



SCHOLAR COACH, INC.

AP ENGLISH LANGUAGE · FREE RESOURCE

AP English Language and Composition — Practice Exam 4: Answer Key, Explanations & Sample Essays

Contents

1. Section I answer key
2. Section I explanations (Questions 1–45)
3. Question 1 (Synthesis): rubric, scoring notes, and scored samples
4. Question 2 (Rhetorical Analysis): rubric, scoring notes, and scored samples
5. Question 3 (Argument): rubric, scoring notes, and scored samples
6. How to score yourself

1. Section I Answer Key

Difficulty: E = easy (about 70% or more of students expected to answer correctly), M = medium, H = hard (fewer than about 40%).

Q#	ANSWER	SKILL	PASSAGE	DIFFICULTY
1	C	1.A	1 (Swift)	E
2	A	7.A	1	M
3	D	3.B	1	M
4	B	1.B	1	M
5	A	3.C	1	E
6	D	5.C	1	H
7	B	7.A	1	H
8	C	5.A	1	M

Q#	ANSWER	SKILL	PASSAGE	DIFFICULTY
9	A	7.C	1	H
10	D	3.A	1	M
11	B	7.B	1	H
12	C	5.B	1	E
13	D	5.B	2 (Letters)	E
14	A	3.B	2	M
15	B	3.C	2	M
16	C	1.B	2	M
17	A	7.A	2	M
18	D	5.C	2	M
19	C	5.A	2	H
20	B	3.A	2	M
21	D	5.B	2	E
22	A	3.C	2	M
23	C	1.A	2	E
24	B	1.A	2	H
25	A	8.B	3 (Gap year)	M
26	C	4.B	3	M
27	B	4.A	3	E
28	D	6.A	3	M
29	B	6.B	3	M
30	A	4.C	3	H
31	C	2.A	3	M
32	D	8.A	3	E
33	B	2.A	4 (Museums)	H
34	A	4.A	4	E
35	D	8.B	4	H
36	C	6.C	4	M
37	A	4.C	4	M

Q#	ANSWER	SKILL	PASSAGE	DIFFICULTY
38	D	2.B	4	M
39	B	6.A	4	H
40	C	8.C	4	M
41	D	2.A	5 (Food deserts)	E
42	A	2.B	5	M
43	C	4.A	5	E
44	B	6.B	5	E
45	D	8.A	5	E

Balance check. Answer letters: A = 11, B = 11, C = 11, D = 12. No letter appears more than once in a row.

Skill coverage. 1.A (3), 1.B (2); 2.A (3), 2.B (2); 3.A (2), 3.B (2), 3.C (3); 4.A (3), 4.B (1), 4.C (2); 5.A (2), 5.B (3), 5.C (2); 6.A (2), 6.B (2), 6.C (1); 7.A (3), 7.B (1), 7.C (1); 8.A (2), 8.B (2), 8.C (1). By category: 1 = 5, 2 = 5, 3 = 7, 4 = 6, 5 = 7, 6 = 5, 7 = 5, 8 = 5.

2. Section I Explanations

Passage 1 (Swift) — Questions 1–12

Question 1. Answer: C. [Skill 1.A — identify the exigence of a rhetorical situation.] The opening paragraph paints a scene every Dublin reader would recognize: beggar women with trailing children, young people turning thieves or emigrating. By calling it “a melancholy object” and tracing its consequences, the speaker creates the problem to which his “proposal” will be offered as the solution. That is what exigence means: the pressing situation that calls for a response. (A) is wrong because the speaker says the mothers are “forced” to beg (line 6), not that they are idle; the blame falls on circumstances. (B) is wrong because the speaker does not urge readers to give more; he proposes a systemic remedy. (D) is wrong because emigration and foreign service are listed as symptoms of poverty (lines 7–9), not identified as its chief cause.

Question 2. Answer: A. [Skill 7.A — word choice and tone.] “Melancholy object” is a conventional phrase of sympathetic social observation. The speaker begins in the voice of a humane, serious commentator, which sets up the later reversal when the same voice announces the proposal. (B) is wrong because nothing in the opening suggests personal loss; the speaker observes the scene as a passerby. (C) is wrong because “melancholy” expresses sorrow, not disgust, and the speaker blames the situation, not the beggars. (D) is wrong because the irony of the passage is not yet visible in the first sentence; amusement would misread the initial stance. Students who know the pamphlet is satire may be tempted by (D), but the question asks what stance the speaker “initially adopts.”

Question 3. Answer: D. [Skill 3.B — the thesis and any indication of the argument’s structure.] In lines 13–16 the speaker says that whoever finds “a fair, cheap, and easy method” of making the children useful deserves a statue. Those three criteria tell the reader that the proposal that follows will be advanced as meeting them. (A) is

wrong because there is no comparison between town and country children. (B) is wrong because the refutation of other projectors appears later (lines 22–24) and is not signaled in the second paragraph. (C) is wrong because the paragraph mentions fathers only in passing and makes no moral appeal to them.

Question 4. Answer: B. [Skill 1.B — how an argument reflects an audience's values.] Offering a statue as the reward for a public servant appeals to readers who admire practical public benefit and its public honors, the kind of audience that read and wrote economic “projects.” (A) is wrong because the sentence invites a scheme and does not flatter distrust of schemes. (C) is wrong because the statue is mentioned hypothetically (“whoever could find out”), not as the speaker’s ambition; this is a “misread the speaker” trap. (D) is wrong because the sentence says nothing about the poor being responsible for their poverty.

Question 5. Answer: A. [Skill 3.C — how claims are qualified or extended.] The speaker says his intention is “very far from being confined” to the children of professed beggars and will “take in” all infants born of parents “as little able to support them” (lines 17–21). That widens the scope. (B) is wrong because the age limit is one year, not a city limit. (C) is wrong because the speaker concedes nothing about beggars who can support their children. (D) is wrong because no objection from charitable readers is acknowledged in these lines.

Question 6. Answer: D. [Skill 5.C — methods of development, here statistical reasoning.] The long sequence of subtractions (from one and a half million souls to 120,000 poor births) imitates the form of an economic tract. The tone of exactness is the point: a monstrous suggestion made to sound like arithmetic. (A) is wrong because the speaker claims others made computational errors but never specifies them. (B) is wrong because miscarriages are subtracted coldly, with no compassion. (C) is wrong because the figures establish the number of poor births annually, not a falling population. This is one of the hardest items on the exam because (A) restates what the speaker says he is doing (lines 22–24) rather than what the passage actually does.

Question 7. Answer: B. [Skill 7.A — diction and its effects.] “Dam” is the word for an animal mother and “breeders” a term for livestock. By applying them to women, the speaker places the poor in the category of animals, which prepares the reader for the later treatment of their children as food and merchandise. (A) is wrong because the effect is the opposite of tender. (C) is wrong because “breeders” does not move the register to a medical one; it moves it to an agricultural one. (D) is wrong because the words do not show familiarity with farming; they show the speaker’s willingness to see people as stock.

Question 8. Answer: C. [Skill 5.A — line of reasoning.] Between lines 22 and 64 the speaker argues that children cannot be supported past a year (lines 25–32), cannot be put to work in “handicraft or agriculture” or at theft before six (lines 49–58), and cannot be sold for profit before twelve (lines 59–64). The unstated conclusion is that some new use must be found. (A) is wrong because emigration appears in the first paragraph as a symptom, not here as a remedy. (B) is wrong because the speaker’s argument never rests on a comparison of compassion. (D) is wrong because the passage contemplates relief for the parish as a goal of the plan, not shifting the cost onto it.

Question 9. Answer: A. [Skill 7.C — how mechanics and punctuation contribute to meaning.] The exclamations are a display of conventional feeling in the middle of the speaker’s cold computation. The shock comes from the gap between the language of moral sensibility (“alas!”) and the logic that follows. (B) is wrong because no digression on crime appears. (C) is wrong because the speaker does not abandon the scheme for a sincere plea; he goes on to say that his scheme will “prevent” the practice. (D) is wrong because the exclamations are directed at the practice, not at the women, whom the speaker pities (“innocent babes”). The choice of the word “display” in (A) matters: the feeling is performed by the persona.

Question 10. Answer: D. [Skill 3.A — evidence and claims.] The gentleman in Cavan testifies that children seldom manage to steal “under the age of six,” and the merchants testify that a child under twelve is “no salable commodity.” Together they establish that poor children can be neither employed in theft nor sold before they are old enough to yield a profit. (A) is wrong because it reads “honest” into the Cavan testimony; the speaker means they are poor thieves. (B) is wrong because the merchants are said to have given their opinion about price, not about welfare. (C) is wrong because trade with the colonies is not discussed.

Question 11. Answer: B. [Skill 7.B — the placement of modifiers and clauses.] The sentence begins with an attribution (“I have been assured by a very knowing American”), adds modifiers that sound like a farmer’s recommendation (“young healthy child well nursed”), and then reaches “food” after three adjectives of approval. The list of cooking methods follows. By holding the noun back until the reasonable-sounding qualifiers are in place, Swift lets the shock land in a calm voice. (A) is wrong because the American’s credentials are a single phrase and not the effect of the structure. (C) is wrong because there is no hesitation; the sentence builds with confidence. (D) is wrong because the cookbook echo makes the tone more disturbing, not lighter.

