

SESSION TWO

FOR TEACHERS ONLY

The University of the State of New York
REGENTS HIGH SCHOOL EXAMINATION

ENGLISH

E

Friday, June 15, 2001—9:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m., only

SCORING KEY AND RATING GUIDE

Mechanics of Rating

The following procedures are to be used for rating papers in the Comprehensive Examination in English. More detailed directions for the organization of the rating process and procedures for rating the examination are included in the *Information Booklet for Administering and Scoring the Comprehensive Examination in English*.

Scoring of Multiple-Choice Questions

Indicate by means of a checkmark each incorrect or omitted answer to multiple-choice questions on the Session Two answer sheet; do not place a checkmark beside a correct answer. Use only red ink or red pencil. In the box provided under each part, record the number of questions the student answered correctly for that part. Transfer the number of correct answers for the Part A multiple-choice questions to the appropriate spaces in the box in the upper right corner of each student's **SESSION ONE** answer sheet.

Session Two	
Correct Answers	
Part A	
(1)	2
(2)	3
(3)	1
(4)	4
(5)	3
(6)	2
(7)	1
(8)	4
(9)	1
(10)	2

Rating of Essays

- (1) Follow your school's procedures for training for rating. This process should include:

Introduction to the task—

- Raters read the task and summarize its purpose, audience, and format
- Raters read passage(s) and plan own response to task
- Raters share response plans and summarize expectations for student responses

Introduction to the rubric and anchor papers—

- Trainer reviews rubric with reference to the task
- Trainer reviews procedures for assigning scores
- Trainer leads review of each anchor paper and commentary
(**Note:** Anchor papers are ordered from high to low within each score level.)

Practice scoring individually—

- Raters score a set of five papers individually
- Trainer records scores and leads discussion until raters feel confident enough to move on to actual scoring

- (2) When actual rating begins, each rater should record his or her individual rating for a student's essay on the rating sheet provided, *not* directly on the student's essay or answer sheet. Do *not* correct the student's work by making insertions or changes of any kind.
- (3) Each essay must be rated by at least two raters; a third rater will be necessary to resolve scores that differ by more than one point. The scoring coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the movement of papers, calculating a final score for each student's essay, recording that information on the student's answer paper for Session One, and determining the student's final score for the examination. The chart located at the end of these scoring materials should be used for determining the final examination score.

**SESSION TWO – PART A – SCORING RUBRIC
READING AND WRITING FOR LITERARY RESPONSE**

QUALITY	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p>Meaning: the extent to which the response exhibits sound understanding, and analysis of the task and text(s)</p> <p>Development: the extent to which ideas are elaborated using specific and relevant evidence from the text(s)</p> <p>Organization: the extent to which the response exhibits direction, shape, and coherence</p> <p>Language Use: the extent to which the response reveals an awareness of audience and purpose through effective use of words, sentence structure, and sentence variety</p> <p>Conventions: the extent to which the response exhibits conventional spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and usage</p>	<p>Responses at this level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -establish a controlling idea that reveals an in-depth analysis of both texts -make insightful connections between the controlling idea and the ideas in each text -develop ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from both texts -maintain the focus established by the controlling idea -exhibit a logical and coherent structure through skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions -are stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging, with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning -demonstrate control of the conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language 	<p>Responses at this level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -establish a controlling idea that reveals a thorough understanding of both texts -make clear and explicit connections between the controlling idea and the ideas in each text -develop ideas clearly and consistently, with reference to relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from both texts -maintain the focus established by the controlling idea -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas through use of appropriate devices and transitions -use language that is fluent and original, with evident awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing -demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language 	<p>Responses at this level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -establish a controlling idea that shows a basic understanding of both texts -make implicit connections between the controlling idea and the ideas in each text -develop some ideas more fully than others, with reference to specific and relevant evidence and appropriate literary elements from both texts -maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas but may lack internal consistency -use appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose -occasionally make effective use of sentence structure or length -demonstrate partial control, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension 	<p>Responses at this level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -establish a controlling idea that shows a basic understanding of the texts -make few or superficial connections between the controlling idea and the ideas in the texts -develop ideas briefly, using some evidence from the texts -may rely primarily on plot summary -establish, but fail to maintain, an appropriate focus -exhibit a rudimentary structure but may include some inconsistencies or irrelevancies -rely on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience or purpose -exhibit some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success -demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension 	<p>Responses at this level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -convey a confused or incomplete understanding of the texts -make a few connections but fail to establish a controlling idea -are incomplete or largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas, but references to the text are vague, irrelevant, repetitive, or unjustified -lack an appropriate focus but suggest some organization, or suggest a focus but lack organization -use language that is imprecise or unsuitable for the audience or purpose -reveal little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect -demonstrate a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult 	<p>Responses at this level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -provide minimal or no evidence of textual understanding -make no connections between the texts or among ideas in the texts -are minimal, with no evidence of development -show no focus or organization -are minimal -use language that is incoherent or inappropriate -are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable -may be illegible or not recognizable as English

- if the student addresses only one text, the response can be scored no higher than a 3.
- if the student writes only a personal response and makes no reference to the text(s), the response can be scored no higher than a 1.
- Responses totally unrelated to the topic, illegible, incoherent, or blank should be given a 0.
- A response totally copied from the text(s) with no original student writing should be scored a 0.

The passages show us that human dignity comes from a person's own strength of character, not from his social status or his environment.

In passage I, the author uses the omniscient point of view to let the reader know Mashenka's social status. She is a young governess whose parents "had nothing" (line 23). She has a "little room" (line 24) in a busy household with many servants. The author also uses the omniscient point of view to reveal Mashenka's dismay and confusion when she is falsely accused. (See the many questions in lines 28-36.)

The author of Passage I uses description and dialogue to reveal the environment and true character of her employees, Madame Huskin and Nikolay Sergeitch. The presence of the servants and the value of the missing brooch tell us that this is a wealthy household. The reader might expect to see these upper class people behave with great dignity, but they behave quite badly. The Lady of the house invades her governess's room and lies about it. ("I upset it accidentally" line 24) She fusses at the dinner table and suddenly orders her husband, "eat your dinner, and don't interfere in what doesn't concern you." The husband meekly obeys. He has inherited this big house and the expensive jewelry, but apparently he can't handle his own finances. "I need money," he says. So he takes his wife's brooch but is afraid to tell her, letting blame fall on Mashenka and the other servants.

The contrast is clear. Mashenka, the poor governess, has true dignity. She has too much strength of character to allow herself to stay in this household, even if it means she must return to her penniless parents. The Master and Mistress, however, have no character at all. Each one puts up with the disgraceful behavior of the other. They have status and wealth, but no dignity.

The author of Passage II uses detailed description to establish the environment in which the characters live. Although this family has a servant (the washwoman), we can see that they are not as wealthy as the family in Passage I. The description of winter, with their windows "decorated with icicles" (line 25) and the price of coal "very dear" (line 26), suggests that they live modestly.

The author's descriptions of the old washwoman let us know that her environment and her condition are even worse. She gets water from a pump and she carries the wash to a cold attic—so cold that the laundry becomes "as brittle as glass" (line 20). The old woman herself is "small and thin" (line 4), with "narrow shoulders" (line 7).

Unlike the wealthy family in Passage I, the poorer family in Passage II has ~~strength~~ strength of character and dignity. Their dignity is revealed by ^{description} their behavior toward the servant. The mother appreciates the good work of the washwoman and gives her hot tea, bread, and a warm place to sit. She worries about the old woman and "prayed for her." (line 9)

But it is the dignity of the old woman that most impresses the reader (and obviously, the author, too). Her strength of character will not allow her to neglect her duty, and her sense of duty keeps her alive: "The wash would not let me die." Furthermore, she ~~will~~ will not use her age and poor health to seek charity from others. She rejects the mother's blessing that she "live to be a hundred and twenty" (line 69) because she knows that she can no longer work and refuses "to be a burden on anyone" (lines 72-73).

By using specific elements such as omniscient point of view, description, and dialogue, the author of these two passages has shown us characters who have dignity and character, who do not. By letting us know each character's status and environment, the author let us see that the ^{true} source of dignity is strength of character.

Session Two—Part A

Date: June 2001

Anchor Level 6–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Reveals an in-depth analysis of both texts by establishing the controlling idea that <i>human dignity comes from a person's own strength of character, not from his social status or his environment</i>. The response makes insightful connections between this idea and the texts by discussing the status, environment, and <i>strength of character</i> of key characters, and then comparing Mashenka, the washwoman, and the poorer family (who possess dignity) to Madame Kushkin and Nikolay Sergeitch (who do not).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully. The response effectively uses specific evidence, including appropriate quotations, from each passage to illustrate the authors' use of the omniscient point of view, dialogue, or description to establish each character's status and environment. For example, the response supports the assertion that the <i>true character</i> of Madame Kushkin is revealed through description and dialogue: <i>(The lady of the house invades her governess' room and lies about it. "I upset it accidentally," line 24).</i></p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a focus on the controlling idea that strength of character, not status or environment, is the source of human dignity. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure, beginning the discussion of each work by identifying a literary element used to reveal status or environment and then providing examples. Coherence is achieved in part by the skillful use of contrast between characters (<i>Mashenka ... has true dignity ... The Master and Mistress, however</i>) and passages (<i>Unlike the wealthy family in Passage I, the poorer family in Passage II</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is fluent and original (<i>She will not use her age and poor health to seek charity</i>). Varied sentence structures control pacing. For example, a long sentence about Madame Kushkin, incorporating a quotation, is effectively followed by a short sentence (<i>The husband meekly obeys</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions with essentially no errors.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6 although it is somewhat weaker in language.</p>	

The meaning of human dignity, as defined in the two passages (through the use of metaphors and characterization), is an internal quality of respectable people, though dignified people may not recognize the quality in themselves. Self respect, as used in the determination ^{of characters} of both passages, is the internal driving force to do what's morally correct. Sense of duty, or rather accomplishing what is expected of oneself, is a quality revealed primarily in passage 2 (of the old woman). Honesty, the external manifestation of self respect, is doing the moral action, regardless of its benefit (or lack thereof) on the part of the moral individual.

Self respect, as used in the determination of characters in both passages, is the internal driving force to do what's morally correct. Mashenka, in her detailed character of a respectable governess, understands that to remain in the ^{Kushkin's} household would be to compromise her own values as an individual. The search for the brooch was simply a spark that caused Mashenka's leave; she already accepted her position as being a "servant" in the household (as also pointed out by Lyza). "... it was her lot to experience in all its acuteness the feeling that is so familiar to persons in dependent positions, who eat the bread of the rich and powerful, and cannot speak their minds." Essentially, Mashenka is recognizing that she indeed is inferior by status, and to remain in such a situation would also compromise her moral values. Mashenka knew that she was raised in a different manner; "... she, well-educated, refined, the daughter of a teacher, was suspected of theft; she could not imagine a greater insult." Leaving, ^{as} she abruptly left the dinner table, under the burden of such accusations, was the only way to maintain her dignity. Similarly, regarding the aspect of internal morality, the old lady from passage 2 certainly met her own level of expectation. "... I don't want to be a burden on anyone!"

By relying on others to care for her, the old lady would no longer be independent; and feeling that being dependent was a compromise of her moral values, she defined for herself and others human dignity.

Sense of duty, or rather accomplishing what is expected of oneself is a quality revealed primarily in passage 2 (of the old woman). Lines 14-22 of passage 2 show that while it would have been simpler to rush through the washing process, and certainly less taxing on the woman (metaphorically, we see how the woman's hands have washed themselves of life), she nonetheless painstakingly does the wash the proper way, as is expected of her. Even in times of illness, the lady "could not rest easy because of the wash. The wash would not let her die." Surely, finishing her task, resuming washing once she was well enough to work, is a true sign of human dignity; retaining one's sense of duty.

Honesty, the external manifestation of self respect, is doing the moral action, regardless of its benefit (or lack thereof) on the part of the moral individuals. Mashenka, though economically in need of the governess position, could not entertain in a situation that compromised her morality. "Never in her life had she been so deeply insulted..." Though leaving caused an economic hardship (she knew her parents had no money), Mashenka chose to follow her moral instincts, thus defining herself as a dignified person. In passage 2, the old lady shows her morality through the honesty with which she carries out her work. Though it is quite obvious her work is indeed superior to most, she nonetheless charges the "going rate", as she feels it is immoral to charge more than the mother's

mistaking counting of each article of clothing, so she knows everything is returned reflects the woman's honesty in that everything is always returned. Even in her time of grave illness, the woman could not rest, "she had been driven by an indomitable will to return the property to its rightful owners..." Her return of the clothing, though a few weeks late, was reminiscent of her honesty. Certainly to be so honest, even in a time of illness, is a quality of human dignity.

- B. shown through ^{the} characterization and metaphor of characters in both passages human dignity is truly an internal quality, possessed only by those w/ the ability to do what's right, regardless of the repercussions

Anchor Level 6-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Establishes a controlling idea that reveals an in-depth analysis of both texts by defining dignity in terms of the self-respect, sense of duty, and honesty revealed by the main characters in the two passages. The response makes explicit and sometimes insightful connections between the controlling idea and each of the passages (<i>Mashenka, in her detailed character of a respectable governess, understands that to remain in the Kushkin household would be to compromise her own values as an individual</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops the idea of the connection between honesty and human dignity clearly and fully throughout (<i>Honesty, the external manifestation of self-respect, is doing the moral action, regardless of it's benefit (or lack thereof) on the part of the moral individual</i>). The response refers appropriately to characterization and metaphor with regard to both passages, but only one example of a metaphor is given from the passages (<i>woman's hands have washed themselves of life</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus established by the controlling idea and interweaves ideas about self-respect, moral character and honesty throughout. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas through the use of transitional words such as <i>Similarly</i> and <i>nonetheless</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is stylistically sophisticated and engaging (<i>internal quality, external manifestation, driving force</i>). Except for the occasional use of contractions (<i>what's</i>), a formal tone reveals an awareness of audience and purpose.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>manifestation, consistently, it's for its</i>). The response uses semicolons and ellipses appropriately.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6, although it is somewhat weaker in organization and conventions.</p>	

Human dignity has been a defining characteristic in the characterization for many works of literature. It is this quality that sometimes gives the characters of a story a sense of life beyond the page. It helps us to relate to the characters and grasp a greater meaning because we know what it is to want to hold fast to our dignity, our pride, and to sometimes have it stripped from us in a most vile and uncouth manner. The given passages both depict a sense of human dignity. They both display this controlling idea in a way that grasps the reader and gives him a greater understanding of what human dignity really means.

The first passage paints us a scene of a young girl named Mashenka who lived with a wealthy family as a governess. It seems that her dignity is compromised for the first time in her life when the lady of the house, Madame Kushkin, searches her room for a lost brooch that she believes to have been stolen. Mashenka displays a great quality of dignity and pride when she decides she cannot live in this house where she has been made to feel insulted and wretched by this accusatory search. She knows that this means she must go back to her parents who have nothing, but she sees no other choice. For the first time she experiences how "... persons in dependent positions, who eat the bread of the rich and powerful, and cannot speak their minds." It is this air of human dignity that leads her to her decision. She cannot live in a place where she feels so violated.

The second passage depicts once more the basic quality of human dignity that helps the reader to relate to the story on a deeper level. This time we are given the tale of a humble washwoman. This woman, nearly eighty years old, picks up, delivers, and does the wash of families in a quality that can be marked as outstanding for the same rate as other, less qualified, people. It is said that the

task she takes on not as easy as it would be today, in fact, it is incredibly difficult. This woman possesses "... the stubbornness of mankind, of the will to work not only as one's strength permits but beyond the limits of one's power." She exemplifies this quality of human dignity in that she does her work even though it may be difficult for a woman of her age, and she does it to the best of her ability. When she takes a heavy load of wash onto her frail shoulders to take home, she will not fall. She thinks, "A donkey may permit himself to fall under his burden, but not a human being, the crown of creation." When she takes ill, her plignity will not allow her to die until her work is done. Until she has fulfilled "the task she has undertaken!" She may not rest in peace.

