

Complexity Scoring Guidelines

Practice Sets I–V

SET I

#1 The first sentence is a fairly straightforward, unqualified statement of opinion, receiving a score of 1. The word “rather” may sound like a qualification, suggesting a degree of “disappointing”, but does not temper the author’s statement enough to warrant a score of 2. The next sentence, however, has the differentiated goals “to impress them with the sanctity of a promise” and to “secure performance” the accomplishment of which the author considers his audience “will be able”.

Score = 3

#2 Though a fairly uni-dimensional, non-elaborated, undifferentiated statement of the importance of some work and how it should be accomplished, the phrase “among other things” indicates that the author recognizes the existence of alternative methods.

Score = 2

#3 The first three sentences are purely descriptive, the author offers no evaluation of the events which might warrant at least a score of 1. In the fourth sentence, however, “bitter” and “funny” are differentiated perspectives, further qualified by “especially if . . .”. The next two sentences are differentiated from each other, as well. “A bourgeois would say . . .” differentiated from “But I have rarely experienced . . .”.

Score = 3

#4 Many beginning scorers try to give this a score of 3, but the events described are primarily a list. Others see the whole paragraph as an unscorable list, but “Still, my last severe attack was lighter than the others” is a qualification of the author’s more general opinion of his health.

Score = 2

#5 “There is no doubt” clearly establishes the score for this selection as 1. Scorers who find themselves assigning a 2 to indicate qualification within this passage may want to make sure that their own thoughts on the topic are not interfering with the author’s.

Score = 1

#6 The evaluations “important” and “transient” are differentiated here, as are the statements “The mandate was a temporary thing” and “so were its obligations”. “The cooperation it promised was fleeting” is also differentiated from the hope that “the quarrel it provoked will be as evanescent”. To top it all off, the entire issue regarding “The mandate” is differentiated from the “dealings with the Arabs”. A series of differentiations with no integration among them.

Score = 3

#7 Some may look for differentiation within or between these two sentences, but they amount to nothing more than a single, unqualified statement.

Score = 1

#8 Nothing more than a series of qualifications. The last sentence may seem like a differentiated statement of expectation, but is merely an example of inclusion/exclusion.

Score = 2

#9 There is an explicit differentiation between “sermons were longer” and “tone was different”. “But the situations are not the same” is another differentiating statement, as is “he kept insisting that I was straying . . .”; both statements delineating the difference between what happened “Four years ago” and the current “situation”. No integration.

Score = 3

#10 This paragraph epitomizes a score of 2. Qualifications abound: “I guess . . .”, “there are exceptions . . .”, and “. . . it just depends”. All with a hint of defining characteristics, but no explicit mention of what those would be.

Score = 2

#11 Most beginning scorers tend to see this as a rather short, somewhat pithy, rambling statement with no complex structure. However, the first full sentence attempts an integration of the differentiated goals “enjoy your life” and “satisfy others” (from the second sentence) with the superordinate statement that one should “try to do it in the bounds of the law”.

Score = 4

#12 When considered independently, “just and lasting peace”, “put an end to or refrain from”, and “directly or indirectly” all appear to be qualifications. The first, however, is a cliché and the others either utilize simple inclusion/exclusion rules or merely describe the only alternatives available. Those who wish to consider “if they seriously desire . . .” a qualification (recognizing that there are those who may not desire) may do so, but the phrasing implies the use of an inclusion/exclusion rule.

Score = 1

#13 Because it is mostly description, some may give this paragraph an “X” for unscorable, but it may also be argued that the qualitative opinions (e.g., “admirable” and “charmingly sung”) allow the assignment of a score of 1.

Score = 1

#14 A score of 1 is safe, but many qualified scorers have argued that the author is implying some qualifications (e.g., “Kitty” writes a long letter, usually interpreted as a friendly act, “but she’s freezing hard”).

Score = 2

#15 A straightforward score of 3. The first two sentences outline a given problem. The last gives a clearly differentiated problem. There are those who may argue that the second problem results from the first and that the phrase “mustering aid” implies some integrated association between the two, but nothing like this is explicitly stated.

Score = 3

#16 The author begins to qualify his or her first opinion with “Actually, . . .”. The qualification is most complete in the last sentence with “one must first establish . . .”.

