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General Directions: This scoring guide is designed so that the same performance expectations are applied to all student responses. It will be useful for most of the essays read, but if it seems inappropriate for a specific essay, assistance should be sought from the Table Leader. The Table Leader should always be shown booklets that seem to have no response or that contain responses that seem unrelated to the question. A score of 0 or — should not be assigned without this consultation.

The essay's score should reflect an evaluation of the essay as a whole. Students had only 40 minutes to read and write; the essay, therefore, is not a finished product and should not be judged according to standards appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. The essay should be evaluated as a draft, and students should be rewarded for what they do well. The evaluation should focus on the evidence and explanations that the student uses to support the response; students should not be penalized for taking a particular perspective. All essays, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional lapses in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into the holistic evaluation of an essay's overall quality. In no case should a score higher than a 2 be given to a paper with errors in grammar and mechanics that persistently interfere with understanding of meaning.

9 – Essays earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for the score of 8 and, in addition, are especially sophisticated in their argument, thorough in their development, or impressive in their control of language.

8 – Effective

Essays earning a score of 8 effectively analyze* the rhetorical choices Gandhi makes to present his case to Lord Irwin. They develop their analysis with evidence and explanations that are appropriate and convincing, referring to the passage explicitly or implicitly. The prose demonstrates a consistent ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing but is not necessarily flawless.

7 – Essays earning a score of 7 meet the criteria for the score of 6 but provide more complete explanation, more thorough development, or a more mature prose style.

6 – Adequate

Essays earning a score of 6 adequately analyze the rhetorical choices Gandhi makes to present his case to Lord Irwin. They develop their analysis with evidence and explanations that are appropriate and sufficient, referring to the passage explicitly or implicitly. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.

5 – Essays earning a score of 5 analyze the rhetorical choices Gandhi makes to present his case to Lord Irwin. The evidence and explanations used to develop their analysis may be uneven, inconsistent, or limited. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the student’s ideas.
Question 2 (continued)

4 – Inadequate

Essays earning a score of 4 inadequately analyze the rhetorical choices Gandhi makes to present his case to Lord Irwin. These essays may misunderstand the passage, misrepresent the choices Gandhi makes, or analyze these choices insufficiently. The evidence and explanations used to develop their analysis may be inappropriate, insufficient, or unconvincing. The prose generally conveys the student’s ideas but may be inconsistent in controlling the elements of effective writing.

3 – Essays earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for the score of 4 but demonstrate less success in analyzing the rhetorical choices Gandhi makes to present his case to Lord Irwin. They are less perceptive in their understanding of the passage or Gandhi’s choices, or the evidence and explanations used to develop their analysis may be particularly limited or simplistic. The essays may show less maturity in control of writing.

2 – Little Success

Essays earning a score of 2 demonstrate little success in analyzing the rhetorical choices Gandhi makes to present his case to Lord Irwin. The student may misunderstand the prompt, misread the passage, fail to analyze the choices Gandhi makes, or substitute a simpler task by responding to the prompt tangentially with unrelated or inaccurate explanation. The prose often demonstrates consistent weaknesses in writing, such as grammatical problems, a lack of development or organization, or a lack of control.

1 – Essays earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for the score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their explanation, or weak in their control of language.

0 Indicates an off-topic response, one that merely repeats the prompt, an entirely crossed-out response, a drawing, or a response in a language other than English.

— Indicates an entirely blank response.

* For the purposes of scoring, analysis means explaining the rhetorical choices an author makes in an attempt to achieve a particular effect or purpose.
When Mohandas Gandhi led the Salt March as a nonviolent protest, it triggered not only the widespread use of nonviolent tactics to push for Indian independence but also a worldwide focus on nonviolence in such protests as Martin Luther King’s civil rights movement or American students’ antiwar demonstrations. In setting such a precedent for nonviolent tactics that nevertheless achieved revolutionary success, Gandhi necessarily needed to strike a firm but conciliatory tone in his rhetoric so as not to undermine peaceful actions with inflammatory words. His rhetoric, therefore, is skillfully used when justifying his movement to British Viceroy Lord Irwin. Gandhi skillfully uses an emphasis on "servitude" to affirm his desire for mutual benefit, repeated "if-then" logical constructions to present a coolly logical argument, and a focus on making key concessionary statements to build a stronger negotiating relationship.

