

**NEW YORK STATE
COMPONENT RETEST**

**ENGLISH
COMPONENT B
MODULE 5**

FRIDAY, MAY 19, 2006

RATING GUIDE

Reading and Writing for Critical Analysis: (Component B: Modules 4 and 5)

Quality	4	3	2	1
	Responses at this level:	Responses at this level:	Responses at this level:	Responses at this level:
<p>Meaning: the extent to which the response exhibits sound understanding, interpretations, and analysis of the task and text(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —provide an interpretation of the critical lens that is faithful to the complexity of the statement and clearly establishes the criteria for analysis —use the criteria to make a clear and reasoned analysis of the chosen text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —provide a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens that establishes the criteria for analysis —make implicit connections between criteria and the chosen text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —provide a simple or incomplete interpretation of the critical lens —allude to the critical lens, making superficial connections to analyze the chosen text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —provide a confused interpretation of the critical lens or do not refer to the critical lens —reflect minimal or no analysis of the chosen text
<p>Development: the extent to which ideas are elaborated using specific and relevant evidence from the text(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —develop ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements from the text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —develop some ideas more fully than others, with some references to specific and relevant evidence and appropriate literary elements from the text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —develop ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text —may rely primarily on plot summary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —show minimal or no evidence of development
<p>Organization: the extent to which the response exhibits direction, shape, and coherence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —maintain the focus established by the critical lens —exhibit a logical and coherent structure through use of appropriate devices and transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —maintain a clear and appropriate focus —exhibit a logical sequence of ideas but may lack internal consistency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —lack an appropriate focus but suggest some organization, OR suggest a focus but lack organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —show minimal or no focus or organization
<p>Language Use: the extent to which the response reveals an awareness of audience and purpose through effective use of words, sentence structure, and sentence variety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —use language that is precise, with a sense of voice and evident awareness of audience and purpose —vary structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —use appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose —occasionally make effective use of sentence structure or length 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —use language that is basic or unsuitable, with little awareness of audience or purpose —attempt to vary sentence structure, with little success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —use language that is minimal, incoherent, or inappropriate
<p>Conventions: the extent to which the response exhibits conventional spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and usage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —demonstrate control of conventions, exhibiting only occasional errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —demonstrate partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors that may hinder comprehension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting frequent errors that may make comprehension difficult 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable —may be illegible or not recognizable as English

A response that is only a personal response and makes no reference to the text(s) can be scored no higher than a 1.

A response totally unrelated to the topic, illegible, incoherent, or blank should be scored a 0.

A response totally copied from the text(s) with no original student writing should be scored a 0.

Your Task: Write a critical essay in which you discuss *one* work of literature you have read from the particular perspective of the statement provided for you in the **Critical Lens**. In your essay, provide a valid interpretation of the statement, agree or disagree with the statement as you have interpreted it, and support your opinion using specific references to appropriate literary elements from the literary work you have selected. **You only need to submit a first draft of the essay.** Write your response in the space provided in your answer booklet.

Critical Lens:

“The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause.” William James

Guidelines:

Be sure to:

- Provide a valid interpretation of the critical lens that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis
- Indicate whether you agree *or* disagree with the statement as you have interpreted it
- Choose *one* work you have read that you believe best supports your opinion
- Use the criteria suggested by the critical lens to analyze the work you have chosen
- Avoid plot summary. Instead, use specific references to appropriate literary elements (for example, theme, characterization, setting, point of view) to develop your analysis
- Organize your ideas in a unified and coherent manner
- Specify the title and author of the literary work you have chosen
- Follow the conventions of standard written English

Where good and evil are concerned, there is no definite line; there is a great deal of gray area in between. However, William James has said that "the difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause." So what someone does is one matter, but why he does it defines whether ~~what he did can be~~ or not he is good or bad. The young man who commits the crime in Dostoyevsky's novel, *Crime and Punishment*, is such an example. While his crime may be what it is, a crime, it is argued that the reasons for him committing the crime are good.