Both stories use similar literary elements such as theme and characterization. Both draw from the same basic theme of how human dignity is a strong force within the hearts of all human beings. It remains when it seems that all else has left us. The stories also both choose similar characters. They are strong women who feel it is their duty to be true to this feeling of dignity and pride within themselves. One must bring herself to leave luxury because her dignity has been compromise, the other cannot die until her work is finished, else her dignity may be compromised as well.

Anchor Level 5–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Reveals a thorough understanding of both texts by establishing the controlling idea that the depiction of human dignity gives the <i>characters . . . a sense of life beyond the page</i> and the desire of readers and characters to <i>hold fast to our dignity</i>. The response clearly connects this idea to each text by concluding, for Passage I, that dignity is the basis for Mashenka’s decision to leave, and for Passage II, that the washwoman feels that leaving her work unfinished will compromise her dignity.</p>
Development	<p>Generally develops ideas clearly and consistently, referring to the conditions in which Mashenka’s <i>dignity is compromised for the first time</i> and the actions of the washwoman that <i>exemplify] this quality of human dignity</i>. A separate paragraph about <i>theme and characterization</i>, while effectively summarizing the longer discussion of dignity, does not specifically identify those literary elements within that discussion.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus on the significance of dignity as a quality that imbues characters with <i>a sense of life</i> in their attempts to <i>hold fast</i> to that dignity. Ideas are logically sequenced. Separate discussions of the depiction of dignity in each passage are followed by a paragraph that unites and summarizes both passages by noting similarities in theme and characterization.</p>
Language Use	<p>Is stylistically sophisticated (<i>she has been made to feel insulted and wretched by this accusatory search</i>). Varied sentence structures enhance meaning. For example, quotations from the text are smoothly integrated into the response, and the use of <i>both</i> to begin the first two sentences in the final paragraphs emphasizes similarities in the passages.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions. Occasional errors in spelling (<i>passegges, aire, seen for scene</i>) do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat stronger in language use.</p>	

Have you ever struggled to finish a task when to do so was almost impossible? Have you ever been frustrated by an injustice and would not rest until the ordeal was settled? These questions surround to mind the phrase human dignity. Without human dignity we cannot persevere in something and stand up for what is right and just. In the passages presented, two very different characters, Madenka (a young governess), and an old washerwoman have one thing in common, human dignity. Madenka's sense of pride forced her to leave a house where she was not treated even though she was going back to a life where she had nothing. The old washerwoman's sense of pride forced her to get up one last time even though she was never ~~working there~~ trying to finish the work she had begun.

In the first passage, Madenka was accused of stealing Madame Kushkin's brooch. Even though the truth came out in the end, she couldn't stay because to do this would compromise her human dignity. The theme of this excerpt is "don't go against your own values." If she decided to stay she would not be happy with her self because she would be going against what she believed in. She would not be able to keep her dignity. This excerpt also shows irony at the end because Madame Kushkin's own husband tells her he was the one who stole the brooch. Madenka is characterized as a "well educated, daughter of a teacher"; a young woman who "could not imagine

a greater insight" than to be suspected of being a thief.

The main character in the second passage is the washerwoman. She is a very old woman who washed clothes for families. The narrator describes how difficult the woman's work had become because of her aging body. The washerwoman took pride in the work she did and wouldn't give up when it became very difficult to continue her work. The theme of this short story is "never quit until you finish what you have started." This story has many metaphors. One example is "these hands spoke of the stubbornness of mankind." This stubbornness is a good quality in the washerwoman. The washerwoman shows human dignity because even though she was old and deathly ill, she felt a sense of duty to finish the laundry and return it to its owners.

Both of these works show how human dignity gives strength to the characters and allows them to persevere when life presents difficulties that are almost impossible to overcome. The mood for both passages is solemn. Mashkin keeps her dignity and self respect but because of this she chooses to lose her job and go back home to her parents who have nothing. The washerwoman finishes her last load of laundry and probably goes home to die. Neither story have a happy ending but the authors have shown how important human dignity is.

Anchor Level 5-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Establishes the controlling idea that the characters' sense of pride enabled them to complete a <i>difficult job or stand up for what is right and just</i>. The response reveals a thorough understanding of both passages and makes explicit connections to the controlling idea by explaining first that Mashenka stood up for her beliefs and then that the washwoman's sense of duty would not allow her to quit until her task was finished.</p>
Development	<p>Develops the main ideas of both passages clearly and consistently. The response demonstrates how the authors use literary elements such as theme, characterization, and irony in Passage I, and theme and metaphor in Passage II to establish the characters' perseverance in maintaining their dignity. The conclusion draws from both passages to show that, although the mood is solemn, the authors <i>have shown how important human dignity is</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus established in the introduction, providing appropriate generalizations from both passages. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure, flowing from the introduction to the second and third paragraphs, which show how the characters in each passage are driven by human dignity. The conclusion ties the passages together by showing the similarities of the characters and the solemn mood of both passages.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is fluent and original (<i>summon to mind</i> and <i>compromise her human dignity</i>). The response varies sentence length and structure, as evidenced in paragraph one, which begins with rhetorical questions aimed directly at the reader.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>exerpt, her self, theif, methaphors,</i>) and agreement (<i>Neither ... have</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.</p>	

A person possesses the quality of human dignity when they have a strong sense of self-worth and self-respect. Both of these passages contain characters that are controlled by their dignity and pride. To have dignity is to accept nothing short of respect and to take pride in everything you do. A person with a powerful sense of self is a strong individual who is rich in respect and dignity.

In the first passage the reader is told the story of a governess who is humiliated by the search of her room and the implied meaning of that search, of her being a thief. As the passage goes on the reader sees her humiliation evolve into outrage and then manifest into the surfacing of her pride and feeling that she had been disrespected. This character displays well the meaning of human dignity. She was faced with a wrong that threatened her pride and she left. Her strong sense of worth overpowered any obligation she might have made. She was willing, "to go back to her parents, who had nothing" instead of staying and suffering the indignity of being searched. The author accurately portrays her sense of dignity with the use of powerful language with strong connotations and the use of repetition. The author repeats the negatively charged word "insulted" twice in the course

of one sentence to show the character outraged at this lack of respect she was shown. Human dignity is to know your rights and to stand up for them no matter what the price and the author conveys that message of self respect very well in the character of Mashenka Pavletsky, the strong willed governess.

If one has self-respect then a strong sense of pride in one's work almost always is possessed also. A sense of duty is another quality of human dignity.

To make a commitment and follow through to the best of one's ability, and no less, is what dignity is all about. Passage 2 contains the character of an old washwoman who possesses this strong sense of pride in her work. The author uses a catalogue to show how hard the wash used to be and by doing so implied the woman's endurance and strength. The author also showed the washwoman's strength and sense of duty through the use of symbolism. The author describes the old woman's hands and uses them to show her inner strength and her core of self respect. The washwoman would not give up her work no matter how cold it was, how much there was, or how sick she was as seen in the quote, "I could not rest easy in my bed because of the wash... The wash would not let me die."

This quote shows such a sense of dignity and pride. It explains that the old woman's sense of duty and the pride she takes in her work were stronger than any illness. That is human dignity.

In a time where dignity and self-respect are often put on the back shelf for money or greed it is good to see characters who believe in themselves and their rights as human beings, to be shown respect and to take pride in all that they do. The two passages effectively show the quality of human dignity and how it governs the lives of those who possess it.

Anchor Level 5-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Reveals a thorough understanding of both texts by establishing a controlling idea that defines dignity and asserts that characters in both passages are <i>controlled by their dignity</i>. The response clearly connects this idea to the texts by discussing how, in Passage I, <i>her strong sense of worth</i> impels Mashenka to return to her parents, and, in Passage II, <i>the old woman's sense of duty ... [was] stronger than any illness</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, citing evidence from each passage that reveals the character's dignity and explains how that dignity influences the character's actions. Mashenka, for example, was <i>faced with a wrong that threatened her pride and she left</i>. Literary elements are cited from both texts: in Passage I, repetition of the word <i>insulted</i>, with its negative connotations, and, in Passage II, the description and symbolism of the washerwoman's hands. The response alludes to the use of dialogue in establishing character (<i>This quote shows such a sense of dignity</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a focus on the manifestations of dignity and the ways in which dignity affects the characters' behavior. The response progresses logically, discussing Mashenka's self respect in Passage I and then repeating this characteristic in the discussion of the dignity and pride of the washwoman in Passage II. The conclusion summarizes the qualities Mashenka and the washwoman have in common. However, internal consistency is somewhat disrupted by personal observation.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language with an evident awareness of purpose (<i>use of powerful language with strong connotations and the use of repetition</i>). The language is occasionally imprecise (<i>manifest into the surfacing</i>). The response varies sentence length and structure to control pacing, although lengthy sentences occasionally demonstrate faulty construction.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting errors in spelling (<i>posesses</i> and <i>acurately</i>), and tense agreement (<i>the author uses a catalogue ... and by doing so implied</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in language.</p>	

Human dignity is the respect and responsibility one feels for themselves. If one doesn't have dignity throughout their life, there is no reason why they need respect because they will do just about anything anyone tells them to do. With dignity comes self-respect and reasons to live for that no one can give you, you have to learn it for yourself. Both passages show the importance of dignity for survival through characterization, structure, and theme.

In Passage I, the main theme of the story was ~~that~~ if one doesn't have dignity, they won't have any self-respect for themselves. You can see this theme portrayed through the characterization of Mashenka. Mashenka is accused of stealing a brooch that she didn't take and never would have even thought of taking. She is asked to stay as governess though, but she can't because of how deeply hurt she was by the insult from the implication of guilt thrown towards her from the mistress of the house. In refusing to stay, she keeps her self-respect and dignity because she stuck to her beliefs. Throughout the story, the structure shows what type of outcome will be obtained because of the type of person Mashenka is made out to be through the word choice. Through the word choice she is made out to be a very intelligent young lady brought up with good morals.

In Passage II, the main theme of the story was the stubbornness and strength throughout life force some to finish their responsibilities before they leave this life. Once their strength to survive is gone or weakened, they

would rather leave quickly than become a burden to their family. The old wash woman in this story is an excellent example of this theme through her characterization. She took special interest in her job as the wash lady by making sure everything was neat and tidy and ready to be worn. The wash woman couldn't pass away until she had completed her responsibility as a wash lady and all the rest of her responsibilities were finished. Once they were completed, she passed away content. Throughout the story, the structure showed how people that insist on doing everything for themselves have good ethics and self-respect. The wash woman couldn't leave anything unfinished because of who she was, and she couldn't expect more than what everyone else was receiving. The wash lady proved her dignity by not thinking she was better than everyone else.

Throughout both passages, the reader can see two different characters with dignity portrayed in different ways. Both characters don't believe themselves to be better than anyone else, and they only want to be respected for who they are. Dignity isn't something you can just take, you have to earn it for yourself.

Anchor Level 4–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Reveals a thorough understanding of both texts through the controlling idea that <i>human dignity is the respect and responsibility one feels for themselves</i> and that dignity is important <i>for survival</i>. The response implicitly connects this idea to the texts by discussing Mashenka’s actions to achieve self respect in Passage I and the old woman’s display of responsibility in Passage II.</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response relies on a brief discussion of Mashenka’s actions in Passage I to relate her struggle for human dignity, explaining that Mashenka cannot stay <i>because of how deeply hurt she was by the ... implication of guilt</i>. In Passage II the response more fully analyzes the old woman’s strong sense of responsibility (<i>The wash woman couldn’t pass away until she had completed her responsibility</i>). However, analysis is weakened by vague or confused references to literary elements (<i>the structure shows what type of outcome will be obtained</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Generally maintains a clear focus on the idea of dignity as it relates to respect and responsibility. Ideas are logically sequenced. The response uses topic sentences that echo the controlling idea established in the introduction and restated in the conclusion. However, the concluding sentences in both main arguments introduce ideas that are not clearly connected to these arguments (<i>very intelligent, good morals, good ethics</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose. Although the wording is often awkward (<i>Mashenka is accused of stealing a brooch that she didn’t take and never would have even thought of taking</i>), the response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure and length.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in agreement (<i>the respect and responsibility one feels for themselves</i> and <i>If one doesn’t have dignity throughout their life</i>) and spelling (<i>excepted</i> for <i>accepted</i> and <i>stubborness</i>) that do not hinder comprehension. A proofreading oversight (<i>the</i> for <i>that</i>) in the beginning of paragraph three does hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat stronger in meaning.</p>	

Human dignity is easier to lose than to obtain. It is having self-respect and a sense of duty and importance that defines human dignity. In the first passage, dignity is nearly ^{lost} through the actions of a woman's search. In the second passage, an old woman's dignity is emphasized through her hardwork and dedication.

The dignity, as defined by the old woman, is that of hard work and strength, a strength that is derived from "generations of forebears". Her dignity was emphasized by the author's description of her endurance and her "inner obstinancy", which told her not to fall under the burden because she was a human being,

"the crown of creation". She took up and fulfilled the tasks that she had undertaken. Even when she had faced illness, she would not release herself of her responsibilities to her employers. She had been driven by an indomitable will to return the property to its rightful owners, to fulfill the task she had undertaken.

The dignity that Mashenka had maintained was that of self-respect. Madame Kuchkin's search humiliated Mashenka to the point where she felt she had to leave. Mashenka had been humiliated by Madame Kuchkin's lack of trust. Her sense of self-worth told her that she could not stay. She didn't even care if she

lost her place if she had to go back to her parents. The insults issued by Madame Kuchkin forced her decision to leave. Her self respect told her that she needed to leave to salvage her dignity.

Dignity defined by both passages revolved around self worth. In the first passage, Mashenka's sense of self-worth told her that what Madame Kuchkin had done was wrong and that she needed to leave to save her dignity. In the second passage, the old woman's sense of self-worth defines her dignity and she felt compelled to finish the job she began, despite the many obstacles of snow and illness. Dignity is intimately maintained for both women, despite hardships.

Anchor Level 4-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Establishes a controlling idea that shows a basic understanding of both texts, asserting that human dignity <i>is having self-respect and a sense of duty and importance</i>. The response makes explicit connections between the controlling idea and ideas in the text (<i>In the first passage, dignity is nearly lost through the actions of a woman's search. In the second passage, an old woman's dignity is emphasized through her hardwork and dedication.</i>)</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response effectively uses paraphrases and direct quotations to support the connection between dignity and self-respect. However, the discussion of literary elements is less developed. The response alludes to characterization without identifying it and specifies the author's use of description in Passage II without providing illustrations.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear focus on the idea of <i>self-respect</i> and <i>sense of duty</i> as examples of human dignity. Ideas are logically sequenced, moving from the general evaluation of human dignity to the specifics of first, the endurance of the old woman who fulfilled the tasks, and then, the decision of Mashenka, whose <i>self worth told her that she needed to leave</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate. Vocabulary is sometimes effective (<i>to salvage her dignity</i>), but sometimes repetitive (<i>dignity</i> is used four times in the opening paragraph) or imprecise (<i>would not release herself of her responsibilities</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting only occasional errors in punctuation within quotation marks ("<i>inner obstinacy</i>") and a misspelling (<i>hardwork</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.</p>	

In the short stories they both show forms of human dignity. In the first passage read a young girl named Mashenka Pavletsky is accused of stealing from the family she was staying with. ~~the second~~ The second passage was about an old washwomen who would not quit working hard. In both of these passages they explain human dignity. They show not just what human dignity is but how to use ~~human dignity~~ ^{it}.

In the first passage a young girl named Mashenka Pavletsky is accused of stealing from the family she was staying with. She was accused of this because she was ^{living w/ strangers} ~~accustomed~~ and not wealthy. As Mashenka walked in the house one day she noticed that the house was in an uproar. Mashenka asked what was going on and the lady of the house accused her of stealing her brooch. This made Mashenka very angry because she knows she was being wrongfully accused. So after dinner she decides she is leaving.

