



AP[®] English Language and Composition 2013 Free-Response Questions

About the College Board

The College Board is a mission-driven not-for-profit organization that connects students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the College Board was created to expand access to higher education. Today, the membership association is made up of more than 6,000 of the world's leading educational institutions and is dedicated to promoting excellence and equity in education. Each year, the College Board helps more than seven million students prepare for a successful transition to college through programs and services in college readiness and college success — including the SAT[®] and the Advanced Placement Program[®]. The organization also serves the education community through research and advocacy on behalf of students, educators, and schools.

© 2013 The College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Central, SAT, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board. Admitted Class Evaluation Service and inspiring minds are trademarks owned by the College Board. All other products and services may be trademarks of their respective owners. Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.org. Permission to use copyrighted College Board materials may be requested online at: www.collegeboard.org/inquiry/cbpermit.html.

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

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



ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION

SECTION II

Total time—2 hours

Question 1

(Suggested time—40 minutes. This question counts for one-third of the total essay section score.)

The need to memorialize events or people is complex; in some cases, monuments honor moments of great achievement, while in other cases, monuments pay homage to deep sacrifice. A monument's size, location, and materials are all considerations in planning and creating a memorial to the past.

Read the following seven sources carefully, including the introductory information for each source. Then, in a well-organized essay that synthesizes at least three of the sources for support, examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument.

Make sure your argument is central; use the sources to illustrate and support your reasoning. Avoid merely summarizing the sources. Indicate clearly which sources you are drawing from, whether through direct quotation, paraphrase, or summary. You may cite the sources as Source A, Source B, etc., or by using the descriptions in parentheses.

Source A (Savage)

Source B (photo)

Source C (Downes)

Source D (Kosareff)

Source E (Musser)

Source F (Roadside America)

Source G (Lin)

Source A

Savage, Kirk. *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2009. Print.

The following is excerpted from a book on monuments in Washington, D.C.

There is no doubt that the modern state has been built on the mass circulation of the written word. Public monuments, by contrast, offer an anachronistic experience: a face-to-face encounter in a specially valued place set aside for collective gathering. . . . [T]he public monument speaks to a deep need for attachment that can be met only in a real place, where the imagined community actually materializes and the existence of the nation is confirmed in a simple but powerful way. The experience is not exactly in the realm of imagination or reason, but grounded in the felt connection of individual to collective body.

In this way the monumental core in Washington functions somewhat like a pilgrimage site, where communities of believers actually come together in the act of occupying a holy site, seeing a relic, reenacting a sacred event. The rhetoric of civil religion—pilgrimage, holy ground, sacred space—is often used to describe monumental Washington because it does seem to ring true. But we must not forget that in the disenchanted world of the modern secular nation, the monument is not, properly speaking, a sacred site. Typically it holds no relic or spiritual trace of a past presence. The site of the Lincoln Memorial, for instance, did not even exist in Lincoln’s lifetime; it sits quite literally on mud dredged from the Potomac River bottom in the late nineteenth century by the Army Corps of Engineers. The memorial itself contains no actual relic of Lincoln. It is pure representation—a colossal marble statue and the text of two speeches carved on enormous panels, all housed in a neoclassical temple One of those speeches, the Gettysburg Address, had already been reproduced ad infinitum in newspapers and readers and textbooks long before the monument was built. The major Union veterans’ organization had even sponsored a drive to put a bronze plaque carrying the full speech in schools and public places throughout the nation.

Why make a pilgrimage to a site with no historical significance to read a text that was already everywhere? The answer is simple: the monument manufactures its own aura. In the context of the Lincoln Memorial, the Gettysburg Address ceases to be a mere “mechanical reproduction” and becomes a treasure-piece by virtue of its hand carving in stone, at large scale, in a sequestered space, distinguished by lavish materials and aesthetic refinement. And the monument creates an actual, if temporary, community of readers, who must obey a particular decorum: they must stand at a certain distance to see the text panels in their entirety, which is not the way we ordinarily read—as photographers and filmmakers have observed to great effect Everything about the experience marks it as extraordinary and authoritative.