Question 12. Answer: C. [Skill 5.B — organization and coherence.] The short paragraph at lines 65–66 closes the preliminaries and announces that the proposal itself will follow, heightening anticipation. (A) is wrong because the paragraph does not summarize anything. (B) is wrong because the phrase “not be liable to the least objection” is confidence, not concession. (D) is wrong because the American’s testimony comes after this paragraph and is not called “principal evidence.”

Passage 2 (Letters) — Questions 13–24

Question 13. Answer: D. [Skill 5.B — how the organization of a text creates unity.] The first paragraph is domestic: the worn fold of the letter, the quiet house, the child studying Latin. It builds a warm and private relationship before the second paragraph turns to a public question. (A) is wrong because the writer says she will not scold him. (B) is wrong because the children’s education is mentioned only in passing. (C) is wrong because the writer expresses no criticism of the Congress here; she says she would “rather you were useful there than idle here.”

Question 14. Answer: A. [Skill 3.B — the central claim.] Her request is stated in lines 16–19: the laws that give a husband the whole of his wife’s property and person should not be “copied out of the old statute book.” (B) is wrong because she says explicitly, “I do not ask for the vote.” (C) is wrong because she welcomes independence. (D) is wrong because she accuses the law of arming husbands with power, not husbands of being inherently cruel; she grants that “men of sense do not need such power.”

Question 15. Answer: B. [Skill 3.C — qualification of a claim.] By disclaiming the vote, the writer limits her request to something she can present as moderate and reachable. (A) is wrong because the tone is restrained, not resentful. (C) is wrong because she does not concede unfitness; she concedes the delegates’ likely reaction. (D) is wrong because property law is introduced in the next sentence, not by this one.

Question 16. Answer: C. [Skill 1.B — understanding of the audience’s beliefs.] She quotes her husband’s own principle that “all men would be tyrants if they could” and asks why the law should then give them tyranny’s instruments. The argument works because it uses his belief against the laws he might otherwise accept. (A) is wrong because the line is not a threat of rebellion; that threat comes later. (B) is wrong because it does not flatter his reputation. (D) is wrong because children are not mentioned in the sentence.

Question 17. Answer: A. [Skill 7.A — comparisons.] To say that the laws were “copied out . . . as if they were as natural as the tides” is to warn against mistaking custom for nature. The simile suggests that unjust law is man-made and therefore changeable. (B) is wrong because the sentence is about the old statute book, not the future. (C) is wrong because the ocean is a figure, not a subject. (D) is wrong because the reference to the tides is not autobiographical.

Question 18. Answer: D. [Skill 5.C — methods of development.] “I know what you will say” is the anticipation of an objection (the war has larger matters), and “a fault built into the foundation is not easily mended after the roof is on” is the analogy that answers it. (A) is wrong because no personal experience of injustice is narrated. (B) is wrong because no legal authority is cited. (C) is wrong because no term is defined.

Question 19. Answer: C. [Skill 5.A — line of reasoning and its support for the larger point.] The husband lists apprentices, scholars, and children as groups that have grown insolent; then he says her letter is the first sign that a “tribe more numerous” has joined them. The list establishes a pattern and the wife is the joking climax. (A) is wrong because he does not call the quarrel unjustified. (B) is wrong because the tone is playful, not alarmed. (D) is wrong because he does not claim women inspired the others. This item is hard because (B) answers a different question: the passage literally describes disorder, but the function of the catalog is comic buildup.

Question 20. Answer: B. [Skill 3.A — claims and the evidence offered for them.] The remark that “the husband wore the title of master and the wife held the keys” supports his claim that the masculine systems are “scarcely more than a theory in practice” (lines 43–45). In other words, men’s legal power is largely nominal in households. (A) is wrong because he does not claim women are content. (C) is wrong because it states the opposite of his evidence. (D) is wrong because he argues for retaining the laws, not repealing them.

Question 21. Answer: D. [Skill 5.B — shifts in organization.] Before this sentence the husband has been bantering (the “despotism of the petticoat,” Washington facing the British fleet). With “I will be serious with you for one paragraph” he drops the joke and explains the actual obstacle. (A) is wrong because the audience stays his wife. (B) is wrong because both halves are about politics. (C) is wrong because he is not apologizing; he is explaining.

Question 22. Answer: A. [Skill 3.C — how claims are qualified.] He agrees with her principle but argues that a frame of government is drawn up by many hands and thirteen jealous colonies, so a motion about husband and wife is impractical for now. (B) is wrong because he affirms the “fresh foundation.” (C) is wrong because he never defends the law as just. (D) is wrong because he promises no future session; he defers the matter to “our children.”

Question 23. Answer: C. [Skill 1.A — components of the rhetorical situation.] His wife had described Johnny reading Latin “with great seriousness and small understanding” (lines 7–8). His remark that Cicero “read with small understanding” as a boy answers her with reassurance as a parent. (A) is wrong because the sentence is not about her political thought. (B) is wrong because the war is not mentioned in her letter as an anxiety. (D) is wrong because her wish for his return is not the referent.

Question 24. Answer: B. [Skill 1.A — message, purpose, and context across a text.] The wife’s serious request receives a joke, but the husband’s closing admits that the law is a “fault,” that the foundation is being laid now, and that the correction will come from “our children,” with an eye to “our daughter.” (A) is wrong because the wife does not capitulate within the exchange. (C) is wrong because the husband, after the joke, answers seriously. (D) is wrong because the exchange is private and affectionate, not an official petition and rejection. This item is hard because (A) and (C) each describe one half of the husband’s letter.

Passage 3 (Writing: gap year) — Questions 25–32

Question 25. Answer: A. [Skill 8.B — sentences that clearly convey ideas.] The two questions are contrasted: millions ask one, fewer ask the other. “But” is the coordinating conjunction of contrast, and “ask” in parallel keeps the structure clean. (B) is wrong because “and” signals addition, not contrast. (C) is wrong because the sentence is ungrammatical and lacks a main clause for its first part. (D) is wrong because “so” creates a false cause-and-effect: the fact that millions ask about colleges does not cause fewer to ask the other.

Question 26. Answer: C. [Skill 4.B — thesis that requires proof and previews structure.] Choice C names the position (“more high school graduates should take a gap year”) and previews the three reasons developed in paragraph 2: recovery from burnout, choosing a major, and better preparation. (A) is wrong because it is vague and hedged (“worth thinking about”). (B) is wrong because it is a statement of fact that needs no defense. (D) is wrong because “always” makes the claim indefensible and the draft contains no support for it.

Question 27. Answer: B. [Skill 4.A — developing a paragraph with a claim and supporting evidence.] Sentence 8 (“Gap years are also fun”) does not advance the paragraph’s claim about readiness and cost, and its casual tone clashes with the formal register of the draft. (A) is wrong because lightness is not the paragraph’s need and a mismatch of tone weakens credibility. (C) is wrong because “fun” is not a benefit supported by evidence. (D) is wrong because the sentence does not repeat sentence 5, so the reason cited is false.

Question 28. Answer: D. [Skill 6.A — commentary that explains the line of reasoning.] Sentence 5 claims a gap year helps students decide what to study. Sentence 6 says students without that chance often switch majors at great cost. Choice D connects the two: time spent exploring is a small cost that prevents a large one. (A) is wrong because it adds a fact (tuition) without commentary. (B) is wrong because it restates sentence 6. (C) is wrong because it introduces a counterexample that undercuts the point rather than explaining it.

Question 29. Answer: B. [Skill 6.B — transitional elements.] Sentence 9 begins a paragraph that moves from benefits to criticism. Choice B acknowledges the preceding paragraph (“These benefits”) and signals the pivot (“have not persuaded everyone, however”). (A) is wrong because “Meanwhile” signals simultaneity, not contrast. (C) is wrong because “In addition” signals that the critics are another benefit. (D) is wrong because it is wordy and offers no logical connection to the previous paragraph.

Question 30. Answer: A. [Skill 4.C — qualifying a claim.] Choice A answers the concern with specific, qualified evidence: programs that require college acceptance before deferral report that nearly all participants enroll. It limits its scope to a type of program and uses the modifier “nearly all.” (B) is wrong because “almost every student who has ever taken a gap year” is still an overgeneralization the draft cannot support. (C) is wrong because “always” and “myth” are absolute. (D) is wrong because “some students . . . do enroll” does not make the concern “unfounded.”

Question 31. Answer: C. [Skill 2.A — conclusions suited to purpose.] The best conclusion reinforces the thesis and leaves a final thought: a gap year is a different route, not an abandonment of the path. (A) is wrong because it retreats from the argument. (B) is wrong because it adds new information and does not conclude. (D) is wrong because it concedes that the dispute is unresolvable and weakens the thesis.

Question 32. Answer: D. [Skill 8.A — diction and tone.] The draft’s tone is formal. “Recover” and “determine which fields of study genuinely interest them” fit that register. (A), (B), and (C) retain slang or colloquialisms (“chill,” “what they are into,” “take a breather,” “kick back”).

Passage 4 (Writing: museums) — Questions 33–40

Question 33. Answer: B. [Skill 2.A — introductions that establish significance.] The sentence states what is at stake: whether the past is treated as property or shared heritage. That establishes why the claim matters beyond museums. (A) is wrong because visitor numbers are a fact with no bearing on the claim. (C) is wrong because it is vague and does not link to the claim. (D) is wrong because the age of museum collecting does not explain significance.