This is a hard ~~decision~~ decision for Mashenka to make because if she moves out she has nothing. So shortly after Mashenka starts packing Nikolay Sergeitch comes in and tells her he stole the brooch. Nikolay says it really belongs to himself anyway and asks Mashenka to stay. The author was irony in this short story by having the reader believe Mashenka stole the brooch and it really being Nikolay. But Mashenka leaves anyway because she has a strong sense of human dignity. Mashenka knows ~~wherever~~ whenever she goes some place still be known - as the girl who stole the brooch. So by her leaving that is the ^{true} meaning of human dignity.

In the second passage human dignity is also described. The passage is about an old washwomen who does wash for another women. The author uses point of view in this short story by having the story told through the eyes of a child. ~~His mother~~ The child's mother has her wash done by the old ~~was~~ washwomen.

Anchor Paper - Part A - Level 4 - C

The story is about an old washerwoman who is very skinny ~~and~~ yet strong. She was able to carry a huge bundle of laundry from the child's house back to her own home. ~~Her~~ ^{But} her home was about an hour and a half away. This old woman would always do the best laundry, it was all washed by hand and ironed. Except the old woman would not charge extra. This old washerwoman had great pride in her work. One day when the wash was supposed to be returned, the old woman never showed up to the child's house. Days past and the wash was still on washerwoman. Finally one day an old woman looking like the living dead walked into the child's home. She said she was very sick and nearly died but could not let go of ~~the~~ ^{life} until the wash was returned. This old washerwoman has a great amount of human dignity. She wanted to make sure all of the other peoples belonging were returned before she perished. That is how human dignity is shown in a human being. It is when someone cares more about someone else than ~~themselves~~ themselves.

That is how human dignity is shown in both passages. Both of these women, Meebabe and the old washerwoman, had great amounts of human dignity in their hearts. In some ways human dignity saves ~~this~~ ^{the} world people live in, because without true human dignity and pride then no one would care. If people didn't care and if there were not good people like these two women in our lives to show us how to use human dignity, this world would not be worth living in. That is how human dignity is ~~participated~~ participated in these passages.

Anchor Level 4–C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Shows a basic understanding of the texts. The response states a controlling idea that links the texts with, but does not directly define, human dignity (<i>They show not just what human dignity is but how to use it.</i>) The response implies the nature of human dignity by making connections between both women’s actions when faced with difficult situations (Mashenka’s employer falsely accuses her of stealing a brooch; the old woman’s failing health threatens her ability to fulfill her responsibilities) and their struggles to preserve their own sense of self-worth.</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others, sometimes using specific, relevant details from both texts, but relying at times on plot summary, especially in the discussion of Passage II. The response refers specifically, although briefly, to the literary elements of irony and point of view.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear focus on the idea of dignity as it is revealed in both passages. Ideas are logically sequenced. The introduction establishes an organizational pattern that is then followed (<i>the first passage, and The second passage</i>). The discussion of each passage concludes with a reference to <i>human dignity</i>. The final paragraph, however, introduces ideas that do not follow logically from the previous discussion (<i>if there were not good people like these two women ... this world would not be worth living in</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary, although attention to the task and an appropriate tone reveal an awareness of purpose and audience. Sentence structures vary somewhat, sometimes successfully (<i>having the story told through the eyes of a child</i>), but often not (<i>The author uses irony in this short story by having the reader believe Mashenka stole the brooch and it really being Nikolay</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in usage (<i>a old women</i>) and spelling (<i>decision, past</i> for <i>passed</i>, and the consistent use of <i>washwomen</i> for <i>washwoman</i>). The response exhibits frequent errors in punctuation (missing apostrophes in <i>peoples</i> and <i>childs</i> and several omitted commas). Nonetheless, these errors do not significantly hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat weaker in language use.</p>	

In literature examples of human Dignity are used throughout. Whether it's the fire that burns in one or the refusal to be look upon as something you see not. In this essay I will tell of the human Dignity that occurs in these stories.

Someone stalled Madam Kuskin's brooch and she was searching everyone's room. Mashenka saw that they went through her belongings and was upset. She was humiliated and in disbelief that she could be accused of being a thief. "Never in her life had she been subjected to such an outrage, never had she been so deeply insulted".

The characters played a big role in this story showing there opinion and how they felt about being suspected.

Although everyone else chose to bare with being searched and thought of as thieves, Mashenka's dignity would not allow her to stay and be humiliated.

Someone's heart can be bigger than there whole self. A old ~~man~~ woman is a cloth's washer for a family. She is over 70 years old. The woman would not be stopped by nothing age nor weather. The woman's dignity for herself would not let her quit. "The bundle was big, bigger than usual." "When the woman placed it on her shoulders, it covered her completely." she walked out "at the house into a harsh winter. After 5 weeks the woman returned after being sick with "the entire wash." "I could not rest easy in my bed because of the wash". "The wash would not let me die."

Some people lack human dignity, But the women in this two stories refused to let anything get there's.

Anchor Level 3–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Shows a basic understanding of the texts by establishing the controlling idea that dignity can be manifested in <i>the fire that burns in one</i> or in the <i>refusal to be look upon as something you are not</i>. However, inasmuch as neither of these manifestations is identified within the discussion of the passages, connections between the controlling idea and the texts remain superficial.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, using some relevant evidence from the text (<i>Mashenka's dignity would not allow her to stay and be humiliated</i>). The response makes no reference to literary elements and relies primarily on plot summary. The discussion of Passage II depends heavily upon direct quotations.</p>
Organization	<p>Establishes, but fails to maintain, a focus on the manifestation of dignity as an inner fire or a refusal to be seen as <i>some thing you are not</i>. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, progressing from an introduction linking literature and human dignity, to separate discussions of each passage, to a concluding statement that links human dignity with <i>the women in this two stories</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>Mashenka saw that they went through her belongings and was upset</i>). The response shows some awareness of audience and purpose (<i>In literature examples of human Dignity are used throughout</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in grammar (<i>this two stories and to be look upon</i>), punctuation (<i>would not be stopped by nothing age nor weather</i>), and capitalization (<i>human Dignity</i>) and frequent errors in spelling (<i>stolled, theft, opionion, bare for bear, there for their</i>) that hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities.</p>	

There are many different topics in which authors choose to write their works about. One such topic is human dignity. Human dignity to me is the respect of yourself and others as a human person. In the following paragraphs I will use two literary works to convey the meaning of human dignity.

In the first work a young woman is accused of taking something that belonged to a woman whom she lived with. The object stolen was a brooch (or a pin) that meant deeply to two women. Madame Kuchkin accused the young woman Mashenka of stealing the brooch after Mashenka had been living there for quite some time. Mashenka came home one day to find Madame Kuchkin in a rage and found out she had invaded her private belongings. Mashenka was devastated by this false accusation. She had her dignity and pride so she went and started to gather her belongings and to leave. While packing, Madame Kuchkin's husband (Nikolay) arrived at her door. He asked her what she was doing and she explained. He then went on to tell her he stole the brooch because his wife felt she owned everything. He felt he had rightful possession of the brooch it was his mother's after all. He asked Mashenka to stay. She refused. She had her self-pride and dignity and was very upset that they had accused her of stealing the brooch so she left. In this literary work there are certain literary elements being used. Irony was one of these forms. The irony of the story was her being accused of the theft and to find out the woman's husband had stole it.

Another passage of literary work that illustrates human dignity is the story about the old women ^{old women} warren. For quite some time the ^{old women} had washed

two women and her child's clothes. The people were very grateful to her. She had always done an exceptional job doing their laundry. It was always cleaned well, starched and pressed. It usually took 3 weeks for the old women to complete the laundry well the one time during a rugged winter the old women picked up the people's clothes and was gone for a while. 3 weeks, 4 weeks from on the 5th week she returned with laundry very ill. She had been terribly sick almost ~~dead~~ ^{dying} ~~dead~~. But she had such ^{she knew} dignity that the people were counting on her so she finished the work. She took that much self pride ^{that} ^{when} ~~that~~ ~~when~~ she was dying she still felt she had to complete the work.

The literary term I feel used was characterization. This I felt because she was so self determined she kept herself strong enough to finish the work she had started.

On conclusion in certain literary works there are many topics, I felt that human dignity was a good one and that ~~both~~ ^{both} characters illustrated the quality very well throughout the passages.

Anchor Level 3-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Establishes a vague controlling idea about human dignity (<i>the respect of yourself and others as a human person</i>) but shows a basic understanding of both texts. The response makes a few connections between the controlling idea and the ideas in the texts by demonstrating how the self pride of Mashenka in Passage I and the old woman in Passage II enabled them to maintain their dignity when confronted with difficult situations.</p>
Development	<p>Relies primarily on plot summaries from both passages. The response refers to a single literary element in each passage (<i>The irony of the story was her being accused ... and to find out the womens husband had stole it and characterization ... she was so self determined ... to finish the work</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Establishes a broad focus (<i>I will use to literary works to convey the meaning of human dignity</i>). The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas. However, the literary terms at the end of paragraphs 2 and 3 do not flow from the preceding information, and the brief conclusion detracts from the overall coherence of the response.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary that is occasionally imprecise (<i>topics in wich authors choose, For quite some time, She took that much self pride</i>). The response demonstrates some awareness of audience and purpose in the introduction. Attempts to vary sentence structure are sometimes successful but at other times result in run-ons or faulty constructions (<i>Well the one time ... with laundry very ill</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting errors in spelling (<i>deerly, accused, devistated</i>), comma usage, and grammar (<i>its was and had stole it</i>) and proofreading oversights (<i>I young woman</i>) that occasionally hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3.</p>	

In literature, the author uses different ways to develop a controlling idea. In a short story and an excerpt from an autobiography shows how two women deal with human dignity in the same way. The author develops this idea by using specific literary elements and literary techniques.

In the short story Mashenka Pavletsky deals with human dignity by leaving the Madame Kushkin house because she feels as if they betrayed her and her pride won't let her stay with them anymore. The author uses literary elements such as characterization and tone to show the way Mashenka felt. The author use characterization of Mashenka which shows that she is a young girl who has a good head on her shoulder and feels as if she were isolated when Mrs. Kushkin went to her and accused her of something she didn't do. The author also use matter of fact for a literary element. The author stick to the point of Madame Kushkin's brooch being stole and the fact that Mashenka feel it wasn't right for them to search her room and suspect her of being a thief. She felt if she stayed in the house she would have felt her sense of pride gone. In the end she decided to pack up her things and leave.

In the second passage the author use characterization and irony to describe the woman. The author use characterization

In describing the woman to be small, old, and wrinkled, the author describes the work that the woman does to give you a back ground of the woman's life. He also describe the details of laudering in order to identify the setting of the story. The old woman was sick with a pile of dry clothes left to be wash but she could not let those clothes just sitting there. As she recovers the old lady stated that "I could not rest easy in my bed because of the wash", the old woman explained. "The wash would not let me die. The irony of the excerpt shows that the woman got her strength back just to finish the laundry and return it back to its rightful owner. After that she never return but she knew that her task was done and had nothing else to live for.

In conclusion I have shown how the author uses literary elements and techniques used to develop the controlling ideas about human dignity and the way each woman dealt with these situation.

Anchor Level 3–C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Conveys a basic understanding of the texts, discussing how Mashenka’s sense of pride helps her to retain human dignity and how the old woman in Passage II cannot die until her task is completed. The response fails to establish a controlling idea but relies on the generalization that the <i>two women deal with human dignity in the same way</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, using details from each passage to show how <i>each woman dealt with there situation</i>. The response attempts to demonstrate the authors’ use of literary elements but this often results in inaccuracies, such as <i>matter of fact for an literary element</i> and <i>charaziation be describing the woman to be small old, and wrinkled</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus in the introduction, stating <i>the author develops this idea</i> of human dignity in both passages <i>by using specific literary elements</i>. However, the response fails to show that the <i>women deal with human dignity in the same way</i>. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas through a structure which includes paragraphing (introduction, <i>short story</i>, <i>second passage</i> and <i>conclusion</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary but demonstrates some awareness of audience and purpose through an attempt to show how the authors use literary elements to develop their work (<i>characterization, tone, setting, irony</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure. However, longer sentences are often unclear (<i>The old woman was sick with a pile of dry clothes left to be wash but she could not let those clothes just sitting there</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>acused, charaziation, laudering, there for their</i>), grammar (<i>author use, being stole, He also describe</i>) and usage (<i>let for leave, be describing, be she knew</i>) that sometimes hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities.</p>	

The meaning of human dignity is stubbornness makes you do things out of the ordinary. The woman in Passage II was overcome by her stubbornness and so was the other one in Passage I. Stubbornness makes you do things more than you have to do and anyone excepts you to do. In Passage I Mashenka was offended when the lady of the house searched her room for a brooch that was stole from her but what she didn't know was that her husband took it from her because it belongs to his mother. Both Mashenka and the lady Madame Kushkin were stubborn because Mashenka wouldn't except the master of the houses apology and the lady wanted her brooch now. In Passage II the old woman wouldn't give up her big bundle of clothes, she felt it was her responsibility to finish what she started. The old woman was very stubborn because eventually she died because of meeting her responsibility, she did more than anyone excepted her to do. Both characters in Passage I and II were stubborn, they both believed in what they were suppose to do. Stubbornness makes you do more than you have to do and so did the 2 characters.

Anchor Level 2–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys an incomplete understanding of the texts, addressing both passages through simplistic discussions of characters’ stubbornness rather than their dignity (<i>Mashenka and ... Madame Kushkin were stubborn because Mashenka wouldn’t expect the master of the houses apology and the lady wanted her broch now</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the texts and a controlling idea that relies on an imprecise interpretation of human dignity.</p>
Development	<p>Is incomplete. The discussion of Passage I consists of one sentence of plot summary and one sentence of characterization. References to Passage II are vague (<i>eventally she died because of meeting her responsibility</i>), and the assertion that the characters were <i>over come by ... stubbornness</i> is unjustified. No reference is made to literary elements.</p>
Organization	<p>Establishes, but fails to maintain, a focus on the idea that <i>stubbornness makes you do things out of the ordinary</i>. This focus, however, is not altogether appropriate for a discussion of human dignity. Ideas are logically sequenced. An introduction presenting a controlling idea and a broad reference to the two passages is followed by separate discussions of the texts, each discussion concluding with a reference to the character’s stubbornness.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is imprecise or unsuitable for the purpose (<i>stubbornness makes you do things more than you have to do and anyone excepts you to do</i>). Sentences are largely ineffective and often flawed.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>excepts</i> for <i>expects</i>, <i>broch</i>, <i>responsibility</i>, and <i>houses</i> for <i>house’s</i>) and paragraphing, and occasional errors in punctuation (missing commas around the appositive <i>Madame Kushkin</i> and misused commas that result in run-on sentences). These errors hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and conventions.</p>	

In the short story (Passage #1) there is a lot of confusion going on about somebody accusing someone else for theft. There is also a lot of asking questions and searching rooms that triggers the confusion in the Kushkin's household. When Madame Kushkin went in Mashenka's room and searched through her things, Mashenka felt that Madame Kushkin invaded her privacy. After Madame Kushkin had searched Mashenka's room and accused her for stealing, she was also insulted about the incident by Liza the maid servant. Mashenka felt that Madame Kushkin's actions were mean and low. I would say that it was pretty low to just go and accuse somebody for stealing and then go in their rooms and search through their things without their permission or consent. Madame Kushkin had no right to accuse Mashenka as the thief and search through her things especially if she didn't find the brooch in Mashenka's possessions or if she didn't have proof that Mashenka stole the brooch. I also say that Mashenka had every right to pack up her things and leave because she didn't deserve that and she didn't have to go through the confusion she went through if she didn't steal the brooch.