2013 AP[®] ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Source B

*The Christopher Columbus Monument in Riverside Park.
Express-Times file photo. Deegan, Jim. "A History
Lesson on Easton's Christopher Columbus
Monument." *Lehighvalleylive.com*. Lehigh Valley
Express-Times, 15 Jan. 2010. Web. 20 Dec. 2010.*

The following is a photo of a monument of Christopher Columbus in Riverside Park, Easton, Pennsylvania.



Express-Times/Landov

Source C

Downes, Lawrence. "Waiting for Crazy Horse."
New York Times. New York Times, 2 Sept. 2009.
Web. 20 Dec. 2010.

The following is excerpted from an online opinion article published in a major newspaper.

The carving of this South Dakota peak into a mounted likeness of Crazy Horse, the great Sioux leader, has been going on since 1948. It's a slow job. After all this time, only his face is complete. The rest—his broad chest and flowing hair, his outstretched arm, his horse—is still encased in stone. Someday, long after you are dead, it may finally emerge.

The memorial, outside Rapid City, is only a few miles from Mount Rushmore. Both are tributes to greatness. One is a federal monument and national icon, the other a solitary dream. A sculptor, Korczak Ziolkowski, worked at it alone for more than 30 years, roughing out the shape while acquiring a mighty beard and a large family. He died in 1982 and is buried in front of the mountain. His widow, Ruth, lives at the site and continues the mission with her many children.

I have to admit: Mount Rushmore bothers me. It was bad enough that white men drove the Sioux from hills they still hold sacred; did they have to carve faces all over them too? It's easy to feel affection for Mount Rushmore's strange grandeur, but only if you forget where it is and how it got there. To me, it's too close to graffiti.

The Crazy Horse Memorial has some of the same problems: it is most definitely an unnatural landmark. Some of the Indians I met in South Dakota voiced their own misgivings, starting with the fact that it presumes to depict a proud man who was never captured in a photograph or drawn from life.

Kelly Looking Horse, a Sioux artist I talked with as he sewed a skin drum at Mount Rushmore, said there were probably better ways to help Indians than a big statue. He also grumbled that many of the crafts for sale at the memorial were made by South Americans and Navajos and sold to people who wouldn't know the differences among Indian tribes, or care. Leatrice (Chick) Big Crow, who runs a Boys and Girls Club at the Pine Ridge Reservation, said she thought the memorial was one of those things that could go on swallowing money and effort forever.

But two other Sioux artists—Charlie Sitting Bull, a weaver of intricate beadwork, and Del Iron Cloud, a watercolorist—said they were grateful at least that the memorial gave them free space to show and sell their work. As for the loss of the Black Hills, Mr. Iron Cloud told me, without rancor, that there wasn't much to be done about it now.

Looking up at the mountain in the golden light of late afternoon, it was hard not to be impressed, even moved, by this effort to honor the memory of a people this country once tried mightily to erase. I came away reminded that eternity is not on our side. The nearby South Dakota Badlands, made of soft and crumbling sediment and ash, will be gone in a geological instant.

The day may sooner come when most human works have worn away as well. When all is lost to rust and rot, what remains may be two enormous granite oddities in the Great Plains: Four men's heads mysteriously huddled cheek to cheek—a forgotten album cover. And, far bigger, a full-formed Indian on a horse, his eyes ablaze, his long arm pointing out over his beloved Black Hills.

From The New York Times, 9/2/2009 © 2009 The New York Times. All rights reserved. Used by permission and protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States. The printing, copying, redistribution, or retransmission of this Content without express written permission is prohibited.

© 2013 The College Board.

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

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Source D

Kosareff, Jason. "Cemetery Faces an Uncertain Future."
Whittier Daily News 25 July 2004. Print.

The following is excerpted from an article published in a local newspaper.

ROSEMEAD—Grandma Mary Pallett must be turning in her grave. The bones of Pallet (1796-1889) and thousands of other San Gabriel Valley pioneers buried at **Savannah Memorial Park** could be moved to make way for a future development.

"Unless something happens and we get the money from somewhere, I don't know how we're going to make it," said Rosie Gutierrez, treasurer for the El Monte Cemetery Association, which owns the 4-acre graveyard at 9263 Valley Blvd.

The association has enough money to keep the place open at least two years, said Bob Bruesch, vice president of the association and a Garvey School District board member.

Developers have an eye for the cemetery site and the community of Asian businesses and residents nearby would like to see it gone because they think it brings bad luck, Bruesch added.