Question 34. Answer: A. [Skill 4.A — evidence supporting a claim.] The Benin bronzes example gives a specific instance in which return was combined with continued access through loans, which supports the claim that return need not mean neglect. (B) is wrong because enjoyment of museum visitors concerns a different claim. (C) is wrong because it restates the claim rather than supporting it. (D) is wrong because a personal anecdote about a mask in Paris does not bear on the claim.

Question 35. Answer: D. [Skill 8.B — combining sentences.] The first half concedes the point (sentence 5) and the second turns to the assumption behind it (sentence 6). A semicolon with “however” shows that relationship precisely. (A) is wrong because it is a comma splice. (B) is wrong because “although” creates a false contrast and “has some force and assumes” merges ideas that should be opposed. (C) is wrong because it creates a dangling construction (“assuming” has no logical subject) and loses the concession.

Question 36. Answer: C. [Skill 6.C — methods of development.] The flag analogy gives readers a familiar object whose meaning lies in what people do around it, which mirrors the mask. (A) is wrong because it is physical description, not comparison. (B) is wrong because it broadens the topic instead of developing the point. (D) is wrong because it is irrelevant to the point about community and meaning.

Question 37. Answer: A. [Skill 4.C — qualifying a claim.] Choice A narrows the claim to objects taken without consent. That makes it defensible without making it empty. (B) is wrong because it is more absolute, not less. (C) is wrong because it is so hedged that no position remains. (D) is wrong because it states a fact rather than a claim.

Question 38. Answer: D. [Skill 2.B — understanding an audience’s beliefs.] The skeptical audience of directors is addressed respectfully (“reasonably point out”) and accurately. (A) is dismissive. (B) is sycophantic and contradicts the writer’s own position. (C) is an ad hominem remark about the directors.

Question 39. Answer: B. [Skill 6.A — commentary that explains how evidence supports a claim.] The sentence explains that public access depends on a willingness to share, not ownership, which ties paragraph 3 to the thesis. (A) is wrong because it is a disconnected observation. (C) is wrong because it contradicts the thesis. (D) is wrong because it undermines the writer’s own proposal without answering the concern. This item is hard because (D) looks like a thoughtful concession; however, a concession that is not answered weakens rather than explains the argument.

Question 40. Answer: C. [Skill 8.C — punctuation for clarity.] The comma before “but” joins two independent clauses; the colon introduces the explanation (“they can borrow pieces back”). (A) is wrong because it creates a comma splice. (B) is wrong because the comma after “but” is unnecessary and incorrect. (D) is wrong because the extra commas disturb the structure and make the sentence nearly unreadable.

Passage 5 (Writing: food deserts) — Questions 41–45

Question 41. Answer: D. [Skill 2.A — introductions that engage the audience.] The scenario draws a general reader into the problem concretely. (A) is generic. (B) is off-topic. (C) announces the topic and does not engage.

Question 42. Answer: A. [Skill 2.B — address of an audience’s values.] Choice A acknowledges the officials’ good intentions (“well intended”) and states the limitation specifically. (B) is accusatory. (C) is insincere and incoherent (“deserve nothing but praise, even though they did not work”). (D) is vague and dismissive.

Question 43. Answer: C. [Skill 4.A — supporting a claim with specific evidence.] The garden example is concrete and shows that a garden reaches households far from supermarkets. (A) is generic history. (B) supports a different claim (mental health). (D) is a conclusion, not evidence.

Question 44. Answer: B. [Skill 6.B — transitions.] “Beyond the food they supply” moves from the idea of food to an additional benefit. (A) is wrong because “Nevertheless” signals contrast. (C) is wrong because the meeting places are not a result of the food. (D) is wrong because sentence 7 is not an example of sentence 6.

Question 45. Answer: D. [Skill 8.A — tone.] “Attempted to address” and “financial incentives” are formal and objective. (A), (B), and (C) are colloquial (“tossing cash,” “a bunch,” “taken a stab,” “shelling out”).

3. Question 1 (Synthesis): Voting Age for Local Elections

3.1 Rubric (6 points)

Each essay is scored on three rows: **A** Thesis (0–1), **B** Evidence and Commentary (0–4), **C** Sophistication (0–1). The wording below follows the structure of the published AP rubric and is paraphrased for this practice exam.

Row A — Thesis (0–1)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response does not present a defensible thesis. It may only restate the prompt, summarize the sources, list pros and cons without taking a position, or fail to respond to the prompt.
1	The response presents a defensible position on whether the voting age should be lowered to sixteen for local elections.

Decision rules. The thesis may be one or more sentences, anywhere in the response. It must take a position; an essay that says only “there are good arguments on both sides” earns 0. A conditional position (for example, “yes, if paired with civics instruction”) is defensible. A thesis earns the point even if the body of the essay does not support it. A statement of fact (“Some cities have lowered the voting age”) is not a thesis.

Row B — Evidence and Commentary (0–4)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response restates the thesis, repeats information from the prompt, or references fewer than two sources.
1	The response provides evidence from or references to at least two sources. Commentary, if any, merely summarizes the sources or restates the evidence; there is no explanation of how it supports an argument.

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
2	The response provides evidence from at least three sources. Commentary explains how some of the evidence relates to the argument, but no line of reasoning is established, or the line of reasoning is faulty.
3	The response provides specific evidence from at least three sources to support all claims in a line of reasoning. Commentary explains how some of the evidence supports the line of reasoning, but it may be uneven or leave some evidence unexplained.
4	The response provides specific evidence from at least three sources to support all claims in a line of reasoning. Commentary consistently explains how the evidence supports the line of reasoning.

Typical responses by score. - **1:** Paragraphs summarize sources in turn ("Source A says that Ashbury lowered the age. Source C says teenagers are immature"), or mention three sources in a vague bundle ("as seen in Sources A, B, and F") without specifics. - **2:** Names and uses three or more sources with some specifics, but organizes as pro and con, or uses each source to illustrate a separate point with no development from one claim to the next; or commentary is mostly "this shows that" followed by a restatement. - **3:** Develops a line of reasoning (for example, from why the vote matters, to why preparation matters, to what the evidence permits us to claim), supports each claim with specific evidence from three sources, but one or two pieces of evidence are dropped in without explanation. - **4:** The same, but each piece of evidence is tied back to the claim and the thesis; sources are put in conversation with each other (one qualifying, complicating, or extending another); no mechanical or grammatical errors interfere with communication.

Decision rules. Reading the table in Source D accurately counts as specific evidence; misreading it does not. Evidence must come from the sources, though it may be paraphrased. Responses may not earn the fourth point if errors in grammar or mechanics interfere with communication. A response that relies on one source heavily and mentions two others briefly may still reach 3 if the brief uses are specific.

Row C — Sophistication (0–1)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response does not demonstrate sophistication of thought or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.
1	The response demonstrates sophistication of thought and/or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.

The point can be earned in four ways: 1. **Nuance.** Crafting a nuanced argument by consistently identifying and exploring complexities or tensions across the sources. 2. **Broader context.** Articulating the implications or limitations of an argument by situating it within a broader context. 3. **Rhetorical choices.** Making rhetorical choices, such as a particular word choice or syntactic structure, that consistently strengthen the force and impact of the argument. 4. **Style.** Employing a style that is consistently vivid and persuasive.

What does not earn the point. Sweeping generalizations about “society” or “teenagers today” offered as context; a token concession (“Of course, some people disagree”) not developed; mentioning another view without exploring it; ornate or inflated language that does not serve the argument; a single sophisticated sentence in an otherwise ordinary essay. The sophistication must be part of the argument, sustained across the response.

3.2 Scoring notes specific to this prompt

What a defensible thesis looks like. Any thesis that takes a clear position on lowering the voting age to sixteen for local elections only. Examples: “Cities should lower the local voting age to sixteen because voting at a stable age builds a lasting habit”; “The voting age should remain eighteen because sixteen-year-olds lack the independence and knowledge for local decisions, and civic education is a better remedy”; “The age should be lowered, but only where the law requires civics preparation.” A thesis that says only “The voting age is a controversial issue with good arguments on both sides” earns 0. A thesis that extends the claim to state and national elections ignores the prompt, though readers may still credit it if the response is clearly about local elections.

What strong responses might argue. - *Habit formation.* Lowering the age helps build lifelong voters because first elections are easier at sixteen than at eighteen (Source B), supported by the high turnout of the youngest voters relative to ages 18–24 (Source D: 44% vs. 21% in Ashbury; 38% vs. 19% in Calder Falls). - *Representation.* Sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds are affected by decisions about schools, buses, and parks and pay sales tax (Sources A and E); excluding them is a failure of representation, which the cartoon dramatizes. - *Preparation matters more than age.* The lower-age cities also required civics units (Sources A and D), and the teacher in Source F says the preparation “is the whole point.” A strong essay may argue that the policy is justified only as a package. - *Maturity and independence concerns.* Pruitt (Source C) and Kessler (Source A) worry about family influence, tax burden, and mobility. A strong essay may argue that these concerns are real but better answered by preparation, or that they justify keeping the age at eighteen. - *Limits of the data.* Source D’s own caution (“cannot be attributed to the voting age alone”), the small sample of four cities, and the fact that the 16–17 turnout rate is calculated among registered voters while the other groups are calculated among all eligible voters. A strong essay may use these limits to qualify what the evidence can prove. - *Alternatives to the vote.* Pruitt’s alternatives (service, advisory boards) and the Tran interview invite an argument about whether a voice without a vote is enough, or whether the vote itself motivates the learning. - *Local versus national.* Local elections are closer to teenagers’ lives and lower in stakes, which may support a limited experiment. Pruitt’s claim that they are technical may support the opposite. - *Persistence.* Source B says the difference persists after the voters turn eighteen, a claim about long-term effects that Source D cannot test.

