

# AP<sup>®</sup> ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION

## 2007 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Question 2

The score should reflect a judgment of the essay's quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 40 minutes to read and write; therefore, the essay is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards that are appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. Evaluate the essay as a draft, making certain to reward students for what they do well.

All essays, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional flaws in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into the holistic evaluation of an essay's overall quality. In no case may an essay with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics be scored higher than a 2.

- 
- 9 Essays earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for 8 essays and, in addition, are especially sophisticated in their explanation or demonstrate particularly impressive control of language.

#### 8 Effective

Essays earning a score of 8 **effectively** analyze the strategies Sanders uses to develop his perspective about moving. The prose demonstrates an ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing but is not necessarily flawless.

- 7 Essays earning a score of 7 fit the description of 6 essays but provide a more complete explanation or demonstrate a more mature prose style.

#### 6 Adequate

Essays earning a score of 6 **adequately** analyze the strategies Sanders uses to develop his perspective about moving. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.

- 5 Essays earning a score of 5 analyze the strategies Sanders uses to develop his perspective about moving. These essays may, however, provide uneven, inconsistent, or limited explanations. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the student's ideas.

#### 4 Inadequate

Essays earning a score of 4 **inadequately** analyze the strategies Sanders uses to develop his perspective about moving. The prose generally conveys the student's ideas but may suggest immature control of writing.

- 3 Essays earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for a score of 4 but demonstrate less success in analyzing the strategies Sanders uses to develop his perspective about moving. The essays may show less control of writing.

#### 2 Little Success

Essays earning a score of 2 demonstrate **little success** in analyzing the strategies Sanders uses to develop his perspective about moving. These essays may misunderstand the prompt; fail to analyze the strategies Sanders uses to develop his perspective about moving; or substitute a simpler task by responding to the prompt tangentially with unrelated, inaccurate, or inappropriate explanation. The prose often demonstrates consistent weaknesses in writing.

**AP<sup>®</sup> ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION  
2007 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Question 2 (continued)**

- 1** Essays earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for a score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their explanation, and/or weak in their control of language.
- 0** Indicates an on-topic response that receives no credit, such as one that merely repeats the prompt.
- Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.

## Question II

2A 1 of 3

Rushdie

In response to an essay by Salman ~~Rushdie~~ on the benefits of moving, Scott Russell Sanders refutes "the belief that movement is inherently good" (Sanders). He claims that we should root ourselves in places rather than ideas, that we should care for the earth rather than our own selfish desires. Through his use of direct quotes, acknowledgement of the counter-argument, and informal yet respectful tone, Sanders relates his belief that we must settle down and cease our tireless moving if we are to ever "pay enough ~~need~~ need and respect to where we are" (Sanders).

Sander's essay was written purely in response to Rushdie's essay — therefore, he ~~uses~~ quotes Rushdie several times directly and then states his own beliefs in similar ways. For example, Sanders quoted Rushdie in saying that "'to be a migrant is perhaps to be the only species of human being free of the shackles of nationalism (to say nothing of its ugly sister, patriotism)'" (Sanders). Sanders asserts this statement by saying "Lord knows we could do with less nationalism (to say nothing of its ugly siblings, racism, religious sectarianism, or class snobbery" (Sanders). In quoting Rushdie directly and repeating his words and syntax, Sanders not only assures the reader of his careful thoughtfulness on the issue, but also states his own belief that moving does nothing to rid us of the



unfortunate aspects of humanity of which we all wish to be free. He also quotes Rushdie several other times; for example, he says, "Rushdie claims that 'migrants must ... make a new imaginative relationship with the world'" (Sanders). He then uses this quote as a counterexample to <sup>one of</sup> his main points — how can one create a new relationship with the world when they are constantly altering their place in it?

Sanders use of direct quotes goes hand in hand with his acknowledgement of the opponent's argument — he quotes Rushdie only to refute his point and bring up his own points. At first he states parts of Rushdie's argument and agrees with them, such as the "hybridity" (Sanders) of American culture which makes us all the more stronger and wiser. He then moves on to another quote with which he does not so readily agree, but to which he "might respond more skeptically" (Sanders). He then moves on to a third quote and completely disagrees with it. Finally, his development of stating the counter-argument is completed when he states that Rushdie articulates exactly "the orthodoxy that [he] wishe[s] to ~~cont~~ counter — that movement is inherently good, staying put bad" (Sanders). He finishes by asserting that we must root ourselves to a specific place ~~and~~ in order to "pay enough heed and respect to where we are" (Sanders).