The young man, Raskolnikov, murders an old woman who pawned things that people sold her. This murder had been planned by him for quite a bit of time; planned and reasoned out. However, he ends up killing the sister of the woman as well. Now this whole thing may seem to be a blatant crime, but after it (for the event takes place in the beginning of the novel), Dostoyevsky writes it so that the reader does not make Raskolnikov out to be the bad person at all.

Much of the book takes place inside Raskolnikov's head, and the reader is given insight to his thoughts and attempts to reason

with himself ^{as to} why the crime ^{is} justified. He explains that the old woman was a parasite in society, and so by ridding society of her, he ^{has} actually ~~does~~ done society a favor.

Raskolnikov argues his point well, and not only to himself either. He discusses this type of reasoning with the head of the police, Porfiry, as well. For as a student, he had written a paper on the nature of crime and the people who committed them. ~~And as any~~ ~~suspect~~ ~~person~~ ~~would~~ ~~be,~~ Raskolnikov is suspicious. In it, he argues that there are certain kinds of people who are above everyone else, and will always have the justified reasons for committing any sort of crime, and through that, will still be "good", and extraordinary, separated from the rest of the human race.

After committing the crime, Raskolnikov ~~did~~ does not even take the money for himself; ^(he stashes it all under a rock) so it really is as if he has done the deed all for the sake of society. And because of the sort of person he is, he would still be deemed a good person by the rest of his actions, to his family, friends, and even strangers who later turn

out to be friends. So despite the fact that Raskolnikov
had committed such a crime that would normally be said to have
been done by a bad person, he still comes out as good because ^{of} his
reasons.

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 4

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides an interpretation of the critical lens that is faithful to the complexity of the statement, explaining that <i>what someone does is one matter, but why he does it defines whether he is good or bad</i>. The response uses this criteria to make a clear and reasoned analysis of <i>Crime and Punishment</i> (<i>While his crime may be what it is, a crime, it is argued that the reasons for him committing the crime are good</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully, showing how a person can justify a bad act if the reasons for committing the act are perceived as good. The response makes effective use of relevant and specific evidence (<i>He explains that the old woman was a parasite in society, and so by ridding society of her, he has actually done society a favor and Raskolnikov does not even take the money for himself</i>), implying point of view as the literary element (<i>Much of the book takes place inside Raskolnikov's head, and the reader is given insight to his thoughts and attempts to reason with himself</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains the focus established by the critical lens that <i>despite the fact that Raskolnikov had committed such a crime that would normally be said to have been done by a bad person, he still comes out as good because of his reasons</i>. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure, first discussing Raskolnikov's crime and then explaining why he is still perceived, by himself and others, as a good person.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is precise (<i>Where good and evil are concerned, there is no definite line; there is a great deal of gray area in between</i>), with evident awareness of audience and purpose (<i>Now this whole thing may seem to be a blatant crime, but after it...Dostoyevsky writes it so that the reader does not make Raskolnikov out to be the bad person at all</i>). The response varies sentence structure or length to enhance meaning (<i>Raskolnikov argues his point well, and not only to himself either</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting only occasional errors in punctuation (missing comma).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.</p>	

"The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause." This quotation by William James illustrates the fact that the right decision, when made for the wrong reasons, can be a wrong decision. "Good" is an ambiguous term that can be defined differently by each individual. Two different people may perform the same action, and yet one may have thought of themselves as "bad," while the other thinks of himself as "good." I agree with this statement, as I have seen it proved through ^{out} my literary repertoire.