Common traps. - Summarizing the sources in order (A, B, C, D, E, F) with no line of reasoning. - Treating the table in Source D as proof that a lower voting age *causes* higher turnout; the source warns against that inference. - Misreading the table: comparing the 16–17 column to the “All eligible voters” column, or claiming Dunmore and Eastgate had sixteen-year-olds voting. - Dismissing Source C by calling the author “old-fashioned” instead of answering the argument. - Reading the cartoon only literally (describing the scene) without explaining its argument: that the exclusion of young residents from local decision-making is the issue, not their readiness. - Ignoring the prompt’s limit to local elections and arguing about presidential voting. - Name-dropping (“as Source B says”) without specific evidence.

3.3 Sample Response: 6 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 4; Row C: 1. Approximately 810 words.)

Lowering the voting age to sixteen for local elections is a sound idea, but only in the form that has actually worked where it has been tried: as a package in which the vote arrives alongside serious preparation for using it. The evidence suggests that sixteen is a good age at which to begin voting and a poor age at which to begin voting unprepared.

The strongest case for sixteen rests on how voting becomes a habit. Teodora Vance (Source B) observes that a citizen who votes in her first eligible election is far more likely to vote again, and she argues that eighteen is often the worst moment to ask for a first vote, because the eighteen-year-old is moving, changing jobs or classes, and leaving behind the adults who might take her to the polls. A sixteen-year-old, by contrast, has a stable address, a school, and a household that votes. The numbers in the Harlan Institute brief (Source D) fit this theory. In Ashbury, 44 percent of sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds voted in the last municipal election, while only 21 percent of eighteen- to twenty-four-year-olds did; in Calder Falls the figures were 38 and 19 percent. The young adults just past the traditional threshold are the ones who show up least, which is exactly the pattern Vance's argument predicts. If the goal is a citizenry that keeps voting, starting when voting is easiest is a rational design choice rather than a gamble.

That argument has to be weighed against Gerald Pruitt's objection (Source C) that local elections are not "glamorous contests of principle" but questions of bond issues and zoning variances that even educated adults struggle to parse. It is a serious objection, and it is the reason a bare lowering of the age would be a mistake. But Pruitt's own proposals contain the answer to him. He wants more civics, more service, and advisory boards. Linh Tran (Source F) shows what happens when a city does teach civics and also grants the vote: her students spent two weeks on a stormwater levy, called the city engineer, and found a mistake in the ballot summary. What changed her mind was not the number sixteen; it was that the unit was attached to a real decision. "Teenagers are not magically more informed at sixteen," she says, yet with preparation they took the responsibility more seriously than many adults do. Pruitt treats civics education as a substitute for the vote. Tran's classroom suggests it works better when paired with one, because students work harder on a decision that is real.

This is also why the Harlan data must be read with care, and why it supports a conditional position rather than a blanket one. The brief cautions that the difference "cannot be attributed to the voting age alone," since both lower-age cities also provided a civics unit. The table's note adds a second subtlety: turnout for sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds is calculated among those who registered, while the other columns count everyone eligible. Forty-four percent of registered teenagers is not the same as 44 percent of all who could vote, and the registration step, which in Ashbury means going in person to the clerk or the high school (Source A), may filter for the already motivated. These caveats do not weaken the case for sixteen. They tell us what we may claim: that early eligibility paired with school-based preparation is promising, not that the age by itself produces a better electorate.

The cartoon in Source E captures what is at stake in a different way. A council chair tells a line of teenagers holding signs that read "We ride the bus" and "We pay sales tax" to "come back when you're old enough to complain about your taxes," while the agenda on the easel lists bus route cuts, a school closure hearing, and a deferred skate park. Those are decisions that fall hardest on the people barred from speaking about them. Yet the cartoon is an argument about representation, and it should not be mistaken for an argument about readiness. Council member Okoye makes the same representation point in Source A when he notes that young people "ride

our buses" and "pay sales tax" but have never been able to hold officials accountable. Representation tells us why sixteen-year-olds should be heard; the evidence on habit and preparation tells us how to make their vote worth casting.

The responsible position, then, is to lower the voting age to sixteen for local elections and to write mandatory civics instruction and easy school-based registration into the law. Voters do not need to be perfect electors. As Tran puts it, "Maturity is not a birthday." A city that gives its young residents a real vote and real preparation is likely to gain both better local decisions and citizens who keep voting long after they have left school.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1):** The first sentence takes a clear, defensible, conditional position: lower the age for local elections, with preparation. - **Row B (4):** The essay uses specific evidence from all six sources (A through F). The line of reasoning builds: habit formation (B, D) leads to the objection about readiness (C), which is answered by preparation (F), which leads to a careful reading of what the data can prove (D), which leads to the argument about representation (E, A), which leads to the policy conclusion. Each paragraph begins from the previous one, and commentary consistently says what the evidence shows *for the thesis* ("exactly the pattern Vance's argument predicts"; "Tran's classroom suggests it works better when paired with one"). Sources talk to each other: Tran answers Pruitt; Source D's caution qualifies Source B. - **Row C (1):** Sophistication is sustained and part of the argument: the essay explores the tension between Pruitt and Tran, notices the denominator problem in Source D's note, and distinguishes the representation argument (E) from the readiness argument. The conclusion is shaped by those complexities (a conditional position).

3.4 Sample Response: 4 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 3; Row C: 0. Approximately 485 words.)

The voting age should be lowered to sixteen for local elections. Young people are affected by local government, they are able to learn about issues, and the evidence shows that when cities have tried it, it works.

First of all, sixteen-year-olds are affected by what local government does. In Source A, Council member Okoye says that teenagers "ride our buses, attend our schools, and work in our shops, and they pay sales tax every time they buy lunch." This shows that young people have a stake in local decisions. The cartoon in Source E also shows this. It has teenagers in a line holding signs that say "We ride the bus" and "We pay sales tax," and the council chair tells them to come back when they are older. The cartoon makes the council look unfair, which supports the point that teens should be allowed to vote.

Second, sixteen-year-olds really do vote when they are given the chance. Source D has a table that shows that in Ashbury, 44 percent of sixteen and seventeen year olds voted, which is more than the 21 percent of eighteen to twenty-four year olds. In Calder Falls it was 38 percent compared to 19 percent. This is more than the overall turnout in both cities, which were 33 percent and 30 percent. This proves that teenagers are interested in voting and will use the vote responsibly. Source B agrees, because it says that voting is a habit, so if people start at sixteen they will keep doing it as they get older. This is a good reason to lower the age because it creates more voters for the future. Source B also says that the age at which people start voting shapes how long they continue, so starting at sixteen gives each citizen more years of practice. Cities that want better participation should want voters to start as early as they can.

Some people disagree. In Source C, Gerald Pruitt says that sixteen-year-olds are not ready to vote on the city budget because they do not own property and do not pay income tax. However, Source F shows that students can be very engaged. The teacher, Linh Tran, says that her students argued about a stormwater levy for two

weeks and one found a mistake in the ballot summary. This shows that teenagers can understand local issues if they are taught about them. Although Pruitt makes some good points, young people are able to be responsible voters, so his argument is not persuasive.

In conclusion, the voting age should be lowered to sixteen for local elections. Teenagers are affected by local decisions, they turn out to vote, and they can learn about the issues. Cities should give them the chance to have a say. A real vote would also show young people that their community respects them, which would make them more likely to stay involved as adults.

Scoring commentary. – **Row A (1):** The first sentence states a defensible position. – **Row B (3):** The response uses specific evidence from all six sources (A through F), and every claim in a simple line of reasoning (teens are affected, teens do vote, teens can learn) is supported by something specific from the sources. That meets the 3-point standard. It does not reach 4 because the commentary is uneven: many sentences begin “This shows” or “This proves” and mostly restate the evidence. The statement that the turnout figures “prove” teens “will use the vote responsibly” is a reasoning leap (turnout is not the same as responsible use), and the response does not notice that Source D warns against attributing the difference to the age alone, or that the 16–17 figure is measured among registered voters. The Source B reference (“Source B agrees”) is a summary, not a synthesis. Source C is answered but not engaged: the response replaces Pruitt’s concern about ownership and independence with the point that teens are “engaged.” – **Row C (0):** The essay concedes one objection (Source C) but dismisses it in a single sentence (“his argument is not persuasive”). It does not explore tensions among the sources or the limitations of the evidence, and the style is competent but plain.

3.5 Sample Response: 2 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 1; Row C: 0. Approximately 305 words.)

I believe that the voting age should be lowered to sixteen for local elections because I think teenagers should have a say in what happens in their town.

