



AP[®] English Literature and Composition 2016 Scoring Guidelines

© 2016 The College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board.

Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.org.

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: apcentral.collegeboard.org.

AP[®] ENGLISH LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION

2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1: Richard Wilbur, “Juggler”

The score should reflect the quality of the essay as a whole — its content, style, and mechanics. **Reward the students 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 offer a persuasive analysis of Wilbur’s use of poetic elements to convey how the speaker describes the juggler and what that description reveals about the speaker. The writers of these essays offer a range of interpretations. They provide convincing readings of the description of the juggler, what it reveals about the speaker, and Wilbur’s use of poetic elements such as imagery, figurative language, and tone. They demonstrate consistent and effective control over the elements of composition in language appropriate to the analysis of poetry. Their textual references are apt and specific. Though they may not be error-free, these essays are perceptive in their analysis and demonstrate writing that is clear and sophisticated, and in the case of a 9 essay, especially persuasive.

7–6 These essays offer a reasonable analysis of Wilbur’s use of poetic elements to convey how the speaker describes the juggler and what that description reveals about the speaker. They are less thorough or less precise in their analysis of Wilbur’s description of the juggler and what it reveals about the speaker, and their analysis of Wilbur’s use of poetic elements is less thorough or convincing. These essays demonstrate the student’s ability to express ideas clearly, making references to the text, although they do not exhibit the same level of effective writing as the 9–8 essays. Essays scored a 7 present better-developed analysis and more consistent command of the elements of effective composition than do essays scored a 6.

5 These essays respond to the assigned task with a plausible analysis of Wilbur’s use of poetic elements to describe the juggler and what the description reveals about the speaker, but they tend to be superficial or pedestrian in their analysis of the description and of the use of poetic elements. They often rely on paraphrase, which may contain some analysis, implicit or explicit. Their analysis of the description and what it reveals or of Wilbur’s use of poetic elements may be vague, formulaic, or minimally supported by references to the text. There may be minor misinterpretations of the poem. These writers demonstrate some control of language, but their essays may be marred by surface errors. These essays are not as well conceived, organized, or developed as 7–6 essays.

4–3 These lower-half essays fail to offer an adequate analysis of the use of poetic elements to describe the juggler and what it reveals about the speaker. The analysis may be partial, unconvincing, or irrelevant, or it may ignore the description, what it reveals about the speaker, or Wilbur’s use of poetic elements. Evidence from the poem may be slight or misconstrued, or the essays may rely on paraphrase only. The writing often demonstrates a lack of control over the conventions of composition: inadequate development of ideas, accumulation of errors, or a focus that is unclear, inconsistent, or repetitive. Essays scored a 3 may contain significant misreading and/or demonstrate inept writing.

2–1 These essays compound the weaknesses of the papers in the 4–3 range. Although some attempt has been made to respond to the prompt, the student’s assertions are presented with little clarity, organization, or support from the poem. These essays may contain serious errors in grammar and mechanics. They may offer a complete misreading or be unacceptably brief. Essays scored a 1 contain little coherent discussion of the poem.

0 These essays give a response that is completely off topic or inadequate; there may be some mark or a drawing or a brief reference to the task.

— These essays are entirely blank.

AP[®] ENGLISH LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION

2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2: Thomas Hardy, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*

The score should reflect the quality of the essay as a whole — its content, style, and mechanics. **Reward the students 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 offer a persuasive analysis of Hardy’s portrayal of the complex relationship between the two characters, Michael Henchard and his daughter, Elizabeth-Jane. The students make a strong case for their interpretation of the complex relationship between the two characters. They may consider elements such as tone, word choice, and detail, and they engage the text through apt and specific references. Although these essays may not be error-free, their perceptive analysis is apparent in writing that is clear and effectively organized. Essays scored a 9 reveal more sophisticated analysis and more effective control of language than do essays scored an 8.

7–6 These essays offer a reasonable analysis of Hardy’s portrayal of the complex relationship between the two characters. The students provide a sustained, competent reading of the passage, with attention to elements such as tone, word choice, and detail. Although these essays may not be error-free and are less perceptive or less convincing than 9–8 essays, the students present their ideas with clarity and control and refer to the text for support. Essays scored a 7 present better-developed analysis and more consistent command of the elements of effective composition than do essays scored a 6.