In the the story from Passage II it talk about and old woman between early and late seventies who was a washwoman or "Laundry-Lady". She wasn't like most ~~women~~ women her age who were sickly, weak, broken in body, bent backed, and walking on sticks. She was a

Anchor Paper – Part A—Level 2 – B

thin but strong woman that had strength from generations of peasant forebears. She'd wash clothes and bring them back about every two weeks. When she lived the old woman had no faucet, so she had to get water from a pump. She also had to scrub clothes in the washtub, rinsed with washing soda, soaked boil in a enormous pot, starched and ironed. She had done this until she was in her late seventies, early eighties and she became sick. But when she came back was determined that work was not going to let her die.

Anchor Level 2-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys an incomplete and confused understanding of the texts, stating that, in Passage I, <i>there is a lot of confusion going on about somebody accusing someone else for theft</i> and asserting that Mashenka or Madame Kushkin (it is unclear which) <i>was also insulted ... by Liza</i> . The discussion of Passage II is limited to a description of the washwoman and her work. The response does not refer to the idea of dignity, and makes no connection between dignity and either text.
Development	Is largely undeveloped. Discussions of both passages rely primarily on plot summary, but because neither summary is connected to any controlling idea, their relevance is not apparent. References to the text are repetitive (<i>and old woman between early and late seventies</i> and <i>she was in her late seventies, early eighties</i>), and vague (<i>But when she came back was determined that work was not going to let her die</i>).
Organization	Lacks an appropriate focus but suggests some organization, consisting of separate summaries of each text.
Language Use	Uses language that is often imprecise (<i>accuse somebody for stealing</i> and <i>In the story from Passage II it talk about and old woman</i>) or unsuitable. The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences effectively (<i>I also say that Mashenka had every right to pack up her things and leave because she didn't deserve that and she didn't have to go through the confusion she went through if she didn't steal the brooch</i>). Much of the language in the second paragraph is copied directly from the text without attribution.
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>accussing</i> and <i>thieft</i>), punctuation (lack of quotation marks with quoted text and some missing commas), and grammar (<i>it talk</i>) that hinder comprehension somewhat.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.	

this essay going to talk about the meaning of human dignity or how a person can defend their dignity and why is important to a person have dignity.

In the first passages the dignity are violate in a young girl in a household that they accused of a theft of a jewelry that she didn't take it is something very humiliation to her because the women who think that is a dominating person who think that she can management everything in this house at least she prefer to go away from the house and doesn't stay there because she have to defend her human dignity.

Here we can see that this person don't stay there because staying there she would demonstrate that she doesn't have human dignity because for her this is a place where she feel bad and where other think that she is a bad person.

In the second passages we can see now a old woman have been surviving all her life washing clothes of other families house and even she was sick she went to work because she love her job and this is a good thing of how she could not died fast.

In conclusion we have to accept and know that the human dignity is important because if it doesn't was like this in this world were many people without human rights and they were many people dominated by others. To get a good human right you have to work hard and don't be offended by others don't do the bad things and don't do that other people do, be yourself!

Anchor Level 2-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys an incomplete understanding of the texts. The response suggests a controlling idea (<i>how a person can defend their dignity and why is important</i>). However, discussion of Passage I makes no connection with the importance of dignity and provides only a slight connection to the idea of defending one's dignity (<i>She prefer to go away from the house ... because she have to defend her human dignity</i>). The discussion of Passage II makes no reference to dignity.
Development	Is largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas about the importance of dignity, but making only vague references to the text (<i>this is a place where she feel bad</i>).
Organization	Establishes, but fails to maintain, an appropriate focus on <i>the meaning of human dignity</i> . The response exhibits a rudimentary structure consisting of an introduction, separate discussions of each passage, and a conclusion. However, the conclusion introduces ideas that are not clearly connected to the previous discussion (<i>many people dominated by others and don't do that other people do, be yourself</i>).
Language Use	Uses language that is often incoherent (<i>this is a good thing of how she could not died fast</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting occasional omissions (<i>even she was sick she went to work</i>) and errors in punctuation and usage (<i>a old woman</i>) and frequent errors in grammar (<i>if it doesn't was like this in this world</i>) that make comprehension difficult. Spelling and paragraphing, however, are generally correct.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat weaker in language use and somewhat stronger in organization.	

In the two passages the authors establish a controlling idea about the meaning of human dignity in the first passage. The author says the money got stolen and in the other passage the old lady like to do laundry. the passage tell about stray when the lady money dispered and the next the passage the old lady was happy to have landry this is the reson thay are human dignity.

Anchor Level 1-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides minimal evidence of textual understanding beyond the unjustified idea that <i>the old lady like to do laundry</i> . The response states that <i>the authers establish a controlling idea</i> but shows no evidence of making connections between the texts.
Development	Is minimal. The response shows no evidence of development. The second sentence merely repeats the misinformation from the first sentence.
Organization	Suggests a focus on <i>the meaning of human dignity</i> . The brief response minimally suggests organization (<i>in the first passage ... in the other passage and this is the reason they are human dignity</i>).
Language Use	Is minimal. The response consists of two repetitive run-on sentences; the second sentence approaches incoherence.
Conventions	Is minimal, making analysis and assessment unreliable. The response exhibits run-on sentences, frequent misspellings (<i>authers, stollen, reson</i>) and agreement errors (<i>lady like</i> and <i>passage tell about</i>).
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1, although it is somewhat stronger in organization.	

Anchor Paper – Part A—Level 1 – B

Human dignity is part of person, every person. This part is not always easy to find, but when found it can give the person the will to go on, to continue a job, creation, or even life in some cases.

Anchor Level 1-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides minimal evidence of textual understanding. Although the response makes a statement about human dignity, there is no reference to either text beyond the allusion to continuing a job <i>or even life</i> .
Development	Is minimal, consisting solely of a statement about human dignity.
Organization	Shows no focus or organization. The response hints at a potential focus (the positive effects of finding one's dignity) and organization (the second sentence is clearly connected to the first), but presents too little material to sustain either.
Language Use	Is minimal. Both of the sentences are flawed, but the second sentence provides a hint of fluency (<i>but when found</i>).
Conventions	Exhibits occasional errors (omitted word in the first sentence, omitted comma in the second sentence, and <i>come</i> for <i>some</i>). The brevity of the response, however, makes assessment of conventions unreliable.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1.	

Practice Paper A—Score Level 5

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Reveals a thorough understanding of both texts through the controlling idea that human dignity is shown <i>through one’s sense of respect, duty, and compliance</i>. The response clearly connects the texts to the ideas of respect and duty, arguing that Mashenka has too much self-respect to stay in a household <i>where she is viewed lower than she actually is</i> and that the old woman’s sense of duty keeps her alive until her job is finished. Although the meaning of <i>compliance</i> is not altogether clear, the response connects this idea to the texts by illustrating the ways in which <i>the two women act upon their concerns</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently. Although the response does not specifically identify the literary element used, each passage is analyzed in terms of how characterization reveals a sense of self-respect or duty, and how that sense shapes each woman’s actions (<i>flabbergasted and disgusted by this accusation ... feels wretched ... can no longer stay</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus established by the controlling idea. Ideas are logically sequenced, with discussions following the organizational pattern established in the introduction (<i>respect, duty, and compliance</i>). Transitional devices are generally used appropriately (<i>In both passages</i> and <i>For example</i>). The use of <i>in addition</i> to connect examples from both passages is less successful.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally fluent and original (<i>submitting to death and disregarding her duties</i>), although occasionally colloquial (<i>put her health on the line</i>) or imprecise (<i>they lessen their comfortability to keep their self value high</i>). Varied sentence structures often control pacing (<i>Despite her frailty and old age, the old woman works diligently and meticulously until each piece “sparkled like silver”</i>) but are occasionally unsuccessful (the long sentence in paragraph two beginning with <i>Because of these</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>flabbergasted, theif, faulter</i>) and punctuation.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5 in all qualities.</p>	

Practice Paper B—Score Level 4

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Reveals a thorough understanding of both texts by establishing the controlling idea that all people, regardless of circumstances, should have a sense of <i>self-respect and pride</i>. The response explicitly connects this idea to Passage II, stating that <i>although she was serving people, especially at an old age</i>, the washwoman displayed dignity through her sense of duty. The connection between Passage I and the controlling idea is implicit in the analysis of Mashenka’s decision to leave the household.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly. The response gives evidence of the cause (<i>no right to suspect her and to rummage in her things</i>) and effect (<i>decided to leave the house</i>) of the insult to Mashenka, but fails to identify her age or position in the household, weakening the notion that dignity is possessed by all, <i>rich or poor, or young or old</i>. In the discussion of Passage II, the assertion that the old woman <i>loved what she did</i> is not justified. The response does not refer to literary elements.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear focus on the idea that all people possess dignity. The response exhibits a logical structure, discussing each passage with reference to self-respect or pride under adverse conditions. The focus shifts somewhat in the attempt to make universal the themes in the text (<i>all people ... should learn from Mashenka and the old lady</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses generally appropriate language, although it is sometimes redundant (<i>self respect for themselves</i>). The response effectively uses parallel or complex structures (<i>no right to suspect her and to rummage in her things</i>). Inconsistency in point of view reveals a somewhat mistaken awareness of audience and purpose (<i>In my opinion, that showed alot of courage and I would just like to say</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>alot for a lot</i>) and agreement (<i>duty ... were</i>). These errors do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 although it is somewhat stronger in meaning and weaker in development.</p>	

Practice Paper C–Score Level 2

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a confused and incomplete understanding of the texts, focusing discussion of Passage I on the dignity of Madame Kushkin. Although the response suggests a controlling idea relating dignity to self-respect and pride, few connections are made between this idea and the texts.</p>
Development	<p>Is largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas about the sources of dignity. References to the text, however, are vague (<i>one old woman works hard though that work needs the endurance to finish it and she says the reason why she did this is because of her sleeve</i>) or unjustified (the assertion that Madame Kushkin thought that <i>truth can destroy her pride</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Exhibits a rudimentary structure with an introduction that refers to dignity and <i>these 2 passages</i>, followed by a brief discussion of each passage. The final paragraph, however, introduces the ideas that dignity can mean the capacity of people <i>to love their works</i> and that <i>many people have their own meaning for human dignity</i>. The response suggests, but fails to maintain, a focus on self-respect and pride.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is often imprecise or unsuitable (<i>We can realize how people have their dignities and The meaning of another human dignity is to love their works</i>). The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect. Although two rhetorical questions are used somewhat effectively, most sentences are flawed to some degree (<i>The meaning of human dignity is to have self-pride and respect to himself like Madame Kushkin didn't tell the truth</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in punctuation and grammar (<i>two meaning and human dignity will helps</i>) that hinder comprehension somewhat.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and conventions.</p>	

Practice Paper D–Score Level 3

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Shows a basic, but occasionally confused, understanding of the texts, establishing the controlling idea that <i>human dignity is an inner sense</i> that tells a person the <i>right thing to do in a situation</i>. The response errs in describing Mashenka as a girl who <i>has just returned home from school</i> and the washwoman’s recovery as one that occurred <i>all of a sudden</i>. The response connects the controlling idea and texts by implying that <i>the right thing to do</i> for Mashenka was to leave the house and for the washwoman, to complete her work.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, discussing, for each passage, the character’s situation (Mashenka is falsely accused; the old woman is ill) and the <i>right thing</i> that each character does. Evidence offered is <u>primarily</u> plot summary.</p>
Organization	<p>Generally maintains a focus on the dignity shown by the two characters. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas. The discussion of each passage consists of a chronological retelling of plot events followed by an observation of the dignity exhibited by the major character (<i>Her human dignity kept her from dying and getting the job done</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>The man would not stick up for her</i>) that is occasionally imprecise or redundant (<i>what kind of self values you possess</i>). Sentence structures vary somewhat, sometimes successfully (<i>What a great insult to her</i>), sometimes not (<i>an inner sense that one has dealing with what they feel is the right thing to do</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in agreement and punctuation, especially apostrophes in possessives (<i>everyones faces, Madames husband, familys clothes</i>). These errors do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and conventions.</p>	

Practice Paper E—Score Level 2

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a confused understanding of the texts, suggesting that, in Passage I, Nikolay showed human dignity by being <i>greedy</i> and by wanting <i>the brooch because it belonged to his mother</i>. The response makes a single tenuous connection between Passage II and the idea of human dignity, asserting that the difficulty of the work <i>was her way of having human dignity</i>. However, the response fails to establish a controlling idea beyond the broad statement that <i>author's show many diferent examples of human dignity</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Is largely undeveloped. References to the texts, although often specific, are largely unjustified (Nikolay's greed as an example of dignity), irrelevant ("<i>Mother always had her money ready</i>"), or repetitive (the notion that doing laundry was <i>a hard job</i>). The first paragraph consists largely of words copied directly from the task.</p>
Organization	<p>Lacks an appropriate focus, alluding only to the existence of <i>examples of human dignity in literature</i>. The response suggests some organization, with separate paragraphs discussing <i>the first passage</i> and <i>the second passage</i> and a conclusion that repeats a key idea of each passage, asserting that the passages <i>show a controlling idea about human dignity</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is often imprecise and reveals little awareness of how to use sentences effectively (<i>showing respect because of his fault by stealing the brooch and techniques which did an excellent way of showing human dignity in all regards</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>author's</i> for <i>authors</i>, <i>diferent</i>, <i>baskett</i>, <i>oldend</i>) and grammar (<i>stoled</i> for <i>stole</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2 although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.</p>	

Different people hold different values. Yet there are certain aspects of human dignity that all people care about (or at least should). In both passages, we see how important they are through one's sense of respect, duty, and compliance.

In passage 1, the main character Mashenka decides to leave her then current home because of a lack of trust. This is because the woman who took her in accuses her of stealing an expensive brooch. Mashenka, flabbergasted and disgusted by this accusation, feels wretched for being accused. She is a woman of fine education and refinement, she is not ^{some} distrustful thief! Because of these self-held views, we see that Mashenka values ^{her} respect very highly, and therefore feels she can no longer stay in a household (though lavish and comfortable as it is) where she is viewed lower than she actually is.

Passage 2 tells a story about an old feeble woman who comes and does enormous amounts of laundry for a family. Despite her frailty and old age, the old woman works diligently and meticulously until each piece "sparkled like polished silver." She is willing to put her health on the line to finish her job and finish it well. She takes it so far as to not allow herself to die because of her unfinished load. She is on the brink of death, but does not falter. "The wack would not let me die," she says. This tough woman's sense of duty is displayed when she would not allow herself to die with an unfinished job. She must finish her work in order to keep her dignity.

In both passages, the two women act upon their concerns. For example, Mashenka does not just proclaim that the action was wrong, she gets up and leaves.

Part A— Practice Paper – A

In addition, the old woman forces herself to get well and finish her work instead of just submitting to death and disregarding her duties. The two women will not risk losing their dignity to make circumstances easier. Instead, they lessen their comfortability to keep their self value high.

From the two passages, one can learn that human dignity is extremely important. It is so important that one should be willing to accept negative consequences to keep it. By maintaining one's sense of respect, duty, and compliance, one can achieve this.

The meaning of human dignity, as revealed in the two passages, is having a sense of self-respect and pride in what you do. Human dignity is a characteristic that all people should possess, whether they may be rich or poor, or young or old. People shouldn't let other people take advantage of them because they feel lower or inferior to them. We are all equal and we shouldn't allow other people to take away our self-respect. This means that we should take pride in who we are and in what we do.

From the first passage, Mashenka Parvitsky displayed a great deal of human dignity when she left the household after having the feeling of being insulted. Even though Liza told her that they found nothing in ~~her~~ her room, she still felt insulted because they had no right to suspect her and to rummage in her things. Mashenka was really upset and never in her life had she been subjected to such an outrage. Even after Nikolay explained the entire situation and apologized to her, she still decided to leave the house. In my opinion, that showed a lot of courage and self-respect.

In the second passage, the old woman also shows human dignity. Although she was serving people, especially at an old age, she loved what she did and had pride in it. Her duty of washing clothes were at that time, very difficult. However, she always gave her best to please herself and her customers. After being ill, she did her

rest to recover and to once again do what she loved to do. She said, "I could not rest easy in my bed because of the wash." "The wash would not let me die." This was once again a display of human dignity. She continued to do what she loved to do, even though she was old and became ill.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that all people should have self respect for themselves and have pride in what they do. We should learn from Mashenka and the old lady.