In Source A, the city of Ashbury lets sixteen-year-olds vote now. A council member said that young people ride the buses and go to school and pay taxes, so they should get to vote. Some of the council did not agree and voted against it, but the vote passed. The article also says that about 1,900 people will become eligible.

In Source C, a principal says that sixteen is too young to vote on the city budget. He says that teenagers do not own property and will leave for college. He thinks that teenagers should learn about civics instead and be on advisory boards. He has been in schools for twenty-six years. So there are people who think teenagers are not ready to vote.

Source B is an article that says that voting is a habit. It says that if you vote the first time you are more likely to vote again. It says that eighteen is a bad age because people are moving. Sixteen is better because they live at home.

There are a lot of other sources too. The table in Source D has numbers about turnout in four cities. The cartoon shows teenagers at a meeting. In Source F a teacher is interviewed and she changed her mind.

Overall there are good reasons on both sides but I think that sixteen-year-olds should be allowed to vote. Teenagers care about their town and in many ways they are just as smart as adults. Voting would teach them to be good citizens, and it would make the town better for everyone. I also think that adults sometimes underestimate young people. Therefore, the voting age should be lowered.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1):** The first sentence is a position on the prompt ("lowered to sixteen for local elections"). Though the reason ("I think teenagers should have a say") is thin, the claim is defensible and responds to the prompt. - **Row B (1):** The response references at least two sources, with some specific detail from A, B, and C, but the commentary is summary. Each paragraph reports what one source "says" and none explains how it supports the thesis. The fourth paragraph merely mentions D, E, and F, and the final paragraph's claims ("in many ways they are just as smart as adults") are unsupported assertions. There is no line of reasoning: the paragraphs could be shuffled without changing the essay. - **Row C (0):** There is no engagement with complexity. The statement "there are good reasons on both sides" is a generalization and does not lead to any development.

4. Question 2 (Rhetorical Analysis): Patrick Henry, Speech to the Virginia Convention (1775)

4.1 Rubric (6 points)

Row A — Thesis (0–1)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response does not present a defensible thesis about the writer's rhetorical choices. It may only restate the prompt, describe or summarize the speech, or name devices without making a claim about what Henry does or why.
1	The response presents a defensible thesis that analyzes Henry's rhetorical choices in the passage.

Decision rules. The thesis must make a claim about *rhetorical choices*, not merely restate the purpose given in the prompt ("Henry persuades the delegates to prepare for war"). Readers accept a thesis that identifies choices by description ("Henry moves from deference to alarm to personal resolve") as readily as one that uses terms. A thesis that only lists terms ("Henry uses ethos, pathos, and logos") sits at the lowest boundary: it may earn the point if it connects the choices to the purpose, and does not if it merely names categories. The thesis may appear anywhere and may be more than one sentence.

Row B — Evidence and Commentary (0–4)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response restates the thesis, repeats the passage, or provides commentary that has no relation to the prompt.
1	The response provides evidence that is mostly general, and commentary that summarizes the speech rather than explaining it.

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
2	The response provides some specific evidence, and commentary explains how some of it relates to the argument, but no line of reasoning is established or the line of reasoning is faulty.
3	The response provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. Commentary explains how some of the evidence supports the line of reasoning and explains how at least one rhetorical choice contributes to Henry's argument, purpose, or message.
4	The response provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. Commentary consistently explains how the evidence supports the line of reasoning and explains how multiple rhetorical choices contribute to Henry's argument, purpose, or message.

Typical responses by score. - **1:** Retells the speech ("Henry says the colonies petitioned and were ignored. Then he says they must fight"), or lists devices with one general example each ("Henry uses imagery and repetition"). - **2:** Identifies choices with some quoted evidence and explains the effect of some of them, but each paragraph treats a separate device (a "device list") and the explanation is mostly "this makes the audience feel" with no developing argument. - **3:** Develops a clear line of reasoning (for example, deference, then redefinition of hope, then evidence, then rebuttal, then personal commitment), quotes specifically, and explains how at least one choice, such as the Judas allusion or the anaphora, advances Henry's purpose with this audience. Commentary is uneven. - **4:** The same, but commentary consistently explains how several different choices work *together* and *for this audience* and how each shapes the delegates' response; the essay reads as an argument about how Henry builds his case.

Decision rules. Multiple instances of the same choice (for example, rhetorical questions) count toward the fourth point only if each is shown to advance the argument. Labeling an appeal ("pathos") is not the same as explaining a choice; the choice is the concrete thing Henry does (an allusion, a sentence structure, a shift in pronoun). Claims about devices the passage does not contain (for example, "polysyndeton" where there is none) weaken credibility and cannot be credited as evidence. A response may not earn the fourth point if errors in grammar or mechanics interfere with communication.

Row C — Sophistication (0–1)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response does not demonstrate sophistication of thought or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.
1	The response demonstrates sophistication of thought and/or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.

The point can be earned by (1) explaining the significance or relevance of Henry's rhetorical choices given the rhetorical situation (for example, his minority position among cautious colleagues, the occasion of a convention still hoping for reconciliation); (2) explaining the purpose or function of the passage's complexities or tensions (for example, Henry's courtesy alongside his refusal of ceremony, or his appeal to reason together with his appeal to providence); or (3) employing a style that is consistently vivid and persuasive.

What does not earn the point. Sweeping statements about "freedom" or "American history"; mentioning the Revolution as background without connecting it to choices; examining individual choices without relating them to one another; oversimplifying the speech as "all emotion"; ornate language that does not advance the analysis.

4.2 Scoring notes specific to this prompt

What a defensible thesis looks like. A thesis that makes a claim about *how* Henry's choices work toward persuading the delegates to prepare for armed resistance. Examples: "Henry persuades a hesitant audience by recasting their hope as an illusion that history refutes, then by offering the record of failed petitions as proof that war is already here"; "Henry moves from deference to defiance, using religious and classical allusions to make dissent a duty." A response that says only "Henry uses ethos, pathos, and logos to persuade" is borderline; one that says only "Henry persuades the delegates to fight" earns no point.

What strong responses might argue. - *Courtesy as strategy.* The opening (lines 1–12) honors opponents and then dismisses ceremony ("This is no time for ceremony"). Henry must disagree with respected colleagues without alienating them, so he praises their patriotism, claims the right to speak freely, and then raises the stakes to treason and "the Majesty of Heaven." - *Religious framing.* The comparison of earthly kings with the "Majesty of Heaven" (lines 11–12), the reference to "the God of hosts" (line 39), and the closing "Forbid it, Almighty God!" (line 57) make resistance a moral and religious obligation. - *Redefining hope.* The siren (lines 13–15), "the delusive phantom of hope" (lines 43–44), and the "lamp of experience" (lines 19–20) recast hope as the danger and evidence as the guide; courage becomes seeing clearly. - *Questions that let the audience conclude for themselves.* "Is this the part of wise men?" (lines 15–16), "Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation?" (lines 26–27), and "But when shall we be stronger?" (line 42). Strong responses distinguish what each question does instead of calling them all "rhetorical questions." - *Biblical and classical allusion.* The siren, the betrayal "with a kiss" (lines 25–26), and "Peace, Peace—but there is no peace" (lines 52–53) lend authority and let educated, religious delegates recognize a pattern of deception. - *Accumulation and parallelism.* The sequence "We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated" (lines 30–31) makes the audience feel the cost of the effort already made, so that "spurned" (line 35) refutes the claim that more patience is possible; the suspended "if we" clauses (lines 35–38) delay "we must fight!" - *Concrete imagery.* "Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston!" (lines 49–50) and "the clash of resounding arms" (line 54) turn abstractions into sounds and places. - *Shift of pronoun and sentence length.* The movement from "we" to "I" in the last line (line 57), the short exclamatory sentences, and the antithesis of liberty and death. A strong response may say that the final turn leaves each delegate to choose whether to stand with him. - *Occasion and reconstruction.* An observant response may note that the text was reconstructed by Wirt, so the wording may reflect Wirt's own style; this earns credit only if it is used to interpret choices, not as a way of avoiding analysis.

Common traps. - Labeling "ethos, pathos, logos" and giving one-line examples without explaining the choices. - Calling the speech an "essay" or writing about "the author" and "readers"; Henry is a speaker addressing delegates in a church in Richmond. - Treating every sentence as "rhetorical question" or "repetition" and not explaining which function each serves. - Claiming that Henry is "angry" or "emotional" without explaining how

the structure (the delay of “we must fight,” the escalating verbs) controls that emotion. - Summarizing the history of the Revolution instead of analyzing the speech. - Reading the opening courtesy as sincere flattery and missing the setup of “no time for ceremony.” - Claiming devices that are not present, such as “alliteration throughout” or “polysyndeton.”

4.3 Sample Response: 6 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 4; Row C: 1. Approximately 830 words.)

At the Second Virginia Convention, Patrick Henry faced delegates who still hoped that patient petitions would preserve peace with Britain. In the speech as Wirt reconstructed it, Henry solves this problem by moving his audience step by step from courtesy to alarm to resolve: he claims the right to disagree in the language of honor and duty, redefines their hope as a danger that experience refutes, and turns their own record of failed petitions into proof that war has already begun, so that the only question left is whether each man will stand with him.