One literary work where I have seen this statement proved is in Time of the Twins by Margaret Weis. In this book, the central themes are ignorance and arrogance. In the city of Istar, the King priest continually abuses his power, ignorant of the growing anger among the gods. From the point of view of the King priest, the King priest is doing what is best for world (creating the

the gods help him vanquish all evil). Thus, the Kingpriest, along with his followers, think of him as a "good" man. However, the gods see the Kingpriest as "bad," as a man who vies to upset the balance between good and evil. The gods try to foreshadow the destruction of Istar with violent storms and unusually large hail. However, the Kingpriest is completely blind to the signs; he thinks that some mysterious evil force is at work. Sure enough, the Kingpriest asks the gods to help him vanquish evil, and the gods throw a mountain down on top of Istar, destroying the city and forever changing the world. Thus, Time of the Twins illustrates the fact that there are different perspectives on "good" and "bad" and that the difference between the two boils down to the cause behind the action.

Therefore, "good" is relative, and ignorance can alter one's viewpoint of what is "good." Someone who does not know much about a certain subject can not accurately,

judge how well they perform in that subject. Someone who does not know English couldn't possibly define the quality of this essay. Being "good" occurs when someone does something that is "good" in their mind. It is only when one purposely hurts another or is consciously "evil" that they ~~see~~ themselves are "evil."

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 3 - A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, explaining that <i>the right decision, when made for the wrong reasons, can be a wrong decision</i>. The response makes connections between the criteria and <i>Time of the Twins</i> (<i>Time of the Twins illustrates the fact that there are different perspectives on “good” and “bad,” and that the difference between the two boils down to the cause behind the action</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas (good and bad are relative to one’s point of view) more fully than others (one who does not know the situation can not judge another’s actions accurately). The response explains how the <i>central themes</i> of <i>ignorance and arrogance</i> show character’s differing <i>perspectives on “good” and “bad”</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the Kingpriest’s ignorance in his choice of action. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, interpreting the critical lens, describing the Kingpriest’s choice of action and the repercussions, and summarizing in a conclusion.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language, with an awareness of audience and purpose (<i>One literary work where I have seen this statement proved is in Time of the Twins by Margaret Weis</i>). The response makes effective use of sentence structure and length (<i>However, the Kingpriest is completely blind to the signs; he thinks that some mysterious evil force is at work</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting only occasional errors in grammar (<i>someone...their and when one...that they</i>).</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.</p>

Through many works of literature, authors have demonstrated many differences between a good man and a bad man. Often times, the "good man" has positive beliefs, and has taken certain actions which has lead to wheather they are a good or bad person. In the novel "To Kill a Mockingbird" by Harper Lee, Atticus demonstrates that he is a good man by a choice of the cause.

Throughout the novel "To Kill a Mockingbird", Atticus has proven to both the town and his family that he is not a racist person. Atticus first shows this when he doesn't follow the beliefs of the rest of the society. By teaching his children that racism is not

a good quality to have, this shows that he has positive values and morals. Atticus is strong in his efforts to try to stop racism in his lifestyle. Another way Atticus proves himself not to be racist is when he agrees to defend Tom Robinson in his trial. Atticus had to try to prove to the judge and the rest of the court that Tom Robinson did not rape Mayella Ewell. What made this particularly difficult was that Tom Robinson was black, and Mayella was a white woman. Since the courtroom was segregated between blacks and white, Atticus had to do his best to try to eliminate racism from both the trial and the judge's decision. In both the

Tan Robinson trial, and his teachings to his children, Atticus Finch is a good man for his efforts in trying to eliminate racism in society.

Harper Lee demonstrates in the novel "To Kill a Mockingbird", that Atticus Finch is a good man by choice of cause. Atticus falls in this category because of his morals and in his actions he made throughout the novel. In most novels, authors demonstrate many differences between a good man and a bad man.

