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.

5 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.
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the exam.

In the poems "Hawks Roosting" and "Golden Retrievals," the poets characterize the speakers in their poems through the animals' points of view.

In the first poem presented, the audience is confronted by an animal that thinks very highly of itself. The poet wrote the poem in the first person so that the audience could see how the speaker is characterized. All of the hawk's surroundings revolve around serving his needs. The high trees are convenient, the "air's buoyancy and the sun's ray" (line 6) are advantageous "because it is all mine," (line 14). The hawk's assertion that creation was all his sums up the way the hawk feels about his environment. He believes that he is the culmination of the whole of Creation's work, like he is the best Creation has to offer. He is the king of the forest. And as king, all those below him are his subjects, including the audience. The hawk seems to be speaking to the audience only out of his leisure. Each stanza begins with a self-centered statement followed by evidence. There are two more stanzas in this poem than the second one chiefly because the hawk enjoys talking about himself. Also, as king, the hawk has a divine right, which is to kill any living thing as he pleases; "no arguments assert my right." (line 20).
In fact this means that he does not even have to explain the reasoning behind this obvious right of his. The last line of "Hawk Roosting" also demonstrates how the hawk is in control. He states that he is "going to keep things like this" (line 24); he is going to maintain his seat of power and maintain the conditions so that they remain in his hands or "hooked feet" (line 3). Rhyming is used with this phrase in the first stanza of the poem when "hooked feet" (line 3) rhymes with "kills and eat," (line 4). This dramatizes the hawk's lofty point of view. The hawk's view of the world is just as cutthroat as he is with his prey.

Contrasting greatly with the hawk's view of the world is the golden retriever's. "Golden Retrieval". The structure of the poem itself varies immensely. There are only four short stanzas instead of six. In addition the speaker cuts off each stanza mid-sentence paralleling his short attention span. The sentences are short and choppy unlike the never-ending sentences of the hawk's because instead of elaborating on how great he is, the dog just describes what he likes to do.
The poem begins with a one-wor ded sentence of “Fetch?” and is peppered with questions and interruptions: “a squirrel who’s—oh joy—actually scared” (lines 3-4). The speaker also inserts onomatopoeia and alliteration simultaneously in line 11 when he says that he “unsnarled time’s warp (and woof!)” dramatizing his point of view and allowing the audience to see how energetic and distracted the speaker is. The speaker leaves the audience with a further reminder of his character when he ends with onomatopoeia in the form of his barking.

Even though both of these animals differ strongly in the way they each view the world, there exists some similarities. They both feel as if they are better than the audience, or to be more specific, humans. The hawk claims to be the sum of all creation, a claim used by humans who believe that they are the winners at the game of survival of the fittest. In “Golden Retrievals,” the “zen master’s bronty gang” (line 18) is the dog’s bark and not the dog’s master (a human)’s call. The gun the dog refers to is “sunk in the past” (line 7) while the golden retriever
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As bounding away to the future, both animals leave humans behind or beneath them.

The speakers were characterized on how they portrayed to the audience their separate points of views through dramatization of how they spoke and their individual characters.
Animals have always had a significant role in the human world. Whether friend or food, man has always had a place for animals. To look at the world through an animal's point of view sheds light onto the ways in which humans look at the world. For Hughes and Doré

Doré uses colorful, characteristic a head and a golden retriever and convey their world views through the usage of selection, sentence structure, and imagery. Using these techniques, the hound is portrayed as a dominant who wants to be in complete control of emotion and the golden retriever is portrayed as carefree, wanting only to warrant every moment.

The diction used by Hughes and Doré is what makes a clear distinction between the hound and the retriever. Doré uses word with a carefree revelation that mean little to humans. He repeats the use of "bow-wow" three times and uses "woof." "Thrillingly" is often used with the words "clear thing." Doré portrays him as a man. Doré's diction is not merely is slow. He speaks of air's "breeze" and the "perfect kill." The hound is certainly portrayed as one with arrogance who dreams of dominating while the diction used to speak of the retriever is simple, reflecting his simple characters and lifestyle.
Dotty’s sentence structure converge the retriever’s view on the world. “Bunny. tumbling leaves a squirrel. Who’s - oh/joy - actually scared.” (3-4). The sentences are not lengthy, but rather short and choppy. Hughes on the other hand, creates sentences that are longer: “it took the whole of creation / to produce my foot, my each feather: / Now I wind creation in my feet...” (10-12). These sentences are not only longer, but the subject in the hawk. The arrogance of the hawk is seen as well as his desire to demo dominate. The short, choppy sentences used by Dotty when the desire to savoir everything that takes place.

A dog is most certainly going to have a different character and a different view of the world than a bird. Dotty and Hughes capture these differences in their poems through sentence structure and diction among many other devices. One can easily see the care free dog and the dominating bird through both poems.
Both Hughes and Colby present an animal's perception of the world. However, both each poem seems to convey a very different view from the other. The Hawk seems to feel superior and advantaged while the Golden Retriever seems to feel oppressed and inferior to man and the world.

Ted Hughes characterizes his hawk by placing it in a setting of calmness, serenity, and height. The hawk sits there “rehearsing” scenes of killing and feeding. The poet uses imagery to paint a picture of the hawk grasping the world by his feet. Its eyes are closed to convey a feeling of security the hawk possesses as it now has all of Creation in its foot. The hawk possesses a tone of superiority and arrogance as it conveys its view of the world as a possession of its own. Hughes uses these images

Ted Hughes characterizes his hawk by placing it in an elevated, serene setting at first. He manages to convey a feeling of comfort and confidence by tapping into the hawk's thoughts and providing the reader with an image of its surroundings, "convenience of high trees", "air's buoyancy and sun's my one advantage to me". The tone is somewhat arrogant and maintaining how the hawk is placing 'Creation' that created it at its feet. The hawk seems to believe it is advantaged and superior. It says "no argument is necessary", "assert my right", and "I am going to keep things just like this" to convey the hawk's power and authority. Hughes uses
Simple diction however, is able to convey the hawk's precise attitude towards the world and its power.

On the other hand, Mark Doty shows another animal view of the world. It is a Golden Retriever's. Doty displays the thoughts of the dog to show how he despises his life and feels oppressed. He uses a lot of satire and ridicules the perception that animals might be joyful. He characterizes the dog through a use of conversation as if the dog is having a conversation with the reader or maybe even himself. He criticizes, "you" for being stuck in the past or concerned with the future which he seems to haveno hope in.

In the end, he writes: "bow-wow, bow-wow, bow-wow" which I believe are put as a representation of the dog bowing for its master and wailing at its pain caused by the world.

Both pieces give very different views of the world. "Golden Retrievers" conveys a dog's feelings of oppression and hopelessness while that of the hawk in "Hawk Roosting" seems to be a feeling of confidence and superiority. Both poets use various forms of literary techniques to both characterize their animals and convey their views.
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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.