Part A— Practice Paper – C

What kind of person doesn't respect himself? Almost all people respect themselves and have their own pride. We can realize how people have their dignities in these 2 passages.

In these 2 passages show us good examples of human dignity. In the first passage, Madam Kushkin looks for in Mashenka's bag for her brooch, but she says the reason why she did this is because of her sleeve. She doesn't want to tell the truth, because she thought that truth can destroy her pride and respect to herself. In the second passage, one old woman works hard though that work needs the endurance to finish it. She says that she can't die, because her work will not let her die. These two passages tell us the meaning of human dignity. Then what is the meaning of human dignity?

The meaning of human dignity is to have self-pride and respect to himself like Madame Kushkin didn't tell the truth. However, there is another meaning of human dignity. This meaning is not self-pride or respect. The meaning of another human dignity is to love their works like one old woman did. Many people have their own meaning for human dignity, but I think these passages tell us two meanings of human dignity, so people understand the passages easily. I believe maybe human dignity will help people when they grow up and have their own works.

Human dignity is an inner sense that one has dealing with what they feel is the right thing to do in a situation. It shows what kind of self values you possess. Both passages contain the quality of human dignity.

In passage 1, a young girl named Mashenka Pavletky, has just returned home from school. The home she is staying at is in a state of confusion. The mother of the home is in a crazed state looking for her brooch which she believes has been stolen. Mashenka sees everyone's faces and how distraught they are. She goes up into her room and discovers the woman Madame Kuschkin, tossing Mashenka's possessions around looking for the money. After realizing Mashenka was in the room, Madame Kuschkin acts as though she tripped over Mashenka's bag and was putting it back together. Later Mashenka realizes that she is being blamed for stealing the brooch. She becomes appalled that Madame Kuschkin would blame her. What a great insult to her. She decides that she must leave the home. While she is packing the Madames husband, Nikolay, comes to her. He tells her that he was the thief. This outrages her even more. The man would not stick up for her when he knows she was innocent. The decision to leave is a very big one. She is better off living there because her real family is very poor and can't support her like the Madame and her husband can. Mashenka

decides ~~to~~ she would rather live a poor life and be respected than to live a better life and not be respected. She then leaves even though they say they are sorry. Her human dignity helps her move on.

In the second passage, a family finds a tremendous washwoman. She is very old, but very reliable. Even though she does a great job she doesn't expect a raise in pay. She does the family's clothes for many years and then all of a sudden is a couple weeks late. When she arrives she looks very pale and sickly. She was all ready to die but then all of a sudden got well again. The old woman had a great sense of duty to get the clothes back to the family. She would not go to her grave knowing that her job had not been fulfilled. Her human dignity kept her from ~~being~~ dying and getting the job done.

In literature author's show many different examples of human dignity in literature. In my essay I will use ideas from both passages to establish a controlling idea about human dignity. Using evidence from each passage, I will develop my controlling idea and show how the author uses specific literary elements or techniques to control that idea.

In the first passage Nikolay stole the brooch. He stated, "I need money, and she... won't give it to me. It was my father's money that bought this house and everything, you know! It's all mine, and the brooch belonged to my mother, and... it's all mine!" Nikolay was greedy. This shows of human dignity. Another was then he left, showing respect because of his fault by stealing the brooch. Nikolay said it was awful. Nikolay's face was pale. He wanted the brooch because it belonged to his mother, by showing human dignity.

In the second passage the old woman was very old and thin but she could be strong to carry the basket of laundry on her long walk. "Mother always had her money ready, because it was too far for the old woman to come a second time." It was hard to wash laundry in those oldend days and it took ~~long~~ work because they had such a hard time. It was a difficult job. The linens always came out clean. Sometimes thieves came. That was always making it a hard job. The old woman got very, very ill. One evening

She came back with the laundry. The old woman stated, "I could not rest easy in my bed because of the wash," the old woman explained. "The wash would not let me die." The work was harder and harder for the old woman was her way of having human dignity. At the end of the passage the author used techniques ~~which~~ which did an excellent way of showing human dignity in all regards.

In conclusion, the passages show a controlling idea about human dignity. In Passage I it was all about a brooch. In Passage II showed remarkable dignity about how difficult for an old washwoman to do the laundry for the families.

Anchor Paper – Part B—Level 4 – C

for both the Capulet's and the Montague's is that they do not want to have anything to do with each other.

In conclusion, there will always be a struggle between good and evil in literature. Not only in literature, but also in life.

Anchor Level 4-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, agreeing with it and stating that <i>sometimes</i> the conflict of good and evil is <i>hard to find</i> or <i>in disguise</i>. The response makes reference to Iago's actions in <i>Othello</i> and implies a connection to a disguised struggle between good and evil. In <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>, the response makes a superficial reference to the struggle between good and evil by mentioning <i>hatred between the two families</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others, with reference to relevant details in <i>Othello</i> of revenge, love, false perceptions (<i>He figures that he would kill her so that she won't cheat again</i>), and mental imbalance <i>because Iago is feeding him lies</i>. The response briefly discusses <i>a boy and a girl who fall madly in love with each other, even though their parents are enemies</i>, but the confused understanding of point of view and theme makes some of the discussion of <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> irrelevant.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the <i>conflict between good and evil</i>. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas; the discussion of each work begins with a restatement of the critical lens, and the final paragraph ends the essay in a similar manner. However, the concluding fragment introduces a new idea, that the <i>struggle between good and evil occurs not only in literature, but also in life</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses generally appropriate language with some awareness of audience (<i>The reader just has to find the struggle and has to read between the lines. As you can see, I agree with this statement</i>). However, the response occasionally uses a cliché (<i>fall madly in love</i>) or informal language (<i>Iago would go all out</i> and <i>He figures that he would kill her</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>Shakespeare</i> and <i>trully</i>), usage (<i>He has trully lose his mind</i> and <i>The point of views for both</i>), and punctuation (<i>Capulet's and the Montague's</i>). These errors do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 although it is somewhat weaker in meaning.</p>	

It is said that "all conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." Indeed, the fundamental conflict of human nature is that of darkness and light; and as a mirror to life, ~~literature's~~ ^{the} conflicts in literature is not different from those in human nature. The struggle of good and evil is shown in Nathaniel Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter, ~~which~~ which portrays the spiritual battle ~~of~~ between an evil man and a sinned minister, as well as the minister's internal turmoil. William Shakespeare's Macbeth, similarly, describes a man's moral decay and the vengeance of the wronged good people. Both authors use various literary elements and techniques such as ~~#~~ symbolism, metaphor, theme and characterization to illustrate the struggle between good and evil in their works.

The Scarlet Letter, written by Nathaniel Hawthorne, is a story of ~~sin~~ damnation and redemption. Roger Chillingworth, finding out his wife's adultery with another Dimmesdale upon his returning from Indian captivity, vows to take revenge on the minister. In the process, however, he transforms himself into the minion of devil on earth. Though the mouth of Pearl (the fruit of the illegitimate union), the author metaphorically calls Chillingworth "the Black Man". Comparing Chillingworth to the Devil, Pearl warns Dimmesdale, "The Black Man wants thy soul." Indeed, Chillingworth sets out to poison his rival — both physically and mentally. Dimmesdale, on the other hand, is waging a war with ⁱⁿ himself. His good nature craves to confess his secret affair with Hester Prynne, yet his darker side — cowardice perhaps — stubbornly refuses. In his torment Dimmesdale carves onto his own chest a scarlet red A. Unlike Hester's red A, which symbolizes repentance and strength, ~~for~~ in Dimmesdale's case the scarlet letter is the symbol of hidden and unforgiven sin. Near the end of the novel, however,

the dying minister finally gathers up the courage to expose his sinner's A, thus earning his illegitimate daughter's forgiveness and escaping eternal damnation of his soul. "Thou hast escaped me!", exclaims Chillingworth, whose soul remains unredeemed, as well as unredeemable. In the end, good has, in a sense, triumphed over evil.

Shakespeare's play Macbeth ~~on the other hand~~ also revolves around the question of goodness and evil. The very theme of the play is how an honest man can be dehumanized by temptation. The character of Macbeth initially is the "valiant cousin, worthy gentleman" of old king Duncan. Tempted by the three Weird Sisters and pressed by his ~~power~~ evil wife, however, Macbeth gradually becomes a ruthless and corrupt ruler. At first he assassinates Duncan to climb onto the throne, then murders his one-time best friend Banquo in fear ~~of~~ and greed. Finally, the last breath of humanity and goodness leaves him when he orders the slaying of Macduff's entire household. At the end of the play, when he receives the news of his wife's death, he ^{only} remarks indifferently: "She should have died hereafter." The bloody tyrant's downfall, however, is foreshadowed by ^{one of} the witches' second prophecies: "Beware Macduff." After receiving the devastating news of the massacre, Macduff is resolved more than ever to overthrow Macbeth, which he eventually achieves by beheading the personification of evil in combat. Thus again, goodness wins the battle, although unlike Dimmesdale, Macbeth's ^{ultimately} soul meets damnation.

Fundamentally, a man's nature is torn between goodness and evil, light and darkness. ~~In~~ literature all conflicts stem from this eternal

It ~~is~~ comes as no surprise, then, that in struggle. Nathaniel Hawthorne writes The Scarlet Letter to question sin, and Shakespeare's Macbeth gives an alarming example of

Anchor Paper – Part B—Level 6 – A

moral decay. The moods of both masterpieces ~~are~~ are gloomy, dissecting and examining the powerful darkness of human psyche. In the end, however, goodness endures and shines through the dark clouds, offering hope and testimonies for the complexity and ambivalence of humankind.

Anchor Level 6-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides an interpretation of the critical lens that is faithful to the complexity of the statement, asserting that <i>as a mirror to life, the conflicts in literature is not different from those in human nature</i>. The response uses the interpretation to make an insightful analysis of <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> as a story of damnation and redemption, and of <i>Macbeth</i> as an example of <i>how an honest man can be dehumanized by temptation</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully. The response makes effective use of theme, metaphor (<i>Comparing Chillingworth to the Devil and Pearl warns Dimmesdale: "The Black Man wants thy soul"</i>) and symbolism (<i>in Dimmesdale's case the scarlet letter is the symbol of hidden and unforgiven sin</i>) in Hawthorne's work; and theme, characterization, and relevant quotations (<i>Macbeth initially is the "radiant cousin, worthy gentleman" and when he receives the news of his wife's death, he only remarks indifferently: "She should have died hereafter"</i>) in Shakespeare's text to illustrate <i>the struggle between good and evil</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus on <i>the struggle of good and evil</i>. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure which begins with the criteria for analysis, continues with effective topic sentences and specific details from each work, and concludes with a reiteration of the focus (<i>a man's nature is torn between goodness and evil, light and darkness</i>). Skillfully used transitions (<i>Similarly, Both authors, In the process, on the other hand, also, gradually, Finally</i>) strengthen the coherence of the response.</p>
Language Use	<p>Is stylistically sophisticated (<i>The moods of both masterpieces are gloomy, dissecting and examining the powerful darkness</i>). The response varies long, complex sentences with shorter sentences to enhance meaning.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>conflict, vengeance, dissecting, pshsye</i>), agreement (<i>conflicts ... is</i>) and usage (<i>sinned minister</i>) when using sophisticated language.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.</p>	

The statement that "All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil" conveys the meaning that all themes and struggles in literature, when broken down to their most filtered form, come down to the conflict of good versus evil. I agree with this statement because good and evil are the purest forms of all emotion; all other emotions simply derive from these basic emotions. Two works of literature that best support this opinion are William Golding's "Lord of the Flies" and William Shakespeare's Othello.

In William Golding's "Lord of the Flies", Golding uses the theme of power to show the conflict of good and evil. In this novel, the main characters are adolescent boys yearning to gain the acceptance and power of the group. All the young boys are free from adult rule to do as they please while they are stranded on the inhabited island. As the novel progresses, the true natures of the boys are revealed. Ralph, the leader of one group, is characterized as a pure, innocent, all-around good boy. He uses ^{his} reasoning and fairness to rule over the boys. Jack, ~~the~~ on the other hand, is the leader of a separate group of boys. Golding displays these boys as savage, constantly hunting to kill, and even creates the chant of "Kill the Beast" associated with Jack's group of boys. Jack rules maliciously with an iron fist. He is characterized as unjust, demanding, and basically ill-natured. Golding uses these

sharp contrasts of good and evil to exemplify this contrast in our society. He states that once allowed total freedom in ~~a~~ a society, our basic emotion of evil will be ~~a~~ magnified. That is why a government with a set rule and laws is imperative to the survival of our culture.

William Shakespeare also conveys a similar message in his play Othello. Shakespeare ^{introduces} ~~creates~~ the character of Othello as a brave, valiant, and honorable man. He also introduces the complete antithesis of ~~O~~ Othello in the character of Iago. Iago is a two-faced manipulator, representing the evil element of this novel. Shakespeare uses ~~I~~ Iago to take advantage of Othello's trusting nature and ~~preys~~ ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~good~~ ~~heart~~ of Othello. Soon, Othello becomes consumed with hate and jealousy, which override all his other emotions. Shakespeare uses Othello to display how a character can cross the threshold of good and evil. He shows his readers the capacity of ~~his~~ his characters to love through Othello and Desdemona's pure love. Shakespeare then displays the capacity of his characters to hate through the murder of Desdemona. These emotions that Shakespeare conveys are also important in the themes of the play. The theme of love, shows the good in all the characters and the theme of jealousy displays the evil in all the characters.

In conclusion, the struggle of good and evil is a basic struggle that is prevalent in all novels. This struggle is exemplified in Shakespeare's Othello

Anchor Paper – Part B—Level 6 – B

and Golding's *Lord of the Flies* through various themes and characterizations. Both Golding and Shakespeare discuss the effects of these emotions in society.

Anchor Level 6–B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides an interpretation of the critical lens that is faithful to the complexity of the statements, asserting that when <i>all themes and struggles ... [are] broken down to their most filtered form</i>, the conflict involves good and evil. The response identifies good and evil <i>as the purest forms of all emotion</i>, and then uses this understanding to make an insightful analysis of the societal <i>effects of these emotions</i> in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> and <i>Othello</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully, using examples of theme and characterization to show the <i>conflict of good and evil</i> in each work. The response examines <i>the theme of power</i> in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> through the contrasting characters of Ralph (<i>a pure, innocent, all-around good boy</i>) and Jack (<i>an unjust, demanding, and basically ill natured boy</i>). Similarly, the themes of love and jealousy are examined through the characters of Othello (<i>a brave, valiant and honorable man</i>) and his <i>antithesis</i>, Iago (<i>a two-faced manipulator</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus on <i>the conflict of good verses evil</i>. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure, which includes a thematic discussion of each work, character descriptions, and skillful use of transitions (<i>works of literature that best support this opinion; Jack, on the other hand; Shakespeare also conveys a similar message; Both Golding and Shakespeare discuss</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Is stylistically sophisticated, using descriptive adjectives and adverbs, contrast, and parallelism in language to achieve a notable sense of voice. The response indicates awareness of audience and purpose (<i>sharp contrasts of good and evil ... exemplify this contrast in our society</i> and <i>He shows his readers the capacity of his characters to love</i>), and varies the structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, with occasional errors in spelling (<i>verses</i> and <i>prevelent</i>) and punctuation (<i>The theme of love, shows the good</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.</p>	

All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil. I agree with this statement because conflict is a battle between opposing forces or ideas. The two most basic opposing forces are good and evil. Since evil has so many different facets (hate, jealousy, etc.) it is reasonable to assume that all conflict in literature can be broken down into some type of good and some form of evil. These topics of good and evil are so broad that even if they are not represented in a conventional, easy to differentiate between manner, the main idea is still present. Romeo and Juliet by William Shakespeare and A Separate Peace by John Knowles both show different versions of the conflict between good and evil.