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 3 - B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, explaining that in <i>many works of Literature, authors have demonstrated many differences between a good man and a bad man</i> and a “good man” has positive beliefs . The response makes connections between the criteria and <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> (In the novel “<i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i>” by Harper Lee, Atticus demonstrates that he is a good man by a choice of the cause).</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas (the Robinson trial) more fully than others (teaching his children about racism). The response explains Atticus Finch’s characterization as a good man because he opposes racism (<i>Atticus has proven to both the town and his family that he is not a racist person and Finch is a good man for his efforts in trying to eliminate racism in society</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a focus on Atticus Finch’s opposition to racism, but some reliance on plot summary detracts from the focus. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, interpreting the critical lens, discussing Finch’s characterization as a good man through his cause, and summarizing in a conclusion.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose (<i>By teaching his children that racism is not a good Quality to have, this shows that he has positive values and morals</i>). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure or length to enhance meaning (<i>What made this particularly difficult was that Tom Robinson was Black, and Mayella was a white woman</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting only occasional errors in spelling (<i>particularly and wheather</i>), punctuation (missing apostrophe), capitalization, and grammar (<i>between blacks and white</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities.</p>	

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A GOOD MAN AND A BAD
ONE IS THE CHOICE OF THE CAUSE. THIS STATEMENT
SAID BY WILLIAM JAMES CAN BE PROVEN THROUGH THE
CHARACTERIZATION OF MACBETH IN THE NOVEL
MACBETH BY WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

MACBETH'S CHOICE TO KILL KING DONALD
MADE HIM A BAD GUY AND HIS LUST FOR MORE
POWER DROVE HIM AWAY FROM BEING A WELL
LOOKED NOBLEMAN. HIS CAUSE TO KILL THE
KING TURNED ON EVERYTHING HE BELIEVED IN AND
MADE HIM THE WORST POSSIBLE PERSON. HE
WENT FROM THE HERO TO THE HATED BY HIS
CHOICES AND HIS LIFE FLIPPED UPSIDE DOWN THE
NIGHT HE KILLED KING DONALD IN MACBETH'S
OWN CASTLE. MACBETH WAS SATISFIED
WITH BEING NOBLEMAN BUT GREED AND LUST
GOT THE BETTER OF HIM.

MACBETH BY WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE
WAS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF WILLIAM JAMES
QUOTE ABOUT HOW A GOOD MAN WHO WAS
A NOBLESMAN (MACBETH) COULD TURN INTO SUCH
A BAD MAN BY CHOOSING TO KILL A WELL
LIKED KING. HIS CHOICE TO BECOME BAD TURNED
HIM SURD A WHOLE NEW CAUSE OF JUST TRYING
TO STAY ALIVE. GOOD MEN ~~BE~~ BECOME BAD
BY TAKING THE WRONG PATHS AND ULTIMATELY
THEIR CHOICES MIGHT NOT BE FOR THE RIGHT
CAUSE.

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 3 - C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, explaining that <i>good men become bad by taking the wrong paths and ultimately their choices might not be for the right cause</i>. The response makes implicit connections between the criteria and <i>Macbeth</i> (<i>His cause to kill the king turned on everything he believed in and made him the worst possible person</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text (<i>Macbeth was satisfied with being nobleman but greed and lust got the better of him</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains an appropriate focus on the characterization of Macbeth as a good man turned bad (<i>He went from the hero to the hated by his choices</i>), but lacks internal consistency. The response suggests organization through paragraphing.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate and occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure or length [<i>Macbeth...was a perfect example of William James quote about how a good man who was a nobleman (Macbeth) could turn into such a bad man by choosing to kill a well liked king</i>].</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>fliped</i> and <i>ultimatly</i>), punctuation (missing apostrophe and missing hyphen), capitalization, grammar (<i>satisfied with being nobleman</i>), and usage (<i>threw</i> for “through” and <i>nobleman</i> for “nobleman”).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat weaker in development and organization.</p>	

The quote "The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause," by William James means that there is only one difference between good and bad people, that one difference is their choices. People choose their paths in life, and some of those paths are bright and sunny and others are a vast wasteland.

I agree with this statement. I think even if people have different backgrounds, their choices are what leads them along. People have dragged themselves up from the poor, ghettos of America and made themselves great.

