Honors English 10 Unit 2 Assessment 1 "Advice to Youth" satire analysis essay

Re-read and refer to your previously annotated copy of Mark Twain's "Advice to Youth." Analyze how the language of the passage serves Twain's satiric purpose, considering such elements as diction, hyperbole, irony, juxtaposition, and tone in your analysis. Before composing your essay, complete the essay planner graphic organization on the reverse side of this page.

RUBRIC

9-8 (95/90)

Superior essays are <u>convincing</u> in their analysis, <u>precise</u> in their textual evidence, <u>cogent</u> in their definitions and use of **literary concepts**, and free of plot summary. These essays need not be without surface flaws, but they demonstrate the <u>adept</u> writer's ability to discuss a <u>complex idea</u> with <u>insight</u> and <u>control</u> of a wide range of the <u>elements of composition</u> (including organization, syntax, conventions, and integration of quotations). At all times, they make a <u>compelling</u> case for their interpretation and stay <u>focused</u> on the question and the <u>precisely-stated thesis</u>. These essays reflect <u>stylistic flair</u>, utilize <u>advanced vocabulary</u>, and provide in-depth and original analysis.

7-6 (85/80)

These <u>effective</u> essays offer a <u>reasonable</u> analysis as well as <u>directly</u> and <u>accurately</u> refer to the text(s) and literary concepts for support with minimal plot summary. They demonstrate the writer's ability to <u>proficiently</u> express complex ideas clearly, and they provide a sustained position and focus; however, they reveal a more limited understanding of complexity and concepts than do the papers in the 9-8 range. Generally, 6 essays present a <u>less sophisticated</u> analysis and <u>less consistent</u> command of the elements of effective writing than essays scored 7.

5 (75)

Offering a <u>safe</u> and <u>plausible</u> analysis, these <u>competent</u> essays make some reference to text(s) and literary concepts but include some plot summary and may not examine complexity effectively. Explanations may be <u>mechanical</u> or inadequately relate evidence to meaning, and the argument may be <u>minimally supported</u> and developed. They may be <u>formulaic</u> and are not as well conceived, organized, or developed as the upper papers. On the other hand, the writing is <u>adequate</u> to convey the writer's ideas and stays focused on the topic.

4-3 (65/60)

These papers offer an <u>inadequate</u> analysis as discussion is likely to be <u>unpersuasive</u>, <u>unfocused</u>, <u>underdeveloped</u>, or <u>misguided</u>. The meaning they deduce may be <u>inaccurate</u> or <u>insubstantial</u> and not clearly related to the topic or evidence. The presentation of ideas may be <u>repetitive</u>. The writing may convey the writer's ideas, but it reveals <u>weaker</u> control over such elements as diction, organization, syntax, or conventions. The 3 essays may contain **misinterpretations** of the topic or the work(s) they discuss; they may also contain little, if any, supporting evidence, and practice **paraphrase** and **plot summary** at the expense of analysis.

2-1 (50/40)

These essays compound the weakness of essays in the 4-3 range and are frequently <u>unacceptably brief</u>. They may persistently **misread**, and usually offer **little clarity**, **organization**, **or support**. They may be <u>poorly written</u> on several counts, including many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics. Although the writer may have made some effort to answer the question, the views presented have **little coherence**.