The form of the battle between good and evil in Romeo and Juliet is love vs. hate. The love is that between the two teenagers. Their love is innocent, pure, and true. Romeo and Juliet overcome ~~sub~~ substantial obstacles to prove their devotion to one another. The largest obstacle is the hatred between their families, the Montagues and the Capulets. The hatred is dark and violent, bringing only death. The two young lovers take their lives in order to be together, but evil does not triumph. The love of Romeo and Juliet is so powerful that the families are touched by it even though the children are dead. The hatred is overcome and good triumphs over evil, love over hate.

In A Separate Peace by John Knowles the struggle is an ~~to~~ inner conflict between friendship and jealousy that takes place in Gene. The friendships

is the special bond between Gene and his roommate, Finny at the Devon school for boys. Gene admires Finny and Finny's accomplishments, but also feels jealousy toward Finny. Foreshadowing of the apex of the conflict is viewed with ~~set~~ a comment by Gene, "There was no harm in envying even your best friend just a little." This conflict builds up in Gene until he breaks and knocks Finny off the tree branch. Finny's injuries eventually lead to his death. The 'evil', the jealousy in Gene overcame the purity and goodness of his friendship.

In conclusion, all conflict in literature can be broken up into a "struggle" between a representative or symbol of good and a form of evil. Examples are the conflict between love and hate in Romeo and Juliet by William Shakespeare and friendship vs. jealousy in A Separate Peace by John Knowles.

Anchor Level 5–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a thoughtful interpretation of the critical lens that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis, asserting that <i>conflict is a battle between opposing forces that can be broken down into some type of good and some form of evil</i>. The response uses this interpretation to make a clear and reasoned analysis of the <i>different facets</i> of evil that generate conflict in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> and <i>A Separate Peace</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, offering relevant evidence about <i>the battle between good and evil</i> through discussions of theme in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>The hatred is overcome and good triumphs over evil</i>), and of conflict in <i>A Separate Peace</i> (<i>the struggle is an inner conflict between friendship and jealousy</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a focus on the <i>struggle between good and evil</i> established in the opening paragraph. The response follows the structure suggested in the introduction, first defining good and evil as <i>the two most basic opposing forces</i>, then discussing each specific work in terms of those basic forces. The conclusion reiterates the connection to the critical lens.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is often fluent and original (<i>hatred is dark and violent, bringing only death</i>), but sometimes imprecise (<i>Foreshadowing of the apex of the conflict is viewed with comment by Gene</i>). The response varies structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions with only two errors: the omission of commas in appositives (<i>A Separate Peace by John Knowles</i>) and the misspelling of one word (<i>roomate</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.</p>	

In literature, every conflict is based on a struggle between the forces of good and evil. The conflict can exist between two people or two different groups representing a protagonist or antagonist, or ~~for~~ a character himself can be struggle between his good ~~to~~ and evil side. In every ~~the~~ literary work, the characters are presented on two opposing sides and the reader is led to ~~to~~ feel sympathetic with the good and contempt towards the evil. Two examples of such literature can be found in William Golding's novel Lord of the Flies and The Tragedy of Macbeth by William Shakespeare.

In the Lord of the Flies, William Golding has portrayed the main theme that both good and evil exists ~~and~~ inside the human character, and when ^{humans} ~~and~~ are present in their natural state, with no restrictions, the evil prevails over the good. Through the story of some boys stranded on an island, Golding has illustrated the regression of society. In ~~the~~ story Ralph is the character who is presented as the good, in conflict with Jack, the evil character. Ralph is chosen ~~back~~ as the leader, who presents a well organized plan of survival for ~~to~~ the boys on the island. He assigns specific duties for food, shelter, and rescue divided amongst the boys. The conch represents the discipline and the order imposed by Ralph's leadership. Ralph is challenged by Jack, who leads the ~~the~~ team of hunters. Their attack of the female pig and its babies illustrates ~~the~~ his inherently evil character. The pig's head on the stick becomes the symbol of ~~the~~ the forces of evil. This conflict between the

two Ralph and Jack exists throughout the novel and leads to the death of a few boys and the destruction of the island.

In the tragedy of Macbeth, William Shakespeare has presented two major conflicts between good and evil. He has illustrated the gradual transformation of Macbeth's character from good to evil. Followed by Macbeth's struggle with ~~the~~ his people and Macduff. Throughout the story, Macbeth is forced to choose between the good and evil inside him. He is persuaded by the three witches to murder King Duncan and crown himself the king of Scotland. ^{Macbeth} He constantly tries to justify his actions and he is plagued with the guilt and fear of King Duncan's murder. But once he has murdered the king, the evil inside him takes over the good and he continues to ~~murder~~ kill anyone who may have presented a potential danger to him. Lady Macbeth also calls upon the powers of evil to ~~make~~ give her the strength to help her husband. The ~~so~~ three witches and their ~~own~~ prophecy symbolizes the evil that takes control of Macbeth and eventually leads him to his death. Macduff becomes the good aspect who kills Macbeth and saves the people.

In both literary works, the author has presented a conflict between good and evil through its characters. Both of authors have ~~shown~~ illustrated the forces of evil as being more powerful than the ~~good~~ good. However, in the end the good ~~does~~ is always victorious. Ralph

Anchor Level 5–B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a thoughtful interpretation of the critical lens, saying that literary <i>characters are presented on two opposing sides and the reader is lead to feel sympathetic with the good and contempt towards the evil</i>. The response uses the criteria to make clear connections to <i>The Lord of the Flies</i> and to <i>Macbeth</i>, although no further reference is made to readers' interpretations.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, stating that <i>both good and evil exists inside the human character</i> (in <i>Lord of the Flies</i>) and that <i>Macbeth is forced to choose between the good and evil inside him</i>. The response uses symbolism to analyze Ralph (<i>who is presented as the good character</i>) and Jack (<i>the evil character</i>) and the objects and events which have symbolic meaning in the novel. The discussion of <i>Macbeth</i> focuses on Shakespeare's characterizations of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, and on the symbolic connotations of Macduff (<i>who becomes the good aspect</i>) and the witches and their prophecies (<i>the evil that takes control of Macbeth</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus on characters who are on either the good or the evil side. The response is organized logically, with each text following a similar pattern: identification of evil, analysis of characters, chronological presentation of pertinent actions, and recognition of good triumphing over evil. The response uses appropriate transitional phrases (<i>Two examples of such literature</i> and <i>In both literary works</i>) to provide direction and coherence.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is fluent and original (<i>He has illustrated the gradual transformation of Macbeth's character from good to evil</i>). The response indicates awareness of audience (<i>the reader</i>) and purpose (<i>The conflict can exist between two people</i>). Effective word choice (<i>inherently</i> and <i>transformation</i>) and generally effective sentence variety control rhythm and pacing.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in grammar, punctuation (<i>assigns specific duties, for food, shelter; and power's of evil</i>) and spelling (<i>throughout</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.</p>	

"All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." In other words conflict which happens in literature is a struggle between good and evil. I disagree with the quote. Two pieces of literature I have selected to support my opinion are Joy Luck Club by Amy Tan and The Great Gatsby by S. Scott Fitzgerald.

In Joy Luck Club by Amy Tan ~~there~~ ^{there} are a lot of conflicts. The biggest types of conflict are character vs character and character vs self. An example of character vs character is Suyuan vs her daughter June. The conflict was because Suyuan wanted June to play the piano and June refused. The conflict was not between good and evil but between who should have the power. Amy Tan uses flashbacks to show arguments and confrontations between mother and daughters. Another conflict was between Lindo and her daughter Waverly. Lindo was proud of Waverly's talent as a chess player and wanted her to continue playing. Waverly wanted her mother to stop taking her credit so she would not practice chess anymore. The conflict is not a struggle between good and evil but a struggle for control. The book also uses ~~parallelism~~ ^{parallelism}. Each mother is parallel to each other while each daughter is parallel to each other. This literary device helps to develop a pattern between the conflicts that take place between mother and daughter. An-mei faced a conflict of character vs self when her youngest son Bing died she did not know what to do. An-mei did not

know if she should believe in God or not. An-mei's conflict was not a struggle between good and ~~good~~^{evil} but a struggle to find what was best for her.

In The Great Gatsby by S. Scott Fitzgerald there were many conflicts that were not a struggle between good and evil. One conflict was Jay Gatsby against ~~himself~~^{himself}. Gatsby wanted Daisy so much he did not know how far he should go to get her. The conflict ~~Gatsby~~ Gatsby faced was not a struggle between good and evil but a struggle to overcome longing. Fitzgerald uses flashbacks and symbolism to show how much Gatsby loved and long for Daisy. By doing this, Fitzgerald gave the reader a chance to see how hard the struggle Gatsby faced was. Another conflict in The Great Gatsby was between Nick Carraway and ~~himself~~^{himself}. ~~Nick's~~ Nick's conflict was not a struggle between good and evil but a struggle to find himself and where he belongs. Nick does not know who his friends are and what his purpose is. Nick struggles between finding out who is trustful and who is not.

The quote "All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." is not correct in my ~~opinion~~^{opinion}. I believe there are many different types of conflict and many different reasons why conflicts occurs. Literature that supports my ~~opinion~~^{opinion} are Joy Luck Club by Amy Tan and The Great Gatsby by S. Scott Fitzgerald.

Anchor Level 5-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens. Although the initial interpretation is a simple restatement, the response disagrees with it, ultimately stating that <i>there are many different types of conflict and many different reasons why conflicts occurs</i>. The response makes a clear analysis of the <i>character vs. character</i> conflict in <i>The Joy Luck Club</i> (<i>The conflict was not between good and evil but between who should have the power</i>) and of the <i>character vs. self</i> conflict in <i>The Great Gatsby</i> (<i>Nick's conflict was ... a struggle to find himself and where he belongs</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, with reference to relevant details of inner conflict (<i>An-mei's ... struggle to find what was best for her and one conflict was Jay Gatsby against himself</i>). The response discusses Tan's use of flashback and parallelism (<i>Each mother is parallel to each other while each daughter is parallel to each other</i>), while the discussion of Fitzgerald's work focuses on conflicts and only mentions <i>flashbacks and symbolism to show how much Gatsby loved and long for Daisy</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus on conflicts other than those of good and evil. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas; several paragraphs begin with a restatement of opposition to the critical lens. The concluding paragraph strengthens the coherence of the response by restating ideas from the introduction.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally fluent (<i>The conflict is not a struggle between good and evil but a struggle for control</i>). The response varies structure and length of sentences, and the formal tone reveals an awareness of audience and purpose (<i>This literary device helps to develop a pattern between the conflicts that take place between mother and daughter</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting errors in spelling (<i>peices, opionion, Fitzgerald</i>), verb tense (<i>long for Daisy</i>) and apostrophe use (<i>it's</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in meaning and conventions.</p>	

"All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." The conflict may occur within oneself, as well as affect a number of different people. Whatever the conflict may be, the struggle between good and evil is what makes all the difference. Two works of literature that show the truth in this statement are The Scarlet Letter and The Catcher in the Rye.

In The Scarlet Letter the time period makes a huge difference in the development of the story. It is the way of society which ultimately leads to the downfall of Hester Prynne and the minister. The minister must choose whether or not to express his role in the illegitimate pregnancy of Hester. Either way he is faced with conflict. Once he chose evil, when he had a physical relationship with Hester, knowing that she was married. He is now faced with the decision as to if everyone else should know that he is the father of Hester's baby. This conflict tears at him until he is at the point of no return. The fight between good and evil took over him, and evil won.

The main character, Holden, in The Catcher in the Rye by J.D. Salinger, is faced with a deep inner conflict. In a way he must choose between himself (good) and the rest of the world (evil). His thoughts and ideas are altered greatly with every new experience that takes place. After being on the streets, by himself, he must make a decision concerning the rest of his life. In his life, the good seems to outweigh the bad. He thinks of his family and realizes that is

where he should be. He shouldn't be running from his problems and fears because that is only the coward's way out. He must face things that are thrown his way and deal with them as they come along.

Sometimes it is not easy for one to choose between good and evil. It takes a lot of thinking and a lot of analyzing. When a character in a piece of literature is faced with a particular conflict, the author tries to distinguish the difference in choices. Some are easier to make than others, but they all hold a certain significance.

Anchor Level 4–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, stating that <i>whatever the conflict may be, the struggle between good and evil ... makes the difference</i>. The response makes implicit connections between the importance of this struggle in conflict and the difficulties of the minister in <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> and Holden in <i>The Catcher in the Rye</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response makes specific references to <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> to illustrate the minister’s struggle to resolve his conflict (<i>The minister must choose whether or not to express his role in the illegitimate pregnancy of Hester</i>). However, the discussion of <i>Catcher in the Rye</i> lacks specificity. The response refers to Holden’s <i>thoughts and ideas [that] are altered greatly</i> but these are not clearly identified. The elements of setting and characterization are more clearly examined in <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> than in <i>The Catcher in the Rye</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear focus on the struggle between good and evil. The response generally exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, moving within paragraphs from a statement of each character’s conflict to a discussion of the struggle, and concluding with the outcome. However, the logical sequence is weakened in paragraph two where ideas of the <i>time period</i>, societal demands, and the minister’s conflict are only loosely connected.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate but occasionally awkward, as in the use of <i>as to if</i>. The response shows awareness of audience and occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure (<i>When a character in a piece of literature is faced with a particular conflict, the author tries to distinguish the difference in choices</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in usage (<i>effect a number of ... people</i>), sentence structure, proofreading (<i>from is problems</i>), and punctuation (<i>It takes</i>). These errors do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.</p>	

After a while, the conflicts in literature become trite. This is because all literature has basically the same one: good versus evil. "All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." There is hardly any other conflict written about, it all boils down to good versus evil. This statement is supported by Nathaniel Hawthorne's work *The Scarlet Letter* and ~~Thomas~~ Arthur Miller's play "*The Crucible*". Both of these authors use a variety of literary elements, including point of view, setting, theme, and irony, to convey their message of good versus evil.

Nathaniel Hawthorne used the point of view of the Puritan people to set up the good versus the bad in his work, *The Scarlet Letter*. The Puritan people condemn Hester Prynne for being an adulteress, and immediately set her apart as being evil. They brand her with a scarlet "A" for adultery, so everyone can see that she has sinned. Also, the use of setting separates her further from the town. Ultimately, though, the struggle of good versus evil is between Hester's lover, a minister named Arthur Dimmesdale, and his desire to be righteous. The basic conflict of ~~the~~ *The Scarlet Letter* is one of good versus evil.

Arthur Miller's play "*The Crucible*", also had a conflict of good versus evil. In fact, one of the themes of the play is good versus evil. Abigail Williams and a group of Puritan girls opt to name people who made them do things forbidden to Puritan society as witches, instead instead of getting punished for what they did. Miller uses irony here, because anyone who confessed to witchcraft and to being evil, did not have to hang. However, those who did not confess to witchcraft were hung. In this case, it takes a long time to see that none of the people were evil or witches, that the girls just wanted some attention. The main

Anchor Paper – Part B—Level 4 – B

conflict, though, is one of good versus evil, of the accused versus the girls who proclaim witchery has gone amuck in Salem.

The conflict in literature is nearly always the same: good versus evil.