I have recently read a story called Frankenstein, by Mary Shelley. This is a story about a grotesque creature made out of parts of dead men. The creator of the monster Victor Frankenstein, abandoned his creation after it's assembly. The creature made choices

on his own. Even though he was unaware of everything around him, He chose to help out a family in need, and help for his creator at his death. Although the monster made some bad choices, he ultimately was a good soul.

As the quote says, the difference between a good vs. bad person is their choices.

The monster chose to do right things even on limited knowledge, because he chose the right things, he was considered a friend to the captain of the ship that was trapped at the North pole.

Every person has the ability to control their destinies. Many people just make wrong decisions without thinking. But it is never too late, you can always right the wrong over time and the right choices can change your life.

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 2 - A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>there is only one difference between good and bad people, that one difference is their choices</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the criteria and <i>Frankenstein</i> (<i>The monster chose to do right things even on limited knowledge</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text (<i>He chose to help out a family in need, and weep for his creator at his death and because he chose the right things, he was considered a friend to the captain of the ship</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on the difference between a good and a bad person. The response suggests organization, with a paragraph addressing the critical lens, a brief discussion of <i>Frankenstein</i>, and a conclusion.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is basic (<i>I agree with this statement and I have recently read a story called Frankenstein, by Mary Shelley</i>), with little awareness of audience or purpose. The response attempts to vary sentence structure, with little success (<i>Even though he was unaware of everything around him</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting only occasional errors in spelling (<i>ultimately</i>), punctuation (inappropriate apostrophes and comma splices), capitalization (<i>Their</i> and <i>North pole</i>) that may hinder comprehension.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.</p>

"The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause," by William Jones, I agree with this statement.

A good man will chose good decisions. A bad man will chose bad choses.

In "Of Mice and Men" ^{by John Steinbeck} George has to make a decision whether to

kill Lennie or let him live. Lennie is a guy that is mentally challenged.

He killed a girl on the farm he was working/living at. He does not

know his own strength. George had to kill him because

it was the second girl that Lennie killed. If George did not

kill him the other farm hands and the master would kill both of

them.

George could not live with Lennie much longer. He was a good

guy but was very dangerous when it came to a fight. George did

the right thing. Lennie was not going to suffer ~~any more~~ anymore.

George Lennie was a good man and hard worker. George told Lennie's "uncle"

that he would take care of him if she died.

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 2 - B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>A good man will chose good decsions. A bad man will chose bad choses</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the criteria and <i>Of Mice And Men</i> (<i>George has to make a decsion weather to kill Lennie or let him live and George did the right thing</i>).
Development	Develops ideas briefly, relying primarily on plot summary (<i>George had to kill him because it was the second girl that Lennie killed. If George did not kill him the other farm hands and there master would kill both of them</i>).
Organization	Lacks an appropriate focus, but suggests organization through <u>paragraghing</u> .
Language Use	Uses language that is basic (<i>Lennie is a guy that is mentaly challenged</i>), with little awareness of audience or purpose. The response makes few attempts to vary sentence structure or length for effect.
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>decsions, choses, mentaly</i>), punctuation (missing comma and missing apostrophe), and usage (<i>chose</i> for “choose”, <i>weather</i> for “whether”, <i>there</i> for “their”) that may make comprehension difficult.
Conclusion:	Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2 in all qualities.

"The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause" a quote by William James. This quote applies to a book called Beowulf by Robert Nye is the story the main character Beowulf is called to kill a monster that is terrorizing a kingdom Beowulf kills the monster and it's mother. This story and the quote have a similar theme Beowulf knows that it is wrong to kill he he is not a bad man for killing the monster Grendel and his mother. I agree with the quote because it does depend on the situation on whether the man is good or bad for his decision.