Gandhi’s repeated use of the word "serve" carries an unexpected meaning in a letter intended to present a case for disobedience, the opposite of servitude; if therefore boosts Gandhi’s ethos by affirming a desire for mutual benefit and selflessness. Gandhi first uses "serve" to demonstrate that he wishes "to serve [your British] people" even as he "want[s] to serve [his] own." This, directly contrasts with the claim that
Gandhi had great “ambition,” no less than to “convert” the British public opinion. Therefore, Gandhi’s use of servile creation juxtaposition of sweeping, ambitious aims and humble tactics. If he seeks to still “serve” the British despite wanting to “convert” and disobey them, his reader must see this seeming paradox as an indication that Gandhi seeks benefit for the British, not just Indians. This serves to both grab the reader’s attention as he attempts to tease out the paradox as well as boosting credibility for Gandhi as not an irrational revolutionary but as a caring figure pushing for what he believes is best for every party. When Gandhi continues to use This diction, saying “I believed I have always served them (the people),” he provides a further appeal to his own authority. “Up to 1919, blindly,” he saw a literally servile perspective on how to help, or “serve,” the British. The fact that he sees himself as no longer “blind” yet still “serving” underscores how Gandhi has approached British relationships to India from multiple perspectives proves he is an expert with experience. This convinces readers to acknowledge the credibility of Gandhi as someone seeking change.

Gandhi then articulates his reasoning in
2

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

repeated if-then statements. The use of the if-then characterizes deductive reasoning; often considered more scientific and/or credible than induction, anecdotes, or assumptions. Gandhi therefore uses these constructions to emphasize an appeal to logic—if his argument is logically consistent from the circumstances in India, his readers ought to believe he is right or justified. He says, "if we want to sever the British connection, it is because of such evils" that he plans to "combat." Gandhi uses this to argue that the Indians have not acted unreasonably, but instead are reacting to inciting "evils" by the British. Therefore, if his readers agree there are some "evils" in how the British have acted, they should agree with Gandhi's movement. Furthermore, Gandhi says that only "if you cannot see your way to deal with these evils... I shall proceed." By providing a plan with provisions by which Viceroy Irwin could prevent Gandhi's disobedience, he casts Irwin as the one in the wrong if he knows he could prevent the Salt March and opposes it but does not act. Gandhi therefore appears more reasoned and ideologically consistent. Gandhi finally argues that "if the British commence with India in purified of greed, you will have
We difficulty recognizing our independence." This forces the British reader to examine their potential "greed" as part of the premise of this logical construction. Gandhi also uses this to lay out a clear path or plan, guiding readers through his logic to support independence.

Finally, he makes key concessions to present himself as conciliatory and calm. Gandhi anticipates British counterclaims and actions, conceding "it is... open to you [Irwin] to frustrate my design by arresting me." By conceding nonviolence may not succeed in a direct confrontation with British imperial strength and authority, Gandhi points out that he has carefully seen potential problems with his tactics. This allows him to draw British readers like Irwin who believe in British strength into agreement before Gandhi says others will render his arrest inconsequential to the movement, portraying the British opposition as unnecessary or unhelpful to the British cause. Gandhi then says he is open to "discussing" or "postponing" publication of this letter and is making conciliatory efforts like "special
deliver [by a young English friend] and Mr. These concessions to Britain’s preferences or prejudices prove Gandhi has reasoned out his argument and is also willing to negotiate while remaining committed to his “cause.” It boosts his ethos as an implicit challenge that urges the British to be similarly willing to compromise.

Overall, Gandhi’s rhetorical choices of a motif of “servitude,” logical if-then statements, and concessionary tone serve to boost his image as a reasoned, idealistic but realistic, and committed leader of his movement.

