors (“symetría,” “encontrava”) and sentence fragments, but they do not detract from the readability of the essay. Vocabulary is appropriate to communicate the content.

Sample: R

Score: Content 2 / Language 1

Content

This essay demonstrates lack of competence and earned a score of 2. Although there are brief references to specific aspects of the story, e.g., “el piensa que ay un monstro llamado Chac Mool y que se no le ase caso lo va matar”, the essay never demonstrates understanding of the question or the story. Rather, it is chaotic and is composed primarily of erroneous information; for instance, the meaning of the commingling of reality and fantasy is explained as “no devera de mintir, ni abusar (?) de ayuda de otra gente.”

Language

In this essay language usage is inadequate to communicate the response to the question and therefore earned a score of 1. Grammatical errors make comprehension difficult. The vocabulary is insufficient to make the essay comprehensible and there is a marked lack of control of the conventions of the written language. Accents are omitted entirely and spelling mistakes are rampant: “imajinasion,” “valla a trallele agua,” etc.

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2003 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Question 3: Análisis de Texto

Sample: FF

Score: Content 9 / Language 5

Content

This very well-developed essay demonstrates insight and originality, and it merits a score of 9. It reveals a superior understanding of how the ideas expressed in the cited passage are reflected in the *Lazarillo*. Moreover, it argues engagingly and persuasively that the quote is more applicable to the first three *tratados* than to the last. The student states a premise in the introduction, develops it in the body, and concludes by reiterating the guiding ideas of the essay. Lázaro's relative optimism at the end of the work is suitably highlighted, along with his more positive outlook on the blind man. The student's explanation for not endorsing the quotation in its entirety, and the development of that argument, reveal superior critical thinking and insight.

Language

There is very good language usage to support effectively an appropriate response to the question. There are infrequent, random errors in grammatical structures, but there is also varied and accurate use of vocabulary. Control of the conventions of the written language is quite good.

Sample: YY

Score: Content 6 / Language 4

Content

This succinct essay suggests competence and merits a score of 6. There is considerable plot summary with insufficient analysis, as well as some irrelevant information, e.g., that the work mocks the government of Carlos V. The preliminary conclusion reached in the middle of the commentary ("Por eso fue que. . .") is appropriate and reveals understanding of the text and the quotation. Lázaro's lack of trust in people is confirmed in the case of his wife, and the final comment links that episode to the preceding ones. The absence of a conclusion weakens the essay. Had the commentary been better organized and its ideas developed, it would have merited a higher grade.

Language

There is appropriate use of vocabulary, and the conventions of the written language are generally correct, notwithstanding errors in accentuation ("decia," "habia") and spelling ("sucseso," "gobierno"), etc. There are some errors in grammatical structures, but they do not detract from the overall readability of the essay.

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2003 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Question 3: Análisis de Texto (cont'd.)

Sample: D

Score: Content 3 / Language 3

Content

This essay suggests lack of competence and received a score of 3. It draws unwarranted parallels between the *Lazarillo* and the critical study by Zamora Vicente. Both are referred to as “cuentos.” This represents a significant misunderstanding of the selection used in the question and of the question itself. It also has a major error in the assertion that Lázaro had only one master. This suggests that the student has neither read nor understood the assigned sections of the *Lazarillo*; further confirmation of this weakness is found in the last sentence of the essay, where the “two characters” (Lazarillo and Zamora Vicente’s phantom) are compared. A more accurate response that revealed greater understanding of the question and the *Lazarillo* would have resulted in a higher score.

Language

Language usage, as related to an appropriate response to the question, is judged to be adequate. There are few grammatical errors (“Es muy similar con el cuento”), and some mistakes in the conventions of the written language (“comun,” “resimiento,” “Luego” etc.); however, the essay is comprehensible.