But Savannah is rich in history and should be preserved, Bruesch argues.

"The pioneers from the Santa Fe Trail would bring their dead along with them, preserved somehow, and bury them here," he said.

More than 3,000 graves fill the cemetery, dated as early as 1847. Bruesch said more graves are scattered under Valley Boulevard and beneath area businesses. The area also was an Indian burial ground before the corpses of settlers filled the place, Bruesch said.

Bruesch said the association would go for historical landmark status with the state, but fears a lack of resources to pull it off. If the cemetery was sold for development, the association or developer would have to move the graves to another location and notify every relative. That task could cost millions of dollars, Bruesch said.

The association has about 200 more plots it could sell for \$1,000 apiece, but it would not bring enough cash to keep Savannah running, Gutierrez said.

"I don't know what the solution is, I really don't," Gutierrez said. "It's going to take a city like Rosemead to take care of it."

"Cemetery faces an uncertain future" by Jason Kosareff, from *The Whittier Daily News*, copyright © 2004 by Steve Lambert. Used by permission.

Source E

Musser, Christine. "Preserving Memory: National Holocaust Memorial Museum Controversy."
Suite101.com. Suite101.com Media Inc., 30 Oct.
2008. Web. 20 Dec. 2010.

The following is excerpted from an article published on a Web site for freelance writers and journalists.

It had to be done, but is The Mall* in Washington, D.C. the proper place for a museum that is dedicated to victims and survivors of the Holocaust?

It is not surprising that immediate and intense controversy erupted when plans were publicized to build a Holocaust museum on The Mall in Washington, D.C. The controversy grew from Jewish and non-Jewish communities, primarily due to the fact that a museum dedicated to the memory of the Holocaust would be built in the United States, who did little to stop the Holocaust from occurring, or as one protester said, "Imagine a Holocaust museum in the town whose political sages refused to lift a finger to halt the Holocaust or open our shores to the few survivors! How offensive to any informed individual!"

As the controversy grew, the supporters of the museum felt that building a museum on The Mall would enhance The Mall's already diverse stories. For example, George Will, a political columnist, states, "No other nation has a broader, graver responsibility in the world . . . No other nation more needs citizens trained to look life in the face"

Holocaust Museum Design

The design of the building encouraged further controversy. Supporters did not want a duplicate of other buildings on The Mall, nor did they want something that would cause further anti-Semitism or to down play the atrocities of the Holocaust.

The Commission of Fine Arts refused the first design, stating the design was too "massive". The members of the commission felt the massive building would overcome The Mall and take away the main purpose of the museum, which was meant to be a place of remembrance and not to overpower The Mall or its visitors.

Albert Abraham was ready to scratch the design until he realized that the design could still work by downsizing it. Still not overly enthused by the design, it was approved by the Commission. Eventually the Commission would decide not to use Abraham's firm and asked James Ingo Freed to design the museum.

*The National Mall: a park in Washington, D.C., that stretches from the Lincoln Memorial to the United States Capitol. It contains a number of memorials, museums, and governmental buildings.

"Preserving Memory-National Holocaust Memorial Museum Controversy" by Christine Musser,
from *suite101.com*, copyright © 2008 by Christine Musser. Used by permission.

Source F

“Obscure Monument to Lobsterdom: Washington, DC.”
RoadsideAmerica.com. Roadside America, n.d.
Web. 20 Dec. 2010.

The following is an entry in an online guide to offbeat tourist attractions.

Washington, DC

H. Elroy Johnson made money trapping lobsters and lived in Harpswell, Maine. In 1939 he posed for a sculpture titled “The Maine Lobsterman,” kneeling before his favorite crustacean while pegging its claw. The sculpture was supposed to be cast in bronze and made part of the Maine exhibit at the 1939 New York World’s Fair. But Maine ran out of money, so the artist just slapped a coat of bronze paint over the plaster model and shipped it to New York. After the Fair ended, the fake bronze statue returned to Maine and spent several decades being moved from city hall to museum to museum. No one seemed to want the man and his lobster. The statue was vandalized, repaired, and ended up in a warehouse where it was **eaten by rats**.

It wasn’t until poor H. Elroy Johnson died that a bronze cast was finally made of the statue, and eight years after that (1981) it was moved to Washington, DC and dedicated in 1983. It was donated by the Camp Fire Girls of Cundys Harbor, Maine, and reportedly cost \$30,000.