#
When the treatment of the black man within the United States became so abhorrent, so disturbing to the everyday security and pursuit of happiness for these individuals, Martin Luther King took a stand as a leader, and with the support of many, initiated change. Although this stand was in the name of civil rights, the same narrative can be applied to the one thing that everyone has sitting in their kitchen, salt.

The right for salt to be free, not controlled by or taxation by Britain's colonial is what Mohandas Gandhi led his followers for in the Salt March in 1930. In an essay he wrote shortly before the march, Gandhi effectively garners a strong appeal of ethos, pathos, and logos through use of strong diction and rhetorical devices in a pleaing to Britain to set India independent and work together for the common good of mankind.

Beginning near the conclusion of his letter, Gandhi immediately starts using vocabulary such as "gravest" to describe the character of India will maintain in their non-violent fight for independence. Along with this, Gandhi carefully asserts, "I do not seek to harm your people,... I have always served them." In these statements of India's character and his own, Gandhi effectively uses an ethos appeal to establish the credibility of both the power and initiative of this independence movement in freeing themselves from Britain, while
also maintaining that India has done no harm or negatively impacted Britain in any manner.

Nearing the middle of the conclusion of his letter, Gandhi employs an appeal to logos in attempting to reason with the British crown representative. Gandhi argues that aspects of Indian society must be free of British restriction by saying that when British commerce with India's, "...purified of greed," "friendly" negotiation can occur, Gandhi sneaky insults the involvement of Britain here and then follows it with a direct challenge to all of Britain to do the logical, right thing to do in removing British "evils" and, "...open a way for real conference between equals.". His diction such as "equals" and "purified" as well as others Gandhi adds such as "fellowship" and "common good" assert India as a positive presence in its attempt in Gandhi's attempt to gain sympathy from Britain for the stress they have placed on Indian society.

As he looks to end his conclusion to his letter, Gandhi transitions from a challenging, accusatory tone to that more of a friendly, agreeable conversation. Prior however, before providing his concluding statements, Gandhi uses an appeal to pathos in arguing that India has been subject to Britain's "cruel monopoly" for far too long and was in warning that thousands of his supporters are ready to civilly "lay themselves open to the penalties" of disobeying the Salt Act. After these final warnings, Gandhi continues his use of pathos in an uptake of a friendly tone
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to close his letter, he uses statements such as stating a lack of a desire to cause Britain "unnecessary embarrassment" and wants to assist in any way. "I can help." By taking a friendly tone, Gandhi paints the picture of being an approachable, agreeable opponent that Britain would never want to hurt. Gandhi takes a risk in leading the fight for India's independence. However, this risk is one calculated and whole-heartedly approached by Gandhi in both the Salt March and in his letter. Gandhi makes an astounding use of pathos, logos, and ethos in trying to change the beliefs of a nation who had been abusing Indian society for far too long.

#
Gandhi's letter talks about how she would fight for what is right in her heart. Gandhi chooses to take as many risks as she can to make Britain's colonial monopoly and taxation give up. Also, she wants Britain to see what they've done to India is wrong, so she chooses non-violence to win. She believes if they get rid of the evils the British have, then they would truly have a chance for negotiation and to win. Gandhi wouldn't have any trouble to march alongside the co-workers of Ashram and disregard the salt laws. Then when it's all set and done, Gandhi believes that tens of thousands of other co-workers will disobey the salt Act 2, so they could fight for what's right. Gandhi continues to fight for what's right no matter if they discuss the matter at hand or they deflect her letter in any way. Without being said, Gandhi chooses to not give up until her voice, his/her voice is heard and destiny is fulfilled at its fullest.
Question 2

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

Overview

This year’s rhetorical analysis question asked students to identify and evaluate the rhetorical choices made by Mohandas “Mahatma” Gandhi in 1930 as he composed a letter to Lord Irwin, the representative of the British crown in India. The prompt explains that the letter was written in the context of a nonviolent march in India protesting Britain’s colonial monopoly on salt. As in past years, this year’s prompt asked students to consider the rhetorical situation a speaker faces and to analyze the choices that the speaker makes in order to elicit appropriate or desirable responses from an audience.