5 These essays respond to the assigned task with a plausible reading of the passage, but tend to be superficial or thin in their discussion of Hardy’s portrayal of the complex relationship between the two characters. While containing some analysis of the passage, implicit or explicit, the discussion of how elements such as tone, word choice, and detail contribute to the portrayal of the complex relationship may be slight, and support from the passage may tend toward summary or paraphrase. While these writers demonstrate adequate control of language, their essays may be marred by surface errors. These essays are not as well conceived, organized, or developed as 7–6 essays.

4–3 These lower-half essays fail to offer an adequate analysis of the passage. The analysis may be partial, unconvincing, or irrelevant; the students may ignore the portrayal of the complex relationship between the characters or the use of elements to develop the relationship. These essays may be characterized by an unfocused or repetitive presentation of ideas, an absence of textual support, or an accumulation of errors. Essays scored a 3 may contain significant misreading and/or inept writing.

2–1 These essays compound the weaknesses of the papers in the 4–3 range. They may persistently misread the passage or be unacceptably brief. They may contain pervasive errors that interfere with understanding. Although some attempt has been made to respond to the prompt, the student’s ideas are presented with little clarity, organization, or support from the passage. Essays scored a 1 contain little coherent discussion of the passage.

0 These essays give a response that is completely off topic or inadequate; there may be some mark or a drawing or a brief reference to the task.

— These essays are entirely blank.

AP[®] ENGLISH LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION

2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3: Intentional Deception

The score should reflect the quality of the essay as a whole — its content, style, and mechanics. **Reward the students 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 offer a well-focused and persuasive analysis of the motives for the character’s deception and how the deception contributes to the meaning of the work as a whole. Using apt and specific textual support, these essays analyze what motivates the character’s deception and how the work as a whole is shaped by it. Although these essays may not be error-free, they make a strong case for their interpretation and discuss the literary work with significant insight and understanding. Essays scored a 9 reveal more sophisticated analysis and more effective control of language than do essays scored an 8.

7–6 These essays offer a reasonable analysis of the motives for the character’s deception and how the deception contributes to the meaning of the work as a whole. These essays analyze what motivates the character’s deception and how the work as a whole is shaped by it. While these papers demonstrate insight and understanding, their analysis is less thorough, less perceptive, and/or less specific in supporting detail than that of the 9–8 essays. Essays scored a 7 present better-developed analysis and more consistent command of the elements of effective composition than do essays scored a 6.

5 These essays respond to the assigned task with a plausible reading, but they tend to be superficial or thinly developed in analysis. They often rely upon plot summary that contains some analysis, implicit or explicit. Although the writers attempt to discuss what motivates the character’s deception, they may demonstrate a rather simplistic understanding of its significance, and support from the text may be too general. While these writers demonstrate adequate control of language, their essays may be marred by surface errors. These essays are not as well conceived, organized, or developed as 7–6 essays.

4–3 These lower-half essays fail to offer an adequate analysis of the motives for a character’s deception and how that deception contributes to the meaning of the work as a whole. The analysis may be partial, unsupported, or irrelevant, and the essays may reflect an incomplete or oversimplified understanding of the significance of what motivates the character’s deception. They may not develop an analysis of the contribution of the character’s deception to the meaning of the work as a whole, or they may rely on plot summary alone. These essays may be characterized by an unfocused or repetitive presentation of ideas, an absence of textual support, or an accumulation of errors; they may lack control over the elements of college-level composition. Essays scored a 3 may contain significant misreading and/or inept writing.

2–1 Although these essays make some attempt to respond to the prompt, they compound the weaknesses of the papers in the 4–3 range. Often, they are unacceptably brief or incoherent in presenting their ideas. They may be poorly written on several counts and contain distracting errors in grammar and mechanics. The student’s remarks may be presented with little clarity, organization, or supporting evidence. Essays scored a 1 contain little coherent discussion of the text.

0 These essays give a response that is completely off topic or inadequate; there may be some mark or a drawing or a brief reference to the task.

— These essays are entirely blank.