A close inspection may reveal tooth marks, but we aren’t promising anything.

RoadsideAmerica.com

2013 AP[®] ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Source G

Lin, Maya. "Making the Memorial." *New York Review of Books*. NYREV, Inc., 2 Nov. 2000. Web. 5 July 2011.

The following is excerpted from an online article by Maya Lin, designer of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C.

The use of names was a way to bring back everything someone could remember about a person. The strength in a name is something that has always made me wonder at the "abstraction" of the design; the ability of a name to bring back every single memory you have of that person is far more realistic and specific and much more comprehensive than a still photograph, which captures a specific moment in time or a single event or a generalized image that may or may not be moving for all who have connections to that time.

Then someone in the class [an architectural seminar Lin took during her senior year at Yale University] received the design program, which stated the basic philosophy of the memorial's design and also its requirements: all the names of those missing and killed (57,000) must be a part of the memorial; the design must be apolitical, harmonious with the site, and conciliatory.

These were all the thoughts that were in my mind before I went to see the site.

Without having seen it, I couldn't design the memorial, so a few of us traveled to Washington, D.C., and it was at the site that the idea for the design took shape. The site was a beautiful park surrounded by trees, with traffic and noise coming from one side—Constitution Avenue.

I had a simple impulse to cut into the earth.

I imagined taking a knife and cutting into the earth, opening it up, an initial violence and pain that in time would heal. The grass would grow back, but the initial cut would remain a pure flat surface in the earth with a polished, mirrored surface, much like the surface on a geode when you cut it and polish the edge. The need for the names to be on the memorial would become the memorial; there was no need to embellish the design further. The people and their names would allow everyone to respond and remember.

It would be an interface, between our world and the quieter, darker, more peaceful world beyond. I chose black granite in order to make the surface reflective and peaceful. I never looked at the memorial as a wall, an object, but as an edge to the earth, an opened side. The mirrored effect would double the size of the park, creating two worlds, one we are a part of and one we cannot enter. The two walls were positioned so that one pointed to the Lincoln Memorial and the other pointed to the Washington Monument. By linking these two strong symbols for the country, I wanted to create a unity between the nation's past and present.

The idea of destroying the park to create something that by its very nature should commemorate life seemed hypocritical, nor was it in my nature. I wanted my design to work with the land, to make something with the site, not to fight it or dominate it. I see my works and their relationship to the landscape as being an additive rather than a combative process.

Reprinted with the permission of Simon & Schuster, Inc., from *BOUNDARIES* by Maya Lin.

Copyright © 2000 by Maya Lin Studio Inc. All rights reserved.

© 2013 The College Board.

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

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

AP[®] ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION

2013 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1

The essay score should reflect the essay's quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 15 minutes to read the sources and 40 minutes to write; the paper, therefore, is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. Evaluate the paper as a draft, making certain to reward students for what they do well.

All essays, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional lapses in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into a holistic evaluation of an essay's overall quality. In no case should an essay with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics score higher than a 2.

- 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 development, or impressive in their control of language.

8 – Effective

Essays earning a score of 8 **effectively** examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument. They develop their argument by effectively synthesizing* at least three of the sources. The evidence and explanations used are appropriate and convincing. 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** examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument. They develop their argument by adequately synthesizing at least three of the sources. The evidence and explanations used are appropriate and sufficient. The language may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.

- 5 Essays earning a score of 5 examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument. They develop their argument by synthesizing at least three sources, but how they use and explain sources is somewhat uneven, inconsistent, or limited. The writer's argument is generally clear, and the sources generally develop the writer's position, but the links between the sources and the argument may be strained. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the student's ideas.

AP[®] ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION

2013 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 (continued)

4 – Inadequate

Essays earning a score of 4 **inadequately** examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument. They develop their argument by synthesizing at least two sources, but the evidence or explanations used may be inappropriate, insufficient, or unconvincing. The sources may dominate the essay's attempts at development, the link between the argument and the sources may be weak, or the student may misunderstand, misrepresent, or oversimplify the sources. 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 examining the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument. They are less perceptive in their understanding of the sources, or their explanation or examples 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 examining the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument. They may merely allude to knowledge gained from reading the sources rather than cite the sources themselves. These essays may misread the sources, fail to develop a position, or substitute a simpler task by merely summarizing or categorizing the sources or by merely responding to the prompt tangentially with unrelated, inaccurate, or inappropriate explanation. Essays that score 2 often demonstrate 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, weak in their control of writing, or do not allude to or cite even one source.
- 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, synthesis means using sources to develop a position and citing them accurately.