This prompt was accessible for most students who typically knew who Gandhi was and were at least marginally familiar with his movement to win India’s independence from Great Britain. As one student wrote, “We all knew and loved Gandhi!”

Within their responses to this, as to any, rhetorical analysis question, students were expected to explain the choices the rhetor (Gandhi) made in his particular situation for his particular audience and how these choices worked. To understand a rhetor’s choices and how they work, a student must first consider the rhetor’s relationship to the audience, as well as how this relationship necessitates both what this specific rhetor should include — and exclude — in the speech to this specific audience. Additionally, a student must consider how the rhetor arranges the speech for the particular audience in the specific circumstances of the speech. While elements of style certainly merit consideration, they are not the first ingredient on which rhetors focus when developing strategies to persuade audiences: Style is the third canon of rhetoric, not the first or even the second.

In other words, to do well, students needed to understand the purpose of Gandhi’s speech, what the relationship must have been between Gandhi and Lord Irwin, what Irwin’s attitude toward Gandhi’s message might have been, and how Gandhi’s specific rhetoric choices worked to make his audience more responsive to his purpose.

Sample: 2A

Score: 9

This effective essay is especially sophisticated in its argument about the rhetorical choices Gandhi made when presenting his case to Lord Irwin. The evidence and explanations are especially thorough in their development, and the student demonstrates an impressive control of language throughout the essay. In particular, in the second paragraph, the student offers a thoroughly developed analysis of Gandhi’s use of the word “serve”: “Gandhi’s repeated use of the word ‘serve’ carries an unexpected meaning in a letter intended to present a case for disobedience, the opposite of servitude; it therefore boosts Gandhi’s ethos by affirming a desire for mutual benefit and selflessness.” The student offers analyses of additional terms and language choices, concluding the paragraph with Gandhi’s assertion of no longer being “blind” but still “serving” as evidence of his “multiple perspectives” and “credibility … as someone seeking change.” The balance of the essay provides a number of well-supported analyses for Gandhi’s rhetorical choices: for example, the “if-then” statements that characterize deductive reasoning, the offering of “a plan with provisions by which Viceroy Irwin could prevent Gandhi’s disobedience,” and the discussion of the letter forcing “the British reader to examine their potential ‘greed.’” The essay concludes as especially sophisticated as it began with an equally impressive control of language.
This essay opens with a promising discussion of the plight of “the black man” and the struggle for “everyday security and pursuit of happiness” taken on by Martin Luther King, Jr. but the connection between that historic movement and “the right for salt to be free of taxation” demonstrates an unevenness that continues throughout the essay. The second paragraph offers an analysis of the term “gravest” in which the student misunderstands Gandhi’s use (“to describe the character India will maintain in their nonviolent fight for independence”). It then makes an assertion that “Gandhi uses an ethos appeal to establish the credibility” of the independence movement but does not provide adequate support for the assertion, leaving the paragraph both uneven and limited. In the next paragraph, the student asserts that “Gandhi sneakily insults” Britain and then challenges them to do “the logical, right thing,” which does show potential for adequate analysis. However, the student does not develop the claim further but instead goes on to discuss diction, demonstrating more unevenness and limited development. There are several moments in the essay where the analysis approaches adequacy, as it identifies rhetorical choices that have the potential for explanation and development. However, the explanations and evidence are never fully developed, so this response remains uneven and limited.

There is a lot of content in this essay, but the response fails to offer any analysis of Gandhi’s rhetorical choices. The student instead substitutes the simpler task of offering a brief summary of the content of Gandhi’s letter. Each sentence is merely a declarative sentence about what the student believes are Gandhi’s intents in the letter (e.g., “Gandhi wouldn’t have any trouble to march alongside the co-workers of Ashram and disregard the Salt laws”). Despite its length, this essay is undeveloped, especially simplistic, and weak in its control of writing (e.g., “Gandhi choses to take as many risks as she can to make Britan’s colonial monopoly and taxation give salt”).