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 2 - C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>it does depend on the situation on whether the man is good or bad for his decision</i>). The response makes a superficial connection between the criteria and <i>Beowulf</i> (<i>This story and the quote have a similar theme Beowulf knows that it is wrong to kill because he is not a bad man for killing the monster Grendel and his mother</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, relying primarily on plot summary (<i>Beowulf is called to kill a monster that is terrorizing a kingdom. Beowulf kills the monster and its mother</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on the idea that a man can be good in spite of committing a bad act, but lacks organization.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is basic with little awareness of audience or purpose. The response attempts to vary sentence structure, with little success (<i>This quote applies to a book called Beowulf by Robert Nye is the story</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>charater, whether, decision</i>), punctuation (missing periods and missing commas), capitalization, and usage (<i>it's</i> for "its" and <i>be</i> for "but") that may make comprehension difficult.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2 in all qualities.</p>	

The quote "The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause" means that a person is deemed "good" or "bad" by what he does. I agree with this quote. This quote can be related to Fahrenheit 451 by Ray Bradbury.

In Fahrenheit 451 the main character "Bob" worked for the people that destroyed books so the citizens wouldn't think for themselves.

Component B – Module 5 - Anchor Paper – Level 1 - A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>a person is deemed “good” or “bad” by what he does</i>). The response agrees with the critical lens and reflects no analysis of the chosen text, <i>Fahrenheit 451</i> .
Development	Is minimal. The response chooses <i>Fahrenheit 451</i> , but provides no text detail beyond “ <i>Bob worked for the people that destroyed books so the citizens wouldn’t think for themselves.</i> ”
Organization	Lacks an appropriate focus and suggests organization through attempts at paragraphing.
Language Use	Is minimal, providing only three original sentences.
Conventions	Is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1, although it is somewhat stronger in meaning and organization.	

As William James once said, "The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the course," directly relates to the ~~book~~ novel, "The Great Gatsby."

Gatsby and Tom Buchanan are after the same thing. They both want the same woman but they go about different ways to sway her. Tom treats her pretty bad, and just insists. Whereas Gatsby tries to have her remember the past between them to spark an old flame.

Component B – Module 5 – Anchor Paper – Level 1 - B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides no interpretation of the critical lens and makes no analysis of the chosen text, <i>The Great Gatsby</i> .
Development	Develops ideas briefly, using general plot summary of the text (<i>Tom treats her pretty bad and Gatsby trys to have her remember the past between them</i>).
Organization	Shows minimal focus and organization.
Language Use	Is minimal, providing only four original sentences.
Conventions	Is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.
Conclusion:	Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1, although it is somewhat stronger in development.

PRACTICE SET

Component B - Module 5 - Practice Set Paper A

Yeah, I agree with this quote. In the book "Of mice and Men" George is a good man but would have at my time become a bad man. When Lennie kills Curly's girlfriend, Curly goes after him, George finds Lennie first and shoots him in the head before Curly catches him. This makes him a good man. If George had let Curly get Lennie, he would have become a bad one.

WILLIAM JAMES ONCE SAID, "THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A GOOD MAN AND A BAD ONE IS THE CHOICE OF THE CAUSE."

THIS DETERMINES THAT THE WAY TO ESTABLISH A VIEW OF GOOD OR BAD, WE MUST FIRST ANALYZE THEIR CAUSE.

A PIECE OF LITERATURE THAT GOES ALONG WITH THE QUOTE IS TO KILL A MOCKING BIRD BY HARPER LEE.

THIS BOOK TELLS US DIFFERENT THINGS ABOUT GOOD AND BAD MEN. ATTICUS WAS A VERY NOBLE MAN WHO'S CAUSE WAS VERY SINCERE. HE WANTED TO HELP TOM ROBINSON GET ACQUITTED IN HIS COURT CASE. HIS CAUSE WAS GOOD, SO IT MADE HIM A GOOD MAN.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A GOOD MAN AND A BAD ONE IS THE CHOICE OF THE CAUSE. ATTICUS IS BETTER THAN MOST BECAUSE HE HAD A DEAR CAUSE.

William James once said "The Difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause". I agree with the idea that your choice as a cause for something does reflect your true character. One example I can think of that reflects this quote is the character of Shylock in "The Merchant of Venice" by William Shakespeare.