Anchor Level 4-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, stating that all conflict in literature <i>boils down to good versus evil</i>. The response makes specific connections to the chosen texts (Hawthorne’s <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> and Miller’s <i>The Crucible</i>), analyzing each work to show that <i>both of these authors use a variety of literary elements ... to convey their message of good versus evil</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response elaborates the actions of the Puritans against Hester Prynne, but only mentions that <i>ultimately, though, the struggle of good versus evil is between Hester’s lover, a minister named Arthur Dimmesdale, and his desire to be righteous</i>. In the discussion of <i>The Crucible</i>, there is more evidence given about <i>good versus evil, of the accused versus the girls who proclaim witchery has gone amuck in Salem</i>. The response identifies the irony of confessing to witchcraft and one of the themes of <i>The Crucible</i>, but the references to setting and point of view in <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> are unclear.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains an appropriate focus on the issue of good and evil. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, moving from introduction through discussion of each work, but ending with an unfinished conclusion. While the response uses transitional phrases (<i>Also</i> and <i>In this case</i>), internal consistency is lacking in <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> discussion, which switches from theme to Hester’s condemnation to the scarlet “A” to setting and back to theme in consecutive sentences.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language with some awareness of audience and purpose. The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success. (<i>Abigail Williams and a group of Puritan girls opt to name people who made them do things forbidden to Puritan society as witches, instead of getting punished for what they did</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>Scarlett, adultery, seperates</i>), punctuation, and usage (<i>were hung</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat weaker in language.</p>	

"All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil."

There is always conflict in literature, no matter if it is man vs nature, man vs man, or man vs. the mind.

There is always good and evil but sometimes it is hard to find because it might be in disguise. Even in the most nicely written essay in literature that has nothing to do with violence, there is a struggle. The reader just has to find the struggle and has to read between the lines. As you can see, I agree with this statement about the struggle between good and evil. In the two works listed below by William Shakespeare, there is a conflict between good and evil.

In Othello, written by William Shakespeare, there is a conflict between good and evil. The theme of this story is the love between Othello and Desdemona and how a person can influence another person to the point of no return.

The point of view of Iago is that since he doesn't like Othello, he

wants to have revenge against him because ~~he thinks~~ Othello didn't give him the position of lieutenant. Iago would go all out just to see Othello suffer. The point of view of Othello is that he is madly in love with Desdemona and can't believe that she is cheating on him.

Even though this is a lie, Othello doesn't know that. He figures that he would kill her so that she won't cheat again. He has truly lose his mind because Iago is feeding him lies.

In the novel, Romeo and Juliet, written by William Shakespeare, there is also a struggle between good and evil. The theme in this story is that there is a boy and a girl who fall madly in love with each other, even though their parents are enemies.

Because of this hatred between the two families, the two teenagers will fall victims to hate. The point of view of Romeo is that he would do anything for Juliet, even if it means to die for her. The point of view of Juliet is that she would kill herself just to be with Romeo in the other world. The point of views

Anchor Paper – Part B—Level 4 – C

for both the Capulet's and the Montague's is that they do not want to have anything to do with each other.

In conclusion, there will always be a struggle between good and evil in literature, not only in literature, but also in life.

Anchor Level 4-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, agreeing with it and stating that <i>sometimes</i> the conflict of good and evil <i>is hard to find or in disguise</i>. The response makes reference to Iago's actions in <i>Othello</i> and implies a connection to a disguised struggle between good and evil. In <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>, the response makes a superficial reference to the struggle between good and evil by mentioning <i>hatred between the two families</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others, with reference to relevant details in <i>Othello</i> of revenge, love, false perceptions (<i>He figures that he would kill her so that she won't cheat again</i>), and mental imbalance <i>because Iago is feeding him lies</i>. The response briefly discusses <i>a boy and a girl who fall madly in love with each other, even though their parents are enemies</i>, but the confused understanding of point of view and theme makes some of the discussion of <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> irrelevant.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the <i>conflict between good and evil</i>. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas; the discussion of each work begins with a restatement of the critical lens, and the final paragraph ends the essay in a similar manner. However, the concluding fragment introduces a new idea, that the <i>struggle between good and evil occurs not only in literature, but also in life</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses generally appropriate language with some awareness of audience (<i>The reader just has to find the struggle and has to read between the lines. As you can see, I agree with this statement</i>). However, the response occasionally uses a cliché (<i>fall madly in love</i>) or informal language (<i>Iago would go all out and He figures that he would kill her</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>Shakesphere and trully</i>), usage (<i>He has trully lose his mind and The point of views for both</i>), and punctuation (<i>Capulet's and the Montague's</i>). These errors do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 although it is somewhat weaker in meaning.</p>	

Anchor Paper - Part B - Level 3 - A

In many works of literature the conflict between good and evil plays a major role in stories. In the stories "The Hobbit" by J.R.R. Tolkien and "Romeo and Juliet" by Shakespeare, the role of good vs. evil plays a important role. However by the quote, "All conflicts in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil," is by far very true but some conflicts aren't just good versus evil. For example there are some struggles that are man vs nature or even good vs good, but for most parts it is good vs. evil.

In the story "The Hobbit" by J.R.R. Tolkien, good versus evil plays a very important role in the story. Bilbo, which is represented by Gandalf the wizard and his crew of dwarfs are in conflict with the impure dragon who stole their treasure. Their conflicts comes into conclusion when the dwarfs take out the dragon in a war that they have towards the end of the book. Well, like most stories ends with good conquering over evil.

In the story of "Romeo and Juliet" by Shakespeare, good vs. evil takes part in the war of the Capulets and Montagues. Romeo who is in deep love with Juliet doesn't understand that they both are on different sides. However, they both don't care, for their love for each other is the story. The king and queen, which is the mother and father of both conflicting sides, ^(Romeo/Montague) kill each other and ^(Juliet/Capulet) Juliet, the nurse, see each other again. In concluding though both Romeo and Juliet were away with each and die together with Romeo is mistakenly thought Juliet was dead.

As you can see by the quote, all conflicts in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil," the quote itself seems to be true. I tend to agree with it. In other words most stories have this conflict.

Anchor Level 3–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens, agreeing with it and stating <i>some struggles ... are man vs nature or even good vs. good, but for most parts it is good vs. evil</i>). The response makes superficial connections to <i>The Hobbit</i> (<i>Here, like most stories ends with good conquering over evil</i>) and to <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>good vs. evil takes part in the war of the Capulets and Montagues</i>).</p>
Development	Develops ideas briefly, relying primarily on plot summary in <i>The Hobbit</i> (<i>conflicts came into conclusion when the nomes take out the dragon in a war</i>) and on inaccurate references in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>The king and queen ... the mother and father of both conflicting sides, tell there son and daughter, to never see each other again</i>). The response briefly alludes to symbolism (<i>Good, which is represented by Gandolf the wizard and his crew of nomes</i>) in the discussion of Tolkien.
Organization	Maintains a focus on the conflict between good and evil through a logical sequence of ideas, although the repetition of ideas in the introduction and conclusion weakens the coherence.
Language Use	Relies on basic vocabulary with some awareness of audience (<i>As you can see by the quote</i>). The response attempts to vary sentence structure for effect, but with uneven success (<i>Romeo who is in deep love with Juliet doesn't understand that they both are on different sides</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension (<i>In concluding though both Romeo and Juliet run away with each and die together since Romeo is mistakingly thought Juliet was dead</i>).
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and language use.</p>	

All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil. This sentence really does describe literature's conflicts very completely. Two books that display this trend are *Of Mice and Men*, by John Steinbeck, and *The Crucible* by Arthur Miller.

In *Of Mice and Men* the main struggle is between good, Lenny, and evil, Curly. The fight between them is only because Curly thinks that Lenny is trying to steal Curly's wife. This, of course, is not true though. This struggle ends in a very tragic way. Lenny ends up being killed by his friend because if he wasn't he would have been tortured by Curly.

In *The Crucible*, the struggle is between Abigail (evil), and John Proctor (good). In this case Abigail wants John Proctor to have an affair with her. She told everyone in the town that his wife tried to hurt her with witchcraft. Therefore his wife had to go to jail and stand trial. In this case in the end, good didn't conquer evil either because Abigail got off free while John died.

I do agree with the statement "all conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." These two works of literature do well to conclude the same idea.

Anchor Level 3–B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens, agreeing with it (<i>This sentence really does describe literature's conflicts very completely</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the criteria and the chosen texts <i>The Crucible</i>, where the struggle is between Abigail (evil) and John Proctor (good), and <i>Of Mice and Men</i>, where the main struggle is between good, Lenny, and evil, Curly.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, relying primarily on plot summary from <i>Of Mice and Men</i> (<i>This struggle ends in a very tragic way</i>) and <i>The Crucible</i> (<i>In this case Abigail wants John Proctor to have an affair with her</i>). The response, while not mentioning specific literary elements, implies that characters in each work are representations of good and evil.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains an appropriate focus on the conflict between good and evil. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, mentioning the struggle in each text. The use of the word <i>either</i> in the last sentence of paragraph three suggests a similarity between the chosen works, but the ambiguity of the response's last sentence further weakens the overall organization.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience. The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure and length; the majority of the sentences are simple sentences.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting errors in spelling, punctuation (<i>This, of course, is not true though</i>), and capitalization (<i>lenny</i> and <i>two books that display</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions and organization.</p>	

Two works of literature that deal with this statement are Macbeth by William Shakespeare and Jane Eyre by Emily Brontë.

In the play, Macbeth, the struggle between good and evil was in Macbeth deciding was he going to kill King Duncan along with a couple of other people he killed later. Lady Macbeth was a bad influence on him. She brought the evil into him. I agree with the statement: "All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form a struggle between good and evil." That is because in most of the novels people have to decide between doing the wrong thing and the right thing.

Macbeth did end up killing King Duncan and after that, it was the start of a very bad thing. Macbeth seemed to be no longer struggling from deciding what was good from evil because he let the evil take over him. The theme of the play was really that Lady Macbeth knew King Duncan was killed she would get money, therefore she wanted Macbeth to kill him.

Then Macbeth was so paranoid that someone knew he did this, that he kept killing those people. In the end, Macbeth ends up dying in a war between him and a group of people.

The second literary work is Jane Eyre. Jane really had to deal with fears

good people and evil people. She struggled so much because almost everyone seemed to be evil to her.

The theme of this novel was about Jane being moved around a lot and hurt. She felt like everyone was hurting her, so she ~~she~~ could do the same to them. While Jane was younger she truly had a confrontation with good and evil.

Unlike Macbeth in the end Jane chose to do the right and ending up very happy. ~~Macbeth~~ Macbeth on the other hand was killed.

Anchor Level 3–C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>in most of the novels people have to decide between doing the wrong thing and the right thing</i>). The response suggests some criteria for analyzing <i>Macbeth</i> (<i>the struggle between good and evil was in Macbeth deciding was he going to kill King Duncan</i>) and <i>Jane Eyre</i> (<i>Jane really had to deal with facing good people and evil people</i>), although the connections made between the criteria and the texts are superficial.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly. Although the response makes some relevant references to <i>Macbeth</i>, it relies heavily on generalizations (<i>She brought the evil into him.</i>) The discussion of <i>Jane Eyre</i> is vague and undeveloped (<i>The theme of this novel was about Jane being moved around a lot and hurt</i>). The response also reveals confusion between theme and plot.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains an appropriate focus on characters' struggles against good and evil. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure through an introduction, text discussions, and conclusion. Some inconsistency is evident in the first paragraph, which introduces <i>two works ... that deal with this statement</i>, but the discussion of the statement itself does not take place until the middle of the second paragraph.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on language that is generally basic and often imprecise (<i>King Duncan along with a couple of other people</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence length for effect, but with uneven success (<i>Macbeth seemed to be no longer struggling from deciding what was good from evil</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control of conventions with occasional errors in spelling (<i>simpilest, paroncyed, dieing</i>), punctuation (<i>get money, therefore</i>), and word omissions (<i>Jane chose to do the right end ending up very happy</i>) that hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat weaker in language.</p>	

through out books and literature there has always been the fight between good and evil and like all good has always triumphed over evil.

In most books yes there is good vs evil but not all. The use of the good or bad makes the story more appealing to the reader. In the book Lord of the Flies by William Golding is a struggle between good and evil. Ralph who portrays good and Jack who is evil these two go head to head to fight for the dominance. In a different type of story called Bless the beast's and children the evil is the outside world and the good as they see it is them.

So in most stories the struggle between good and evil is all out but not in all stories but the one's with it involve the reader more.

Anchor Level 2–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens, stating that <i>through out book's and literiture there has alway's been the fight between good and evil and the use of the good or bad makes the story more appealing to the Reader</i>. The response makes superficial connections between the criteria and the chosen texts, <i>Lord of the Flies</i> and <i>Bless the Beasts and Children</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Is incomplete, hinting at ideas in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> (<i>these to go head to head to fight for dominice</i>). The response is largely undeveloped in <i>Bless the Beasts and Children</i>. The response alludes to symbolism in both <i>Lord of the Flies</i> (<i>Ralph who portray's good and Jack who is evil</i>) and <i>Bless the Beasts and Children</i> (<i>the evil is the out side world ad the good as they see it is them</i>), but does not develop these comments.</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus (<i>In most book's yes there is a good or evil</i>). The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, but includes information about both books in just three sentences. The conclusion reiterates the idea that good and evil in a story <i>involve the Reader more</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is imprecise (<i>like all good has alway's triumphed over evil and So In most stories the struggle between good and evil is allot but not in all stories</i>). The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>literiture</i> and <i>dominice</i>), punctuation (<i>alway's, one's, beast's</i>), and usage that make comprehension difficult.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in meaning and organization.</p>	

In the literature Romeo and Juliet by William Shakespeare is between good and evil because its between the capulet and the montague.

I agree that this literature is a good example of good and evil.

Romeo is a montague and Juliet is a capulet. the montagues were evil but the capulet were good. Romeo and Juliet fall in love but the hatred between the two would keep them apart. they get married in secret but because of good and evil it again keep them apart until they killed each other to be together to stop the hate between good and evil.

Another form of literature is Buffy the Vampire Slayer. the slayer is good but the vampires are evil. in order to stop the spread of evil the slayer has to kill the vampires. theirs only one slayer that is until she dies than another slayer will take her spot.

Anchor Level 2–B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides an incomplete interpretation of the critical lens, asserting that <i>this literature [Romeo and Juliet] is a good example of good and evil</i>. The response alludes to the critical lens, generalizing about the good and evil forces present in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> and <i>Buffy, the Vampire Slayer</i>, but does not use the critical lens to analyze the chosen texts.</p>
Development	<p>Is largely undeveloped, with references to the texts limited to vague or unjustified statements about good and evil in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>the motifs were evil but the capulates were good and they killed each other to be together to stop the hate between good and evil</i>), and repetitive references to plot in <i>Buffy, the Vampire Slayer</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on the good and evil present in each work. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure of three paragraphs, although no specific introduction or conclusion are evident. The use of <i>another</i> is the only evidence of transition between paragraphs.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is imprecise (<i>Romeo and Juliet fall in love but the hatred between the two would keep them apart and Another form of literature is buffy the Vampire Slayer</i>). The response relies on the coordinating conjunction <i>but</i> to connect sentences, revealing little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling, usage, and punctuation that make comprehension difficult (<i>theirs only one slayer that is until she dies than another slayer will take her spot</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in organization.</p>	

After reading many works of literature I agree that "all conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, and a struggle between good + evil."

The first work of literature is the book *The Lord of the Flies* by ~~Jack~~. It is a story about a group of adolescent boys who get stuck on an island after their plane has crashed. The conflict begins between each other when they try to make up rules to abide on the island. Two factions are formed, one with Jack and one with Robert. They begin conflicting with each other which created mass chaos.

Many die ~~and~~ due to the conflict in the second story that shows all conflicts are in their simplest form is ~~the~~ *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. "That's the bottom line."

written by Will Shakespeare. The conflict is between Macbeth and Banquo on who will take over the kingdom. Many conflicts arise and Macbeth takes the throne.