This gradual movement from agreement to complete disagreement reinforces Sanders' point and respectfully refutes Rushdie's point consequently.

His disagreement with Rushdie in principle could have been marked by a condescending and imposing tone—however through his choice of phrases, Sanders' tone is informal, yet respectful of Rushdie's point of view. He connects himself with the reader and Rushdie by using such words as "I", "our", and "we" (Sanders). He places himself on our level as well as Rushdie's; he is conversational and informal. Yet he is still respectful towards Rushdie and admits that even though he disagrees completely with him, Rushdie articulated his views "as eloquently as anyone" (Sanders). He is respectful of the man whose ideas he is refuting—there is not even a hint of ad hominem argument in this essay, for Sanders never attacks Rushdie himself. This tone develops his point as one that is accessible and easy to understand for all people, as one that we all should hold as a fundamental belief of society.

Sanders does not develop his point of view with vicious verbal slander or disrespectful destruction of Rushdie's well-thought out argument. Rather, he uses a respectful as well as informal tone, direct quotes, and acknowledgement and sometimes agreement with his opponent's argument.

#

In his passage *Staying Put: Making a Home in a Restless World*, Scott Russell Sanders employs a veritable plethora of ~~re~~ rhetorical strategies in order to create a skeptical, critical, and even at times mocking tone towards incessant migration. As this idea is exemplified by Salman Rushdie, Sanders systematically attacks the philosophy that "movement is inherently good [and that] staying put is bad."

Sanders begins his criticism by outlining opposition. His colorful diction depicts America as a land of "heroes," and he implements zeugma in order to equate "explorers" and "cowboys" with "rainbow-chasers," seeming to embrace such an idealistic view. He also addresses the audience using the 1st person plural pronoun "we" and ~~our~~ the possessive "our" which immediately unifies the perspective of the author and the reader. However, beginning with the short and grim sentence ~~conducting~~ <sup>in</sup> the first paragraph, Sanders' skepticism begins to shine through as he qualifies the statement "stand still ... and you die" with his own editorial "we are wanted." All of a sudden the author begins to question this idealism, asking how Americans ~~could listen to~~ "could hear such [infeasible] a proposal without hoisting."

In the second paragraph Sanders addresses Rushdie's direct points, and only adds to his



credibility as an authority by making the admission that because of the diversity created by migration "we are stranger." Still, Sanders attacks Rushdie's assertion that "to be a migrant is the only species of human being free of the shackles of nationalism," even mocking his syntactical structure by using parenthesis to offer his analysis on the state of which social problems have, (or have not) been resolved. In the third paragraph, Sanders bolsters his argument by ~~adding~~ citing historical examples to lend ethos to his opinions, and concludes the paragraph by metaphorically exposing the ridiculous notion that the world was meant to accept heterogenous ~~cultures~~ practices, (suited for and specialized in one region), in all locales.

Ultimately, Rushdie believed in a world based on ideas because he himself was a consummate romantic, but as a pragmatist, Sanders does not ~~at~~ overlook how "By settling in, we have a chance of making a durable home for ourselves, our fellow creatures, and our descendants"

#

In Staying Put: Making a Home in a Restless World, Scott Russell Sanders' position on moving continuously is obvious right from the start. He begins with examples of the people we look at as heroes and what they did. His point begins there because all of those people were ones who moved around quite often. People like sailors, explorers, and cowboys were always traveling. He makes a very interesting statement in the essay stating "Our promise land has always been over the next ridge or at the end of the trail, never under our feet." This abstractly says that our strive for happiness is likely to go on forever. It's as if we are running in place trying to get to the promise land. He uses examples of situations where people feel like they need to move to a new location, and those examples provide imagery for the reader. Sanders states that "if we fish out a stream or wear out a field, or if the smoke from the neighbor's chimney begins to crowd the sky, why move?" People seem to be under the impression that happiness will be achieved without a struggle, and that's not the case.

Sanders also uses a lot of parallel structure in his examples of the things Americans do in general that involve moving. He says that "Americans have built the most roads, and airports, dug the most canals, and





aid the most rails out of any other nation. It's like we are fascinated with new surroundings.

Sanders really starts to unleash a kind of ignorance of the Americans in the middle of his essay. Moving is not always the solution. He states that some people feel like moving will "make a new imaginative relationship with the world." Some people will just carry bad habits for the rest of their lives.

Sanders also alludes to many historic events that involved the idea of moving for benefit. It alludes to the Spaniards Central and South America, Colonists and North America and the Dust Bowl of 1930's. It's obvious that this way of thinking has been going on for hundreds of years. He uses a simile comparing the mind of people and the land of the world to dough and cookie cutters. "The habit of our industry and commerce has been to force identical schemes onto differing locales."