Sample 1A

There are many ways to memorialize a person or event. One can write a song, piece together a scrapbook, or design a monument to commemorate a special person or an important event. A monument, through careful consideration of its location, size, material, and purpose, can effectively pay homage to deep sacrifices or honor moments of great achievement.

When a group or agency first contemplates memorializing an event or person through a monument, they should consider the location. A beautiful park or a place held close to the person's heart can elevate the meaning of the monument. A monument of Christopher Columbus stands tall in Riverside Park in Easton, Pennsylvania (Source B). Seeing his monument while strolling under the trees on a sunny day in Riverside Park makes one remember the important role Christopher Columbus had in American history. If his monument were located behind an abandoned building or amongst a cluster of billboards and other signs, people would not consider his importance as beautiful and inspiring. When contemplating where to build a museum to commemorate the Holocaust, many individuals were furious with the plans for a Holocaust museum being built on The Mall in Washington, D.C. (Source E). Protesters questioned why "a museum dedicated to the memory of the Holocaust would be built in the United States, who did little to stop the Holocaust from occurring" (Source E). Thus, a group or agency must consider that The Mall in Washington, D.C. has no significant importance when considering building a monument to anyone affected by the Holocaust. It is important to consider the location in order to properly memorialize an event or person.

Once a location has been determined, the size and material for the monument must be planned. The size of a monument or museum is important to ensure that the person or event being commemorated gets the proper amount of remembrance. After the decision to build a Holocaust Museum in The Mall in Washington, D.C. was made, protesters began debating that the design plan was too large (Source E). The purpose of the museum was to remember the Holocaust, "not to overpower the Mall or its visitors" (Source F). By downsizing the museum, they were able to create a place of remembrance without overpowering the other memorials and monuments in The Mall. The material of a monument can also help provide the right sense of remembrance. When designing the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C., Maya Lin put much thought into the material of the monument. She chose "black granite in order to make the surface reflective and peaceful" (Source(s)). The mirroring effect of the granite helped to create a world of reality and a world of remembrance. Her choice of material helps to complete the feeling of sorrow while remembering the bravery of those who served in Vietnam. The material and size of a memorial can greatly change the feeling of remembrance and its effect on those paying homage to an event or person.

When considering memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument, the message a group or agency is trying to portray through the monument should be considered. When designing the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Maya Lin decided to create a wall of names set into the ground. It was important to commemorate those who lost their lives in Vietnam, and she felt the best way to remember everything about each individual person was engraving their name into a wall. This allows people to remember everything about the person rather than just one instance, as a picture does (Source G). When constructing the monument for Crazy Horse, the sculptors decided to have him "pointing over his homeland, the Black Hills" (Source C). This commemorates the great accomplishments Crazy Horse had in the Black Hills while communicating his love for them (Source C). The message a monument displays is very important in the remembrance of that person or event. When designing a monument to communicate about a person or significant event, the location, size, material, and purpose of the monument should be considered.

Sample 1B

Monuments are structures that honor great moments, immortalizing the memory in granite and stone. They are truly everywhere - these manmade structures can be found in parks, nestled in mountains, and standing next to great historical places. However, one cannot just create a monument and expect it to "stand" without consideration. What factors must be considered? If a group or agency decides to try to immortalize an event or person in a monument, they should consider the following: The monument should represent something meaningful, should be there for remembrance, and should work with the surrounding landscape, not destroy it.

In history, there have been some monuments created that were not treated well, perhaps because they did not have a profound impact on people viewing the structure. A certain Lt. Elroy Johnson posed for a sculpture named "The Maine Lobsterman" (Roadside America). This sculpture was to be cast in bronze and displayed at the 1939 New York World's Fair, but due to money issues, this could not be completed. Instead, the statue was coated in bronze paint. Over the years, the statue was neglected and slowly became destroyed. It was vandalized and eaten by rats. Obviously, people lacked respect for this object. Why? It is because it was only meaningful to a select few people. When creating monuments, you must be willing to care for it - keep it in a place where it is appreciated. Otherwise, it will not be cared about.