Henry begins by honoring the men he is about to contradict. He praises the “patriotism, as well as abilities” of the earlier speakers and hopes that his dissent will not be “thought disrespectful” (lines 1-4). The courtesy keeps his opponents’ goodwill, but “This is no time for ceremony” (lines 6-7) announces that it is ending. He then raises the stakes beyond politics. The question is “nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery” (lines 8-9), and to hold back his opinion would be “treason towards my country” and “disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings” (lines 10-12). The last clause matters. By placing a heavenly sovereign above “earthly kings,” Henry relocates his hearers’ loyalty before he has said a word about rebellion, so that speaking against the Crown’s policy can be framed as obedience to a higher duty. A minority opinion becomes a matter of conscience that a pious audience is obliged to hear.

Having secured a hearing, Henry attacks the delegates’ hope itself. Hope is an “illusion,” and its song is the song of a “siren” that “transforms us into beasts” (lines 13-15). The classical allusion threatens exactly what educated gentlemen prize, their reason. He then flatters that reason with a question that answers itself: “Is this the part of wise men?” (lines 15-16). No one can say yes without embarrassment. Henry presents himself as the man willing “to know the worst, and to provide for it” (lines 17-18), which makes courage a matter of facing facts rather than of eagerness for a fight. His next metaphor continues the pose of modesty: “I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience” (lines 19-20). The image makes his case seem empirical rather than passionate.

That evidence arrives through the most vivid sequence in the speech. Henry takes the king’s gracious reception of the colonial petition, which his opponents read as a sign of favor, and calls it an “insidious smile” (line 24), then warns, “Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss” (lines 25-26). The allusion to Judas turns courtesy into treachery for churchgoing men. He follows with a question that exposes the Crown’s contradiction: “Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation?” (lines 26-27). Letting the delegates draw the inference themselves makes the conclusion feel like theirs. Then comes the accumulation: “we have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne” (lines 30-31). The anaphora and the escalating verbs, from formal to abject, make the delegates feel the full length of the effort they have already made, and “spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne” (lines 34-35) turns their patience into evidence that conciliation is exhausted. Henry then delays the verdict through a chain of “if we” clauses (lines 35-38) before delivering it in three words, “we must fight!” The suspended syntax makes the conclusion seem less his preference than the only place the sentence could end.

The remaining objection, that the colonies are weak, is answered in the same spirit. Henry replies with questions: "But when shall we be stronger?" (line 42). The image of "lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope" (lines 43-44) revives the earlier motif, so the audience now hears caution as passivity. Then the sentences shorten: "Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston!" (lines 49-50). The abstraction "slavery" acquires a sound and a place the delegates can attach to a city they know.

The speech ends by moving from the collective to the personal. Henry insists that "the war is actually begun" (line 53) and asks why "we" stand "here idle" while "our brethren are already in the field" (line 55). Then he drops the plural: "I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!" (lines 57-58). The shift from "we" to "I," and the stark antithesis of liberty and death, turn the vote from a calculation into a test of character.

The delicate task of the speech is to disagree with respected colleagues without losing them. Henry manages it by never attacking the men, only their hope, so that his most radical claim, that peace is already gone, sounds like the conclusion the delegates have reached themselves.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1):** The thesis goes beyond the prompt's statement of purpose to make a claim about the *shape* of Henry's choices (courtesy, then alarm, then resolve) and what they do for a hesitant audience: redefine hope, convert failed petitions into proof. - **Row B (4):** The essay moves chronologically through the speech and builds a line of reasoning in which each stage prepares the next (the hearing, the redefinition of hope, the evidence, the rebuttal, the personal commitment). Evidence is specific and accurately cited by line. The commentary consistently explains *how* multiple choices contribute to Henry's purpose with this audience: the "above all earthly kings" clause relocates loyalty; the siren allusion attacks the delegates' sense of their own reason; the Judas allusion recasts the king's courtesy; the suspended "if we" clauses make "we must fight" seem inevitable; the shift from "we" to "I" turns a vote into a test of character. - **Row C (1):** The opening and closing paragraphs situate the choices in the rhetorical situation (respected colleagues, a minority position, an audience that still hopes), and the essay explains the function of a tension: Henry is courteous and yet refuses ceremony, and he attacks hope while claiming to follow reason. Because sophistication runs through the whole argument, it is not a decorative remark.

4.4 Sample Response: 4 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 3; Row C: 0. Approximately 495 words.)

In his speech to the Virginia Convention, Patrick Henry uses emotional language, repetition, and strong images to convince the delegates that they should prepare for war with Britain. He does this by showing that peace is no longer possible and by making the audience feel that fighting is their only honorable choice.

Henry begins by being polite to the other speakers. He says "no man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism" of the gentlemen who spoke before him (line 1). This makes the audience willing to listen to him even though he disagrees. But then he says "this is no time for ceremony" (line 6) and says the question is "freedom or slavery" (line 9). The word "slavery" is a powerful word because it is the opposite of freedom and it makes the situation seem like an emergency. He also says that staying silent would be "treason" and "disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven" (lines 11-12). This brings in religion, which was important to his audience, and it makes the delegates feel that listening to him is a duty.

Next Henry argues that hope is dangerous. He compares hope to a "siren" that turns men into "beasts" (lines 14-15). This makes the audience feel that they could be fooled if they keep hoping. Then he asks "Is this the part of wise men?" (line 15), which is a rhetorical question that makes them think they should not be foolish. He then

says he has “one lamp” which is “experience” (lines 19-20), so he uses the past to show that the British cannot be trusted. He calls the British king’s reception of their petition an “insidious smile” and says “betrayed with a kiss” (lines 24-26). This is a reference to the Bible that his audience would understand and it makes the king seem like a traitor.

Henry also uses repetition to show that the colonists have already tried everything. He says “we have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated” (lines 30-31). The repetition of “we have” makes the list feel long and shows that all of these efforts failed. After that, he says “we must fight!” twice (lines 38-39). This repetition shows how strongly he feels and it makes the delegates feel the same. Later he says “Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston!” (lines 49-50). This image makes slavery seem real and close by.

At the end Henry says “give me liberty or give me death!” (line 58). This shows his passion and his courage. Using “I” instead of “we” makes it personal and shows he is committed to what he believes. It also asks the audience to decide whether they will be as brave as he is.

In conclusion, Henry uses polite language, religion, rhetorical questions, repetition, and imagery to persuade the delegates that they must prepare to fight. He effectively appeals to their emotions and their reason so that they will agree.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1):** The thesis names the choices (emotional language, repetition, images) and a function (to show that peace is impossible and that fighting is honorable). It is general but defensible. - **Row B (3):** Evidence is specific and well chosen (the siren, “one lamp,” “insidious smile,” the “we have” series, the chains), and the essay has a rough line of reasoning that follows the speech. The commentary explains how at least one choice works: the biblical reference “his audience would understand” and the repetition of “we have” making the list “feel long.” It does not reach 4 because much of the commentary is generic (“this shows his passion and his courage”; “this makes the audience feel the same”) and does not consistently explain how the choices work *with each other* or why they suit *this* audience of cautious delegates. The first two body paragraphs treat devices in sequence and do not make explicit how the redefinition of hope leads to the evidence about the petitions. - **Row C (0):** The essay does not engage the speech’s complexities (for example, the tension between courtesy and defiance) or situate the choices in the occasion beyond a passing remark that religion mattered to the audience. The conclusion repeats the thesis.

4.5 Sample Response: 2 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 1; Row C: 0. Approximately 315 words.)

Patrick Henry gives a speech to the Virginia Convention in 1775 about how the colonies should fight Britain. He uses a lot of rhetorical devices in the speech to make his argument.

First, Henry uses ethos. He says that he respects the gentlemen who spoke before him, and he says he loves his country. This makes him sound like a good person who can be trusted. He also says that he would be guilty of treason if he did not say what he thinks, and that makes the audience trust him because he is being honest.

Second, Henry uses pathos. He uses emotional words like “slavery,” “chains,” and “death” to make the audience feel afraid. He says “Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston!” which makes the audience feel emotional. He also asks questions like “Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?” This is a rhetorical question that makes the audience think about what they would give up.

Third, Henry uses logos. He says that the British have ignored their petitions and have sent fleets and armies. He says “we have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated” which shows that they have tried everything. This is logical because if they tried everything and it did not work, then the only choice is to fight.

Henry also uses repetition. He says “we must fight” more than once and “let it come” more than once. This makes his message strong. He also uses metaphors like the “lamp of experience” and the “siren.” These are good metaphors because they make his writing more interesting.

In conclusion, Henry uses ethos, pathos, logos, repetition and metaphors in his speech to make the delegates want to fight Britain. This is why the speech is so famous and why it is remembered today.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1, at the lower boundary):** The opening sentence (“uses a lot of rhetorical devices”) would not earn the point on its own. The conclusion supplies a thesis that names choices (ethos, pathos, logos, repetition, metaphor) and ties them to a purpose (to make the delegates want to fight), so the point is awarded by a narrow margin. - **Row B (1):** The response sorts the speech into ethos, pathos, and logos and provides some quotation, but the evidence is mostly general and the commentary is a label followed by a statement of effect (“makes the audience feel afraid,” “makes his message strong”). Henry’s *choices* are never described in any detail (the Judas allusion, the “if we” clauses, the shift to “I” are absent). There is no line of reasoning; the paragraphs could be reordered. Calling a metaphor “good” because it is “more interesting” is not analysis. - **Row C (0):** There is no engagement with the rhetorical situation (the delegates who hope for peace, the minority position of the speaker), only the generalization that the speech is “famous.”