A pound of flesh of his choice was the agreement of the loan between Shylock and Antonio. When came the time, Antonio was unable to repay his loan to Shylock and a decision was to be made. For Shylock, years of prejudice from Italian Christians, him being a Jew, was what propelled his fire to take a pound of flesh from Antonio. However, Bassanio returned in time to make payments with increased interest to Shylock. However, Shylock's mind was made, he wanted his pound of flesh.

The major cause was not the inability to repay the loan, for Bassanio had much more than borrowed. It was the years of scrutiny that Shylock used for his reason to punish Antonio. For that was the difference in Shylock's character that decided his fate. Shylock could have accepted reparations for the original deal. Instead he used his religious mistreatment as a reason to punish Antonio, that was his choice of the cause. He easily could have been a decent man and gained back his loan with interest, but his choice was made and his cause was set. This made what seemed to be a decent, good man, seem so bad and unfair, his choice.

When the difference in your character is in your hands, your choices reflect who you truly are. As in "The Merchant of Venice"

by William Shakespeare, Shylock made his choice.
His character was forever seen as bad due
to the choice of the cause. But as William
James said, "The Difference between a good man
and a bad one is the choice of the cause!"

"The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause," William James. What Mr. James could have meant when he said those words was that you become either a good or bad guy by the choices you make in your life. For instance, your career, your friends, even your clothing apparel.

In "The Great Gatsby", by F. Scott Fitzgerald, there are many differences between Nick, the good guy, and Tom, the bad one. For instance, Nick was always brutally honest and forthright, while Tom kept secret his affair with Myrtle. Another instance is Nick and Tom's careers. Nick didn't make a lot of money, but he had an honest living and he never took any handouts, such as when Gatsby offered him a job. On the other hand, Tom didn't have to work at all, his money was handed to him by his filthy - rich parents.

So in conclusion, what William James meant when he said "the difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause" was that you aren't good just to be good or bad for the sake of being bad, but it's a gradual build-up of your attitude, friends, and all other aspects of your life.

"The difference between a good man and a bad one is the choice of the cause." This quote by William James states that a person chooses his/her own path, and if he/she chooses something unfavorable, it will cause them to be a bad person. I ^{do not} agree with this statement. Its message is refuted in the novel White Oleander by Janet Fitch.

The novel is a coming of age tale about a girl ^{is sent} to live in foster care when her mother kills her boyfriend. The young girl, Astrid, is taught by her mother that it is unnecessary to look out

for others as long as she is
pleasing herself. While floating
from house to house, she encounters
many temptations. The first
house she encounters, she sleeps
with her foster mother's boyfriend.
The foster mother shows her in
a jealous rage, but she lives.
She also does drugs with
neighborhood kids, dyes her
hair black and denounces
her mother as the final say
in her life. But these
actions do not make her a
bad person. She is a
product of her environment.
Due to her misguided

childhood, she never had a proper mother. She made her choices based on outside, negative influences.

In conclusion, William James' definition of a good person and a bad person is narrow minded, basic. In order to determine a person's character, it is necessary to take ~~the~~ very variable into consideration.

Component B – Module 5 – Practice Set Paper A – Level 1

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Does not refer to the critical lens, except to agree with it. The response reflects a minimal analysis of the chosen text, <i>Of Mice and Men</i> (<i>George is a good man but would have at any time become a bad man</i>).
Development	Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text (<i>George finds Lennie first and shoots him in the head before Curly catches him and If George had let Curly get Lennie, he would have become a bad one</i>).
Organization	Shows minimal focus and organization.
Language Use	Is minimal, providing only four original sentences.
Conventions	Is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.
Conclusion:	Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1, although it is somewhat stronger in development.