It is evident that the monuments created should also be there to spark one's memory, to stand as a great reminder of the past. A sculptor named Korczak Ziolkowski made an icon of Crazy Horse, an influential Sioux leader. (Downes) Downes says, "...it was hard not to be impressed, even moved, by this effort to honor the memory of a people this country once tried mightily to erase." Even in that quote, the word "memory" is used. This monument may offend some people, but honestly, it serves its purpose: It is a reminder of this country's past... One that will not be easily forgotten.

Lastly, the monument should not disturb any of the nature that was there before it. It should work harmoniously with the land. The nature and monument itself should work together to bring out the best qualities in each other. In Source G, Maya Lin says, "The idea of destroying the park to create something that by its very nature should commemorate life seemed hypocritical, nor was it in my nature," in reference to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. She also said, "I wanted my design to work with the land, to make something with the site, not to fight it or dominate it." It is clear that Lin has great respect for nature, which is both admirable and thoughtful. She creates a monument which not only coincides with nature but is also extremely meaningful and is an immortalized memory of the past.

So, in conclusion, there are undoubtedly many other things to keep in mind when considering creating a monument. But, the most important things are that first off, the monument should be meaningful. It should be looked upon in awe and satisfaction, making people reflect not only on the monument but on themselves. Second, the monument should be memorable. It should have a great connection with the past and have the ability to be remembered far into the future. And last, the monument should work with nature to create something beautiful and unique with the land.

Sample 1C

As you tour the country, monuments and memorials are scattered everywhere. They are important because they remind Americans of the past and how far America has progressed. However, the government does not need to spend an excessive amount of money on memorials and monuments. In some cases, the monuments and memorials don't bring emotion to people; it's all personal.

Memorials and monuments don't have meaning if the person has no personal relationship or experience with the event or person. For example, the Lincoln Memorial has no importance to some. "It holds no relic or spiritual trace of a past presence", the Lincoln Memorial "did not even exist in his lifetime." (Source 4) It sits there on mud from the Potomac River Valley since the late 19th century; it is pure representation. Why waste money on something most Americans don't appreciate? "The people and their names would allow everyone to respond and remember." (Source G) "Memorials and monuments don't show appreciation any greater than an individual who educates oneself about an event that means something to them.

Also, money is wasted on the location and the production of the monument. Surprisingly, there is "a Holocaust museum in the town whose political sages refused to lift a finger to halt the Holocaust or open our shores to the few survivors." (Source E) The museum is located in the Washington D.C mall which angered many people, not only did the USA not help during the Holocaust, but now America decides to put the museum in a mall. Having monuments and memorials can sometimes cause more harm than good. Maya Lin, the designer of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, did a fantastic job in designing the memorial so Americans can enjoy and appreciate the veterans of the war without the thought of the money and damage problem. To build a monument that would "destroy the park" would be "hypocritical." (Source G) Monuments are built to remind us of how far we have come, and to give thanks to all those who have sacrificed, but we shouldn't damage the earth by doing so.

Simply, remembering names and educating ourselves about events and people would show more appreciation. Monuments and memorials are wonderful things to an extent, but they can cause more harm than good. Monuments and memorials need to be toned down and built with more emotion that relates to people.

AP[®] ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION

2013 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 1

Overview

Question 1 provided students with seven sources to draw from in composing essays that “examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument.” Students were instructed to respond to the prompt with an **argument** supported by a synthesis of material from at least three of the sources. Students were also required to clearly and accurately cite the sources they used in formulating their responses.