5. Question 3 (Argument): Chesterton on Tradition and “the Democracy of the Dead”

5.1 Rubric (6 points)

Row A — Thesis (0–1)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response does not present a defensible thesis. It may only restate the prompt, say that “there are many sides,” summarize Chesterton’s claim, or fail to take a position on the extent to which the claim is valid.
1	The response presents a defensible position on the extent to which Chesterton’s claim about deference to tradition is valid.

Decision rules. The position may be agreement, disagreement, or qualification (“largely valid, but only when...”). It must be a position and not a description. A thesis that merely says “Chesterton has a point, but tradition can also be bad” is borderline; a reader will look for whether it commits to some idea of *how far* the claim holds. There are no sources in this question, so defensible means that a reasonable reader could argue the position with evidence from reading, observation, or experience. The point may be earned even if the body does not support the thesis.

Row B — Evidence and Commentary (0–4)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response restates the thesis, repeats Chesterton's words, or provides evidence unrelated to the prompt.
1	The response provides evidence that is mostly general, and commentary that summarizes or simply asserts.
2	The response provides some specific evidence, and commentary explains how some of it relates to the argument, but no line of reasoning is established or the line of reasoning is faulty.
3	The response provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. Commentary explains how some of the evidence supports the line of reasoning.
4	The response provides specific evidence to support all claims in a line of reasoning. Commentary consistently explains how the evidence supports the line of reasoning.

Typical responses by score. - **1:** Names traditions (Thanksgiving, weddings, school rituals) or makes claims about "our ancestors" without detail, and states that they are important. - **2:** Offers a few specific examples (the Constitution; slavery as a tradition; a family dinner) and says what each shows, but arranges them as "good traditions" and "bad traditions" with no argument connecting them. - **3:** Builds a line of reasoning across paragraphs (for example, tradition as evidence; the limits of that evidence; a standard for deciding), with specific examples for each claim and some real explanation of why they matter to the question of *extent*. - **4:** The same, with explanation consistently tied to the thesis and the abstract question: each example is shown to bear on what we owe the past and why.

Decision rules. Students rarely lack examples; the usual failure is not explaining the example's relevance to the abstract question. Examples from history, literature, current events, observation, or experience are all acceptable if they are specific. Personal anecdotes work when they are explained in terms of the claim. A response may not earn the fourth point if errors in grammar or mechanics interfere with communication.

Row C — Sophistication (0–1)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
0	The response does not demonstrate sophistication of thought or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.
1	The response demonstrates sophistication of thought and/or a complex understanding of the rhetorical situation.

The point can be earned by crafting a nuanced argument that explores complexities or tensions (for example, that the "dead" are not a single voice, or that the democracy metaphor fails because the dead electorate was not representative); by articulating implications or limitations of the argument by situating it in a broader context; by making rhetorical choices that consistently strengthen the argument; or by sustained vivid and persuasive style.

What does not earn the point. A single sentence beginning “Of course, some traditions are harmful”; a “bad traditions” paragraph that merely lists slavery and then returns to the original position; sweeping generalizations about “society” or “the modern world”; ornate language that does not carry the argument.

5.2 Scoring notes specific to this prompt

What a defensible thesis looks like. Any clear position on how far we owe deference to tradition, with some indication of reasoning. Examples: “Chesterton is largely right because custom stores the results of generations of trial and error, which a single generation cannot match”; “Chesterton is wrong, because the ‘dead electorate’ was never representative and deference perpetuates injustice”; “Tradition deserves a presumption of respect, but not the final say, because its value depends on whether it can be revised.” A thesis that says only “Tradition is important” is not yet a position on *extent*.

What strong responses might argue. - *Tradition as evidence.* Customs that have survived many generations have been tested under many conditions; the living are a small sample (Chesterton’s own “fence” reasoning; practical examples like cooking, agriculture, or craft apprenticeship). - *The unrepresentative electorate.* The “dead” who shaped tradition were not a democracy: women, enslaved people, and the poor were excluded from the making of law and custom. Deferring to tradition can mean deferring to the powerful of the past (coverture; slavery; exclusion from the franchise). - *Tradition contains its own critics.* Reformers often appeal to deep traditions against shallow ones: Frederick Douglass invoking the Declaration of Independence, Martin Luther King Jr. invoking the same promissory note, suffragists appealing to the ideal of consent. The dead are not one voice. - *Institutional design.* Constitutions (amendment requirements), common law (precedent), and scientific practice (peer review) balance deference with revision; they treat the past as a vote that is counted but not final. - *Presumption versus veto.* The metaphor of a vote implies counting, not commanding. A strong essay may argue that the most defensible reading is a rebuttable presumption in favor of tradition, with the burden on the reformer. - *Experience of community and identity.* Family and community rituals create belonging and continuity, which have value even when their original reasons are lost; a strong essay will explain *why* such traditions deserve deference (for example, because they bind people together) and where this reason stops. - *Costs of deference.* Medical or technological examples where custom resisted evidence (handwashing in nineteenth-century hospitals, resistance to new methods) show that deference can cost lives. - *Who counts as “the living” and “the dead.”* Strong responses may notice that tradition is also made by the living in the present, who choose which ancestors to heed.

Common traps. - Choosing “good traditions” and “bad traditions” and treating Chesterton’s claim as obviously right or wrong without examining *extent*. - Treating “tradition” as any habit or holiday and not engaging the political metaphor (democracy, vote, oligarchy). - Taking “democracy of the dead” literally (“the dead cannot vote”) and stopping there. - Presenting the dead as uniformly wise or uniformly benighted (“our ancestors were less educated”), a sweeping generalization the rubric does not reward. - Using personal anecdotes without explaining relevance to the claim. - Writing a formulaic counterargument paragraph that concedes and then drops the point. - Ignoring the second sentence of the quotation (“the small and arrogant oligarchy of those who merely happen to be walking about”), which is a rhetorical claim about the living that deserves comment.

5.3 Sample Response: 6 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 4; Row C: 1. Approximately 730 words.)

G. K. Chesterton is right that tradition deserves a hearing, but wrong if the “vote” he gives the dead is allowed to become a veto. Customs are the stored results of experiments the living have not had to repeat, and a reformer who ignores them is gambling with other people’s inheritance. Yet the dead were never a fair electorate, and their ballots are frequently marked by the habits and interests of the people who happened to hold power. We owe the past a presumption, not obedience, and the traditions most worth honoring are the ones that contain the means of their own correction.

Chesterton’s claim is strongest when we think of tradition as evidence. A custom that has survived many generations has survived many tests: it has been tried by people with different temperaments in different seasons, and it has not yet failed badly enough to be dropped. The living, by contrast, are a small sample taking one measurement. The American Constitution builds this humility into its design. Article V does not forbid change, but it demands a two-thirds vote of Congress and ratification by three-quarters of the states, which means that any alteration must persuade a wide majority of the living before it displaces the settled choice of the dead. That arrangement is Chesterton’s “democracy of the dead” translated into law: the past sits in the room, and the present must make its case. A reformer who says “I see no reason for this old fence” has, in Chesterton’s sense, forgotten that the people who built it had reasons too.

But the metaphor becomes misleading the moment we ask who the dead voters were. A democracy counts everyone, and tradition counts only those who left a mark. When Abigail Adams wrote to her husband in 1776 urging him to “Remember the Ladies” and to be “more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors,” she was objecting to coverture, a legal custom that centuries of English law had passed down as though it were nature. The custom’s long survival proved nothing about its justice; it proved that the people it harmed had no vote in the one electorate that mattered, and that the people who wrote the rules were the ones who benefited from them. The same is true of the medical tradition that Ignaz Semmelweis challenged in Vienna in 1847. When he showed that physicians who washed their hands in chlorinated lime had lower maternal death rates in his ward, many of his colleagues resisted, because the practice of moving from the autopsy room to the delivery ward was simply what physicians did. Tradition here was not wisdom stored but habit defended, and women died while the profession consulted its own routines. A tradition that cannot be questioned by the living is not a democracy of any kind; it is an oligarchy of the longest-serving.

Still, it would be a mistake to conclude that the living should simply outvote the dead, for the dead are not one voice. In “What to the Slave Is the Fourth of July?” in 1852, Frederick Douglass did not reject the founders; he called the signers “brave men” before he condemned the nation that celebrated them while holding slaves. He used the Declaration of Independence, a tradition, to indict the practice of slavery, also a tradition. Douglass shows what Chesterton’s metaphor leaves out: tradition is a quarrel among the dead, and the living cast the deciding ballot by choosing which of their ancestors to heed. That choice is a judgment, and judgment cannot be handed to the past. Even the Nineteenth Amendment, which finally overrode the exclusion of women from the vote, was won in part by appeal to the same ideal of consent of the governed that the founders had put on paper.