I definitely would say that his concluding paragraph was most effective because of its diction. It really just tops off his argument that people who move don't have a stable life. It just makes the reader think. He says "People who root themselves in places are likelier to know and care for those places are people who root themselves in ideas." He also says that when we decide to stop moving everytime something bad happens we can learn to respect where we are currently. "By settling in, we have a chance of making a divisible home for ourselves, our fellow creatures, and our descendants. It appeals to

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

2

2C 3 of 3

ethos and makes him sound very credible

#

**AP<sup>®</sup> ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION  
2007 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 2**

**Overview**

This question called for students to analyze the strategies used by essayist Scott Russell Sanders in a passage that encourages readers to consider the personal, social, and environmental advantages of “staying put.” Writing in response to Salman Rushdie’s essay celebrating migrants who root themselves in ideas, not places, Sanders argues in favor of habitation, not migration.

**Sample: 2A**

**Score: 9**

This essay offers no elaborate introduction. It doesn’t need to: The analysis question calls for an examination answer, not a discursive essay, and this student follows an instinct to get right to work on the analysis. The essay first examines Sanders’s use of material directly quoted from the Rushdie essay, showing how Sanders uses the Rushdie material as a springboard for developing his own beliefs. The student notes the effect of Sanders’s direct quoting: “In quoting Rushdie directly and repeting [*sic*] his words and syntax, Sanders not only assures the reader of his careful thoughtfulness on the issue, but also states his own belief that moving does nothing to rid us of the unfortunate aspects of humanity of which we all wish to be free.” The student next examines how Sanders moves from legitimately and honestly examining Rushdie’s argument to offer his own counterargument. The response offers a succinct evaluation of this organizational strategy: “This gradual movement from agreement to complete disagreement reinforces Sander’s [*sic*] pont [*sic*] and respectfully refutes Rushdie’s point consequently.” Finally, the writer analyzes Sanders’s “conversational and informal” tone: “He is respectful of the man whose ideas he is refuting—there is not even a hint of ad hominem argument in this essay, for Sanders never attacks Rushdie himself.” In summary, this paper analyzes the logic, organization, and tone of Sanders’s essay quite fully and fluently.

**Sample: 2B**

**Score: 6**

This essay opens with a broad assessment of Sanders’s “veritable plethora of rhetorical strategies” and then focuses on what the student sees as a “skeptical, critical, and even at times mocking tone.” The essay praises Sanders’s “colorful diction,” even mentioning the use of zeugma (but without clearly pointing out where it is in the original text). The student recognizes Sanders’s use of first-person plural pronouns, “which immediately unifies the perspective of the author and the reader,” but then senses a shift toward skepticism in Sanders’s diction. Throughout this opening section of the essay, the student does a good job of explaining how diction and style support Sanders’s evolving ideas. The next move, though, keeps the essay in the adequate, rather than effective, range by arguing that Sanders attacks Rushdie, “even mocking his syntactical structure.” It is difficult to substantiate such overstated claims. The student’s subsequent attempt to show how Sanders’s use of historical examples both “bolsters his argument” and “lend[s] ethos to his opinions” is quite acceptable, however. The essay concludes with a quite nice, if brief, comparison between Rushdie as a “consummate romantic” and Sanders as a “pragmatist.” In short, this essay shows all the hallmarks of a first draft, which, if the student could return to it, temper its overstatement, and flesh out its points with examples, would be effective.

**AP<sup>®</sup> ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION  
2007 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Question 2 (continued)**

**Sample: 2C**

**Score: 4**

This essay is an inadequate response to the task. It is disjointed. It identifies discrete features without ever clearly explaining how the features connect to, and support, Sanders's purpose and evolving ideas. The essay begins with a gloss on the content and relies on glossing heavily throughout. It observes that Sanders supports his points with historical examples and even notes that some of these examples evoke imagery. The student remarks that "Sanders also uses a lot of parallel structure in his examples of the things Americans do" and offers a brief analysis of the effect of that syntactic strategy. The student then refers to Sanders's use of historical examples and points out his use of a simile—"comparing the mind of people and the land of the world to dough and cookie cutters"—quoting Sanders's conclusion that "The habit of our industry and commerce has been to force identical schemes onto differing locales." The essay concludes by attempting to praise the diction of the final paragraph, but the student seems incapable of offering examples, saying merely that "It just makes the reader think." The student seems to know what analysis is but inadequately performs the task, falling back on the strategies of paraphrasing content and pointing out stylistic features yet not connecting the two.