As always, this year’s synthesis question asked students to integrate reading and writing skills. Students had to read and comprehend six verbal texts and one pictorial text and consider how these texts might constitute a “conversation” about the question posed by the prompt. Next, students had to **use** the sources to help them formulate their own arguments in response to the question. While the direction to “examine the factors” might not seem to call for an argument, the prompt clarifies the argumentative task with the verb “should consider.” Students’ arguments, in other words, had to take a position on the responsibilities a group or agency must take into consideration when undertaking the two-fold task of deciding who or what to memorialize *and* how to memorialize this subject. Students had to substantiate their positions with information or perspectives offered in at least three of the sources; they were also free to draw from their own experiences and observations to supplement their use of sources to explain and support their positions. Finally, students had to demonstrate responsible attribution skills by clearly identifying the sources of material they used to help them formulate their responses. The direction to “use the sources to illustrate and support your reasoning” was intended to underscore the centrality of the student’s own argument in the synthesis essay. “Using” sources entails more than simply quoting or paraphrasing and citing sources and surrendering responsibility for formulating an argument to the sources themselves.

Sample: 1A

Score: 8

The student develops an effective argument that examines three key factors (location, size, and material) a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument in order to “effectively pay homage to deep sacrifice or honor moments of great achievement.” The sources selected illustrate a critical understanding of each source’s position, allowing the student to convincingly engage the sources to facilitate the student’s own argument. For example, in the first body paragraph, the student argues that it was a good decision to place the statue of Christopher Columbus in a serene location in order to invite reflection on the “important role Christopher Columbus had in American history” rather than “behind an abandoned building or amongst a cluster of billboards” that would have robbed people of the opportunity to be inspired by Columbus’ contributions. The student proceeds to effectively contrast the appropriateness of the location of Columbus’ statue with the placement of the Holocaust Memorial Museum within the boundaries of the United States since Americans did little to stop the atrocities. Likewise, in the second body paragraph, the student compares the decision to downsize the Holocaust Memorial Museum with Maya Lin’s thoughtful choice of materials for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to demonstrate the importance of considering the “effect on those paying omage [*sic*] to an event or person.” The student’s final paragraph rounds out a fully developed essay emphasizing, once again, the importance of the message portrayed by a monument, bringing back a connection to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and adding an explanation of how the design of the statue of Crazy Horse “commemorates the great accomplishments Crazy Horse had in the Black Hills while commemorating his love for them.” The sources are clearly cited, and source material is smoothly integrated into the student’s own prose. The essay earned an 8 for its effective argument, appropriate synthesis of sources, and consistent ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing, as particularly evidenced in its coherence and transitions.

AP[®] ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION

2013 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 1 (continued)

Sample: 1B

Score: 5

The student opens the essay with some description of the prevalence of monuments that immortalize “memory in granite and stone,” then proceeds to identify three key factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument: meaningful representation, purposeful intention of remembrance, and smooth incorporation within the “surrounding landscape.” Although essays scoring in the upper range do sometimes use each factor as an organizing element, the links between the factors and paragraphs in this essay are strained, and the formulaic structure keeps the essay from adequately developing the student’s argument. The essay is unevenly developed, moving in and out of focus in each paragraph, and sometimes making unsubstantiated claims, as in the second paragraph, where the student notes that the reason the H. Elroy Johnson statue was neglected was “because this is only meaningful to a select few people.” Likewise, the paragraph about memory contains mostly summary of a single source and presents a vague commentary that while the statue of Crazy Horse “may offend some people,” it serves a purpose. The student brings the essay back into focus in discussing the importance of a monument working “harmoniously with the land” but relies on lengthy quotations rather than on the student’s own commentary in developing the argument. Although the student uses at least three sources and cites them appropriately, the essay earned a 5 for its inability to synthesize the sources in the service of the student’s argument and for its uneven explanation of how the sources contribute to the student’s examination of the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument.

Sample: 1C

Score: 2

The student demonstrates little success in developing a position on the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument, choosing instead to open the essay by questioning the government’s rationale for creating monuments because of the “excessive amounts of money” spent and the idea that “monuments and memorials don’t bring emotion to people.” In the second paragraph, the student simplistically argues that the Lincoln Memorial “has no importance to some” because it sits on old mud from the Potomac River Valley, a piece of evidence drawn almost word for word from Source A without any attribution. The student continues to examine only one side of the task (creation of monuments) in the third paragraph by contrasting the waste associated with building the Holocaust Memorial Museum because it “angered many people” with the “fantastic job” Maya Lin did in designing the Vietnam Veterans Memorial because it did not “damage the earth.” The student consistently struggles to use and cite sources in the service of an argument. The essay earned a 2 for its misreading of sources, simplistic argument, and consistent weaknesses in writing, particularly in its lack of development and control.