Anchor Level 2-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a confused interpretation of the critical lens by first misquoting it (<i>and a struggle between good + evil</i>), and then, by using a clause that reveals a misunderstanding of the lens (<i>that shows all conflicts are in there simplest form</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the critical lens and the chosen texts, <i>Lord of the Flies</i> and <i>Macbeth</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Is largely undeveloped, briefly listing plot elements from both texts but not elaborating on the sources or nature of the conflicts between the <i>two factions</i> of boys or between <i>Macbeth</i> and <i>Banquo</i>. After the introductory sentence, the response makes no reference to the struggle between good and evil, and contains an irrelevant and unjustified comment ("<i>That's the bottom Line</i>") in the middle of a sentence.</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on conflict, but lacks consistent organization. The response mixes cause and effect (<i>The conflict begins, Two factions are formed, They begin conflicting</i>) and chronological sequence (<i>The conflict is between Macbeth and Banquo, Macbeth takes the throwne</i>). The absence of a conclusion further weakens coherence.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is imprecise (<i>who get stuck, due to the conflicting, make up rules to abide on the island</i>). The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect (<i>They begin conflicting with each which creates mass ciaos</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control with errors in spelling (<i>there for their, ciaos, Will Shakespere</i>), usage (<i>to abide on and on who</i>), and grammar (<i>One with Jack and one with Robert</i>), which occasionally hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in meaning and conventions.</p>	

Anchor Paper – Part B—Level 1 – A

In my opinion of the critical lens is that there is good literature and Bad literature. I do agree with that quote.

I have read one book called the West Side Story, In which my opinion is a good work of literature, Among other books I've read in the past who's work of literature hasn't been that great

Anchor Level 1-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides a confused interpretation of the critical lens (<i>In my opinion of the critical lens is that there is good literature and Bad literature</i>). The response reflects minimal analysis of one text, <i>West Side Story</i> .
Development	Is minimal. The response contains one vague reference to <i>West Side Story</i> (<i>a good work of literature</i>), but there is no evidence of development.
Organization	Lacks an appropriate focus, due in part to the confused interpretation of the critical lens but suggests some organization. After agreeing that <i>there is good literature and Bad literature</i> , the response gives an example of good literature and alludes to unnamed works that exemplify bad literature.
Language Use	Is minimal, often incoherent (<i>In which my opinion is a good work of literature, among other books I've read in the past who's work of literature hasn't been that great</i>).
Conventions	Is minimal, making assessment of the conventions unreliable.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1, although it is somewhat stronger in meaning and organization.	

Anchor Paper – Part B—Level 1 – B

I don't think that all conflicts in literature are, even in its simplest form, just a struggle between good and evil. It probably is most of the time, especially if you broke the story down into its smallest parts.

In most stories though, the conflict is usually between people. If a conflict is between people that doesn't mean one of them has to be good and one of them has to be evil. They can both be wrong and at fault, and both of them can be the good one. There doesn't even have to be an evil person in the story, everyone can be good.

Anchor Level 1-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides an incomplete interpretation of the critical lens (if you broke the story down into its smallest parts); then vacillates between agreement and disagreement with the statements (I dont think, It probably is most of the time and the conflict is usually between people). The response reflects no analysis of specific texts.
Development	Is minimal, with no reference to specific texts to support the idea that <i>conflict ... doesn't mean one of them has to be good and one of them has to be evil</i>). The response suggests alternative patterns of conflict (<i>They can both be wrong ... and both of them can be the good one</i>), but these ideas are not developed.
Organization	Suggests a focus on the idea that conflict between people does not necessarily entail a struggle between good and evil, but without specific textual evidence, organization is lacking.
Language Use	Relies on basic vocabulary that is often repetitious. The response makes some attempt to vary sentence structure, but its minimal length makes analysis unreliable.
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional oversights in proofreading (omitted <i>e</i> in <i>between</i> and <i>on for one</i>), errors in agreement (<i>conflicts ... its</i>) and punctuation resulting in a run-on sentence and a sentence fragment. These errors hinder comprehension somewhat.
Conclusion: Although the response fits criteria for Levels 1, 2, and 3, it remains at Level 1 because it makes no reference to specific texts.	

I disagree with the statement that all conflict in literature is simply a struggle between good and evil. Although this theme is present in many works of literature, the actual source causing the conflict can be a variety of things. Two works supporting my theory are the *Odyssey* of Homer and *Oedipus Rex* by Sophocles. It is fate and destiny that are the source of conflict and the struggle between good and evil stems from there.

In *Oedipus Rex*, ~~destiny~~^{fate} plays a major role in the actions of characters through out the story. Conflicts arise ~~rather~~ between different people at times, but they are a direct result of their fate, not their good or evil nature. This theme is illustrated through the title character Oedipus. He had a pre-determined destiny that was prophesied and relayed to him. When he found out about it, he did everything in his power to avoid it and in doing so fulfilled the prophecy. *Oedipus Rex* also shows that conflict can arise from a variety of other sources, because the story is full of conflict, but lacks a major underlying evil force. These struggles can be the result of things like ignorance of truth or perseverance.

The *Odyssey* of Homer also supports my theory because of the fact that despite the presence of many good and evil faces, many of the conflicts are not a result of a struggle between them. Odysseus' main concern is going home after a war but destiny keeps him from accomplishing this. He encounters faces of good and evil along the way, but no matter what he does nobody can help him in his journey. The gods in the story may have their own wishes concerning Odysseus' success, but there is never a confrontation between them that leads to conflict.

"All conflict in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." I disagree because not all literature is in its simplest form and is about a struggle between good and evil. For example, The Lottery and Marcus Garvey by Mary Laylor.

In the Lottery, the ^{annually} people of the town have a lottery. No ordinary lottery. Every family participates. And if the family is chosen from the lottery, then another draw takes place, but this time between the family members and who ever gets chosen is stoned to death.

In Marcus Garvey by Mary Laylor, it's about politics. Marcus Garvey, A Nationalist leader, fought for Blacks rights in America and all over the world and encouraged them to go back to Africa our homeland. Marcus Garvey devoted his whole life to this, even though he didn't accomplish everything he wanted too, he set the pace for it, and so many people followed in his foot steps.

And so, all conflicts in literature are not in its simplest form, and is not always about a struggle between good and evil.

"All conflicts in literature is, in its simplest form, a struggle between good and evil." This statement is saying that in most written works the good forces are battling the evil forces. I believe this statement to be true. In the novels *Roots*, by E.L. Doctorow, and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, written by Mark Twain, the theme of good fighting evil, is present in both.

In the novel *Roots*, the characters representing the "good side," are those in favor of black freedom. On the opposite side, the characters representing the "evil side," are those opposed to black freedom. The entire novel is about these two foes clashing because of their beliefs.

When the character, Sore, goes to see the president to ask for help, she is beaten to death. This occurs because she is distrusted simply because she is black. The author does this to give the rest of the characters a stronger motive to fight. He develops their characters to harsher, more determined people.

Now the clash between good and evil is very evident.

In the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the character Huck Finn is the "good" struggling against evil. The "evil" would be the way he was raised with his father. The novel is about Huck's development as his own person. The author uses the conflict of Huck having to choose between his father and what he thinks is right, to develop Huck's character.

When Huck decided that he was going to help a runaway slave, Jim, escape to freedom, he already

make a choice between the good side and evil side. Each time Huck had to protect Jim from something, he was battling with his upbringing. The struggle between good and evil was internal for Huck.

The battle between good and evil was shown in two very different ways in the novels *Regime* and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. The struggle between good and evil is always present in our lives in different forms every day.

The critical lens is right. There's always a struggle between good and evil (good guy/bad guy). In "To Kill A Mockingbird" you have The Finches "good" and the town folk "bad". No matter what story, there is conflict. In "A Clockwork Orange" it's Alex vs. the world. Although it's reversed. The narrator is the "bad" force. Plain and simple, all literature is a struggle between good and Evil.

The critical lens is saying that every novel or book made is a dispute between the good side and the bad side of things. I would agree with this because if there was no conflict between good and evil then the book wouldn't be a book. There always has to be good and bad point of view in books.

In Romeo and Juliet by Shakespeare, there was evil between the Montagues and Capulets. They would have sword fights and kill each other. Romeo tried to stop the fighting when he fell in love with Juliet. The struggle between the good and evil was over when Romeo and Juliet died. In a way the evil was won but the Capulet helped each other in the end and it turned out good.

In To Kill a Mockingbird by Harper Lee there is a sign of conflict between good and evil. Tom Robinson was accused of raping Mayella Ewell. Mayella had died and they all went to court. Everyone went against Tom cause he was black. Tom's lawyer, Atticus, tried to bring out the good of all attitudes by saying that he was innocent and it was a lie. Yet, racism overpowered the good and Tom was eventually shot.

In every book I read, I can almost find a conflict between good and evil. It is in every book and basically never avoided. The conflict between good and evil makes a book good.

Practice Paper A—Score Level 5

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a thoughtful interpretation of the critical lens, establishing the idea that while the struggle between good and evil <i>is present in many works of literature</i>, it is not always the source of conflict. The response asserts that in <i>Oedipus Rex</i> and <i>The Odyssey</i>, <i>it is fate and destiny that are the root of conflict</i> and that a struggle between good and evil <i>stems from there</i>. The response uses this idea to analyze the chosen texts.</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others, supplying a more complete and accurate discussion of <i>Oedipus Rex</i> than of <i>The Odyssey</i>. The response focuses on the common themes in each work as shown through the characters of Oedipus and Odysseus. Few details are given to demonstrate that <i>Oedipus Rex</i> is <i>full of conflict</i> or that <i>Odysseus' main concern is going home after a war</i>; the discussion of <i>The Odyssey</i> also contains plot inaccuracies.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus established by the critical lens, following a logical discussion of the role of fate and destiny in contrast to the role of good and evil in both texts. The response uses transitions (<i>Although, when, also</i>) as well as transitional phrases and clauses (<i>it is fate and destiny that; This theme is illustrated; but no matter what he does</i>) to sequence ideas, although the response has no formal conclusion.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally fluent and original (<i>despite the presence of many good and evil forces, many of the conflicts are not a result of a struggle between them</i>) but occasionally contains redundancy (<i>predetermined destiny and ignorance of truth</i>). The response uses a variety of compound and complex sentences to control rhythm and pacing.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>variety and prephesy</i>), and punctuation (<i>the title character Oedipus</i>) when using sophisticated language.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in development and organization.</p>	

Practice Paper B—Score Level 3

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a confused interpretation of the critical lens, disagreeing with it, <i>because not all literature is in its simplest form and is about a struggle between good and evil.</i> The response makes only superficial connections between the lens and <i>Marcus Garvey</i>, implying conflict (<i>fought for Blacks rights</i>), but makes no reference to conflict in <i>The Lottery</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, relying primarily on plot summary in the references to <i>The Lottery</i> (<i>who ever gets chosen is stoned to death</i>) and on plot summary and evaluation of Garvey's ideas in the discussion of <i>Marcus Garvey</i> (<i>even though he didn't accomplish everything he wanted too; he set the pace for it, and so many people followed in his foot steps</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Establishes, but fails to maintain, a focus on how the chosen works illustrate a disagreement with the critical lens. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, with an introductory paragraph, separate discussions of two works, and a conclusion, that reiterates disagreement with the critical lens.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience. The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure for effect, but with uneven success (<i>And so all conflicts in literature are not in its simplest form, and is not always about ... good and evil</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting errors in usage (<i>the people ... annually has; its about politics; he wanted too</i>) and punctuation (<i>for Blacks rights</i>) which do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions and weaker in meaning.</p>	

Practice Paper C—Score Level 4

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, stating that <i>in most written works the good forces are battling the evil forces</i>. The response makes clear connections between <i>the theme of good fighting evil</i> and characters' struggles with these forces (racism and negative parental influence in <i>The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</i> and racism in <i>Ragtime</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response generalizes that <i>the entire novel [Ragtime] is about the clash between those favoring and those opposing black freedom</i>, but uses one incident to elaborate this idea. Huckleberry Finn's upbringing and relationship to Jim are more fully examined. In each work, evidence is presented using theme and characterization as the focal points.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains an appropriate focus on characters battling good and evil. Although use of transitions is limited, the response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas by discussing the forces of good and evil present in each work, the characters' reactions to good and evil, and the results of their struggles.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language with some awareness of audience (<i>The struggle between good and evil is always present in our lives</i>). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence length (<i>The author does this to give the rest of the characters a stronger motive to fight.</i>)</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>batteling, simply, struggeling</i>) and punctuation (<i>Hucks developement and good fighting evil, is present</i>). These errors do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.</p>	

Practice Paper D–Score Level 2

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens as <i>a struggle between good and evil (good guy/bad guy)</i>. The response makes superficial connections between the critical lens and the chosen texts, <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> and <i>A Clockwork Orange</i>, identifying the “good” and “bad” forces in each work.</p>
Development	<p>Is largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas but providing only a one-sentence thematic statement for each work (<i>The Finches</i> “good” and <i>the town folk</i> “bad” and <i>Alex vs. the world</i>). Although, the response alludes to the narrator in <i>A Clockwork Orange</i>, this idea is unelaborated.</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus (<i>No matter what story, there is conflict</i>) and some organization, but because of the response’s brevity, maintains neither.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary, with some language that is inappropriately colloquial (<i>you have The Finches</i>). Attempts to vary sentence structure, are largely unsuccessful. For example, an attempt to identify good and evil forces in both sentences results in awkwardness (<i>and the town folk “bad”</i>). However, the brevity of the response makes assessment unreliable.</p>
Conventions	<p>Although the response exhibits occasional errors in punctuation that do not hinder comprehension, its brevity makes assessment unreliable.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in meaning and weaker in language use and conventions.</p>	

Practice Paper E–Score Level 3

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens, stating <i>that every novel or book made is a disupute between the good side and the bad side of things</i>. The response agrees with the critical lens and asserts that a book requires conflict or it <i>wouldn't be a book</i>. Superficial connections are made between the criteria and the chosen texts, <i>Romeo and Juliet (In a way the evil won but the families befriended each other in the end and it turned out good)</i> and <i>To Kill a Mockingbird (racism overpowered the good and Tom was eventually shot)</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, relying primarily on plot summary in both <i>Romeo and Juliet (Their was evil between the Montagues and Capulets. The would have sword fights and kill each other)</i> and <i>To Kill a Mockingbird (Mayella had lied and they all went to court. Everybody went against Tom cause he was black)</i>. The response mentions <i>their always has to be good and bad point of views in books</i>, but offers no elaboration of literary elements other than conflict.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains an appropriate focus on the <i>conflict between good and evil</i>. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, with separate paragraphs for each work and reference to the criteria for analysis in each discussion. The concluding paragraph reiterates previously stated ideas, but then introduces a new topic, the idea that <i>conflict makes a book good</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary, occasionally using language that is imprecise (<i>In every book I read, I can almost find a conflict between good and evil. It is in every book and basically never avoided</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>disupute</i>, and <i>cituation</i>) and usage (<i>Their always has</i> and <i>The would have</i>) that hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and weaker in language.</p>	

Regents Comprehensive Examination in English—June 2001

Chart for Determining the Final Examination Score (Use for June 2001 examination only.)

To determine the student's final examination score, locate the student's total essay score across the top of the chart and the student's total multiple-choice score down the side of the chart. The point where those two scores intersect is the student's final examination score. For example, a student receiving a total essay score of 18 and a total multiple-choice score of 22 would receive a final examination score of 83.

**Total
Essay**

Score →	Total Multiple-Choice Score																									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
0	0	3	6	9	12	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	
1	2	5	8	11	14	17	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	
2	3	6	9	12	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	
3	5	8	11	14	17	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	
4	6	9	12	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	
5	8	11	14	17	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	
6	9	12	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	
7	11	14	17	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	
8	12	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	
9	14	17	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	
10	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	
11	17	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	
12	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	
13	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	86	
14	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	87	
15	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	86	88	
16	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	87	90	
17	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	86	88	91	
18	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	87	90	92	
19	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	86	88	91	93	
20	31	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	87	90	92	94	
21	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	86	88	91	93	95	
22	34	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	87	90	92	94	96	
23	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	86	88	91	93	95	97	
24	37	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	87	90	92	94	96	98	
25	38	41	44	47	50	53	55	58	61	64	66	69	72	74	77	79	81	84	86	88	91	93	95	97	99	
26	40	43	46	48	51	54	57	60	62	65	68	70	73	75	78	80	83	85	87	90	92	94	96	98	100	