So the extent to which Chesterton’s claim is valid is the extent to which we treat tradition as a presumption that can be rebutted. The burden of proof should fall on the person who wants to change a long-standing custom: she should be able to say what the custom was for and why it no longer serves. But when that burden is met, as it was by Adams’s heirs, by Douglass, and by Semmelweis’s vindicators, the living are not betraying the dead. They are keeping faith with the part of the past that taught them how to argue with it.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1):** The first sentence takes a qualified but committed position (the claim is right about tradition as a hearing and wrong if the vote is a veto) and previews the argument's direction. It addresses *extent*, as the prompt asks. - **Row B (4):** The essay builds a line of reasoning: tradition as evidence (Article V as the institutional form of Chesterton's idea), then the limits of that evidence (coverture, Semmelweis), then the complication that tradition is itself a quarrel (Douglass), then a standard (presumption and burden of proof). Each example is specific, and commentary consistently explains what it shows about the question of extent ("the custom's long survival proved nothing about its justice"; "tradition is a quarrel among the dead, and the living cast the deciding ballot"). The essay engages Chesterton's metaphor of democracy rather than treating the quotation as a slogan. - **Row C (1):** The essay explores a tension throughout: the dead are both a source of evidence and an unrepresentative electorate, and they are not one voice. It also takes Chesterton's own political metaphor seriously enough to test it ("an oligarchy of the longest-serving"). Sophistication is part of the argument, not an add-on.

5.4 Sample Response: 4 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 3; Row C: 0. Approximately 475 words.)

Chesterton says that tradition is the "democracy of the dead" and that we should give a vote to our ancestors. I believe that this claim is partly valid. Tradition is important because it keeps people connected and teaches us lessons, but we should not follow tradition when it is wrong or unfair.

One reason tradition is valid is that it teaches us lessons from the past. For example, the United States Constitution was written over two hundred years ago, and we still follow it today. The Founders thought carefully about how to build a government, and the Constitution has lasted because they learned from history. If we ignored it and changed our government every time we wanted to, the country would be unstable. This shows that respecting the past can protect us from making mistakes. It also shows that Chesterton is right that our ancestors should have a say.

Tradition also matters because it brings families and communities together. In my family, we have a tradition of eating dinner together every Sunday. It started with my grandparents and it is still going now. Even though we are all busy, it gives us a time to talk and to feel like a family. If we stopped this tradition because it was inconvenient, we would lose something valuable. So traditions can be worth keeping because they give us a sense of belonging, and that is a kind of respect for the people who started them.

Another reason to respect tradition is that it can protect things that people would otherwise lose. When I visited my town's historical society, I saw old photographs of festivals and parades that the town stopped holding. People told me they regretted it, because the festivals were one of the few times when neighbors who did not know each other were in the same place. If those traditions had been kept, the town might feel more connected today. This shows that the dead sometimes know things about community that the living forget, which supports Chesterton's idea that they should have a vote.

However, not all traditions are good, and Chesterton goes too far if he says we must always listen to the dead. For many years in America, slavery was a tradition, and so was not letting women vote. If people had said that these traditions should be followed because our ancestors did them, then these injustices would still exist. People like Frederick Douglass and Susan B. Anthony fought against these traditions, and they were right to. This shows that sometimes the living have to overrule the dead because the dead were wrong.

In conclusion, Chesterton is partly right because tradition teaches us lessons and brings us together, but we must be willing to change when a tradition is unfair. We should respect the past, but we should not be ruled by it.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1):** The thesis is a defensible, qualified position ("partly valid") that says when tradition should be followed and when not. - **Row B (3):** The response gives specific, relevant examples for its claims (the Constitution, the Sunday dinner, the lost festivals, slavery and women's exclusion from voting, Douglass and Anthony) and arranges them in a clear structure with some real explanation ("If we ignored it and changed our government every time we wanted to, the country would be unstable"). It reaches 3 because the evidence supports each claim in a reasoned sequence. It does not reach 4 because commentary is uneven: "This shows that respecting the past can protect us from making mistakes" restates the example, the family-dinner paragraph never explains why that kind of tradition supports Chesterton's *political* claim about a vote, and the slavery paragraph asserts that the living "have to overrule the dead" without exploring what that does to the democracy metaphor. The line of reasoning is mostly "good traditions, then bad traditions." - **Row C (0):** The final paragraph's concession ("we must be willing to change when a tradition is unfair") is the kind of expected counterargument that the rubric says does not earn sophistication. The essay does not examine Chesterton's metaphor, who the "dead" are, or how the two kinds of traditions might be reconciled.

5.5 Sample Response: 2 points

(Row A: 1; Row B: 1; Row C: 0. Approximately 350 words.)

I agree with Chesterton that tradition is important and that we should listen to our ancestors. Tradition is something that has been passed down for many years, and it is important to respect it.

Traditions are important in many ways. For example, in America there are many traditions like Thanksgiving and the Fourth of July. On Thanksgiving, families get together and eat turkey and say what they are thankful for. On the Fourth of July, we watch fireworks and celebrate our country. These traditions are important because they have been around for a long time and people like them. If we did not have traditions then life would be boring and people would not have anything to celebrate.

Also, our ancestors knew a lot of things. They did not have technology like we do but they were smart and they survived. They knew how to farm and build houses and make things by hand. Today people rely on their phones too much and forget the wisdom of the past. If we listened to our ancestors more we would probably have fewer problems today.

Another thing is that traditions help people know who they are. When I go to my grandmother's house on holidays, we make the same food that she made when she was young, and it makes me feel proud of where my family comes from. I think that if everyone had this feeling, there would be less fighting in the world and more respect for each other.

Some people might say that tradition is bad because it can hold people back. But I think that traditions are mostly good, and if a tradition is bad then people will stop doing it. For example, people don't have slavery anymore. So tradition is good because it stays if it is good and goes away if it is bad.

In conclusion, I agree with Chesterton that tradition is the democracy of the dead. We should respect our ancestors and follow tradition because it is what makes us who we are. Tradition gives us identity and meaning, and without it we would be lost.

Scoring commentary. - **Row A (1):** The first sentence takes a position (agreement with Chesterton), which responds to the prompt, though it does not address the *extent* of validity or define "tradition." - **Row B (1):** Evidence is general (Thanksgiving, fireworks, "our ancestors knew how to farm") and the commentary mostly asserts ("life would be boring"; "tradition gives us identity and meaning"). The one counterargument paragraph rests on a faulty line of reasoning: that bad traditions "go away" by themselves, supported by the claim that

"people don't have slavery anymore," ignores how long such traditions persisted and how they ended. The essay does not engage Chesterton's democratic metaphor. – **Row C (0):** The essay offers generalizations ("people rely on their phones too much") and no engagement with complexity.

6. How to Score Yourself

6.1 Step by step

1. **Multiple choice.** Count your correct answers (no penalty for wrong answers). Your MCQ raw score is out of 45.
2. **Essays.** Score each essay 0–6 using the rubrics above (Row A + Row B + Row C), ideally with a teacher or a classmate who has read the sample responses. Be conservative: a point is earned only when the response meets the whole description, and the samples above show where the boundaries fall. Your essay total is out of 18.
3. **Composite estimate.**

Composite (out of about 150) $\approx$ MCQ raw $\times$ 1.5 + essay total $\times$ 4.58

For example, 32 MCQ correct and essays of 4, 3, and 4 (total 11) gives about $48 + 50.4 = 98.4$.

6.2 Approximate score bands

College Board does not publish raw-to-AP conversions, and the cut points shift from year to year. The bands below are rough estimates for orientation only.

COMPOSITE (OUT OF ~150)	APPROXIMATE AP SCORE
105 or above	5
87–104	4
65–86	3
45–64	2
Below 45	1

6.3 Quick reference: composite estimates

MCQ RAW (OF 45)	MCQ POINTS	ESSAY TOTAL 6	ESSAY TOTAL 9	ESSAY TOTAL 12	ESSAY TOTAL 15
20	30	57	71	85	99
25	38	65	79	93	106
30	45	72	86	100	114
35	53	80	94	108	121
40	60	87	101	115	129

6.4 Using your results diagnostically

- **Section I by skill category.** Use the key in Section 1 to tally misses by category. Reading categories (1, 3, 5, 7) are the Swift and Letters sets (Questions 1–24); writing categories (2, 4, 6, 8) are Questions 25–45. A pattern of misses in one category matters more than a total score.
- **Reading misses.** If you missed items that ask about the function of a part (Questions 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 19, 21), practice stating in one sentence what the part *does* rather than what it says. If you missed tone and diction items (2, 7, 17), practice naming the connotation of key words before looking at the choices.
- **Writing misses.** The writing items reward matching the revision to the *stated goal*. Before reading the choices, restate the goal in your own words (for example, “qualify the claim,” “add commentary, not evidence,” “formal tone”). Eliminate choices that are fine prose but do something else.
- **Question 1 (Synthesis).** Ask whether your essay used at least three sources with specific evidence, whether each paragraph builds on the previous one, and whether you explained *why* each piece of evidence matters. Check that you read the table in Source D correctly, including its note.
- **Question 2 (Rhetorical Analysis).** Ask whether your thesis names choices and a purpose, whether you described what Henry actually does (an allusion, a sentence structure, a shift in pronoun), and whether you stayed in the rhetorical situation: a speaker, an audience of delegates, a specific occasion.
- **Question 3 (Argument).** Ask whether you defined “tradition,” whether you addressed *extent*, and whether each example was explained in terms of the claim. A single “although” sentence does not earn sophistication; a tension that runs through your argument does.

End of Answer Key.

Want a plan built around **your** student?

BOOK NOW →