Component B – Module 5 – Practice Set Paper B – Level 2

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>to establish a view of good or bad, we must first analyze their cause</i>). The response makes superficial connections to <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> (<i>His cause was good, so it made him a good man</i>).
Development	Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text (<i>He wanted to help Tom Robinson get acquitted in his court case</i>).
Organization	Suggests a focus on Atticus Finch’s cause and suggests some organization with an interpretation of the lens, followed by a brief discussion of the chosen work.
Language Use	Uses language that is basic, with little awareness of audience or purpose (<i>Atticus is better than most because he had a dear cause</i>). The response attempts to vary sentence structure, with little success (<i>This determines that the way to establish a view of good or bad, we must first analyze their cause</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>acquitted</i> and <i>betwee</i>), capitalization, and usage (<i>Mocking Bird</i> for “Mockingbird” and <i>who’s</i> for “whose”) that may hinder comprehension.
Conclusion:	Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.

Component B – Module 5 – Practice Set Paper C – Level 3

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens, explaining that <i>when the difference in your character is in your hands, your choices reflect who you truly are</i>. The response makes implicit connections between the criteria and <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> (<i>Shylock made his choice. His character was forever seen as bad due to the choice of the cause</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully, showing how a choice of a cause determines your character (<i>years of prejudice from Italian Christians, him being a Jew, was what propelled his fire to take a pound of flesh from Antonio and This made what seemed to be a decent, good man, seem so bad and unfair, his choice</i>). The response relies mostly on plot summary, but references to character are implicit.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on how the choice of a cause determines your character. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, beginning with an interpretation of the critical lens, followed by a discussion of Shylock’s oppression being the deciding factor <i>to punish Antonio</i> in determining his character, and summarizing in a conclusion. Some ideas in the response are repeated, detracting from organization (<i>Shylock made his choice and forever seen as bad due to the choice of the cause</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language (<i>reparations for the original deal and his religious mistreatment</i>). The response shows some awareness of audience and purpose and occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure or length (<i>For that was the difference in Shylock’s character that decided his fate</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in punctuation (comma splices and misuse of commas) and grammar (<i>him being a Jew</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities, although it is somewhat stronger in development.</p>	

Component B – Module 5 – Practice Set Paper D – Level 2

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>you become either a good or bad guy by the choices you make in your life</i>). The response makes superficial connections to <i>The Great Gatsby</i> (<i>your career and all other aspects of your life</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from the text (<i>Tom kept secret his affair with Myrtle; he had an honest living and he never took any handouts, such as when Gatsby offered him a job; Tom didn't have to work at all, his money was handed to him by his filthy-rich parents</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on choices determining whether you are good or bad and suggests organization with an interpretation of the lens, followed by a general discussion of some of the choices made by each man, and a conclusion.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate, but at times imprecise (<i>clothing apparel and he had an honest living</i>), with some awareness of audience or purpose. The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure or length (<i>For instance, Nick was always brutally honest and forthright, while Tom kept secret his affair with Myrtle</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in punctuation (misuse of a hyphen) and grammar (a comma splice).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in language use and conventions.</p>	

Component B – Module 5 – Practice Set Paper E – Level 3

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens (<i>if he/she chooses something unfavorable, it will cause them to be a bad person and to determine a person’s character, it is necessary to take every variable into consideration</i>). The response makes implicit connections between the criteria and <i>White Oleander</i> (<i>While floating from house to house, she encounters many temptations and She made her choices based on outside, negative influences</i>).</p>
Development	Develops some ideas more than others, explaining how Astrid’s bad choices (affair, drugs, dying hair, and denouncing her mother) and <i>her misguided childhood</i> show us how <i>she is a product of her environment</i> .
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus established by the critical lens on how Astrid is not a bad person because of her choices but because of many circumstances. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas explaining many variables that influenced her character.
Language Use	Uses language that is generally appropriate (<i>Its message is refuted and outside, negative influences</i>), while occasionally making effective use of sentence structure or length (<i>Due to her misguided childhood, she never had a proper mother</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>neighborhood</i> and <i>jelous</i>), punctuation (a missing hyphen), and omitted word (<i>a girl is sent</i> for “a girl who is sent”).
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities.</p>	