Score = 2

#17 There are numerous differentiated items in this paragraph. There is the series of differentiated items that the author “tried to explain”: “what I really did say”, “why I said it”, and “how I was trying to make the kind of suggestion . . .”. Then there is differentiation between these explanations in the first sentence and the issues in the second that the author “also pointed out”. Note: Remember that the mere presence of a large number of differentiations does not justify a score higher than 3.

Score = 3

#18 Some may think this paragraph is merely descriptive, but there is at least qualification in such phrases as “but one feels it may begin to be so” and “but I liked it when we were there before”. It is a common error to say that the third sentence is giving differentiated opinions of the island, but this is simply a list of reasons for the single opinion, “It is very pleasant here”.

Score = 2

#19 Even expert scorers have had some argument over the correct score for this paragraph. It has been suggested that there is differentiation between the author’s opinion that “the adorers of Alfred Tennyson . . . haunt one at all seasons” and the fact that “Mrs. Browning used to say things very like it about her own poetry,” but the current official opinion is that this is not explicit or clear enough. Among those who insist upon scoring differentiation, some go so far as to say that there is integration implied in the last sentence. Even if the differentiation were to be allowed, however, the integration may be more easily dismissed by noting that it goes only one direction. The “haunting” adorers have affected the author’s opinion, but his opinion has not affected the adorers. Simple cause and effect, no integration.

Score = 2

#20 The last two sentences detail two distinct possible courses of action and their likely outcomes. Were there only the two possible outcomes, this would be simple factual inclusion/exclusion (if “x”, then “y”, if not “x” . . .), but there are more possible outcomes than the ones mentioned, making the statement more subjective.

Score = 3

SET II

#1 The second half of this paragraph abounds with differentiation, both within and between sentences. For example, the two sentences beginning “The sense of history is marked . . .” each contain differentiations and are differentiated from one another.

Score = 3

#2 This passage demonstrates how knowledge of the topic can significantly ease scoring. However, even with a full understanding of what is being said (by Queen Elizabeth I, by the way), the passage is no more than a single opinion (“We never doubted . . . that Tyrone . . . would instantly offer a parley”) with lots of description tacked on.

Score = 1

#3 Following the previous paragraph, it is tempting to describe this as mere chatter as well, but there are two differentiated sentiments regarding “Dear good Ernie”: “may he be happy” and “be a blessing to his country”.

Score = 3

#4 The final sentence summarizes the paragraph by providing an over-arching cognitive schema involving “international peace and security” and describes how “division” operates within that schema. These summary points are fully developed within the body of the paragraph. The schema, however, is not fully nor explicitly integrated and therefore does not quite reach a score of 7.

Score = 6

#5 This paragraph is essentially a long rambling description. The last sentence has what looks like a differentiation between “the right to intervene” and “to lease certain parts”, but these are simply provisions which the “law stated”. Others may try to score “illusion followed by a rude awakening” as differentiation, but this is merely a temporal sequence.

Score = 1

#6 Some may be tempted to call the first sentence a qualification, but it is an empty statement; a classic straw man.

Score = 1

#7 Although this appears to be a simple descriptive list, there is a differentiation between good and bad qualities with an attempt at integration in the last two sentences. The integration is not fully developed, however.

Score = 4

#8 There is a straightforward differentiation between “those whose feelings are shocked . . .” and “those who delight . . .”.

Score = 3

#9 This is a difficult paragraph because the author keeps changing the subject with no clear differentiation between topics. There is an implied connection, but it is not elaborated. There is, however, a qualification in the statement “But if you are going to write . . .”, implying that the author has allowed for ambiguity.

Score = 2

#10 As with #7, this looks like a list, but “special articles”, “annotations on letters”, and “constant letters” are all differentiated sources of project ideas.

Score = 3

#11 This paragraph has caused some confusion for learning scorers. Some want to assign a score of 2 because the first 10 words appear to suggest a qualification between how serious “the incident was” and how it “was made even more serious”. This is, however, temporal sequencing without differentiation. There is not an elaboration concerning any differences [other than an increase in intensity] between the old and new states of seriousness. Had the author provided information regarding some way in which the previous seriousness stands apart from, or perhaps contributed to, the later state of affairs, there may have been clear differentiation.

Score = 1

#12 The second sentence expresses a qualification of the statement made in the first. It establishes the conditions under which “rules are necessary”.

Score = 2

#13 After allowing for the qualification that the information is “pure conjecture” but “just possible”, this paragraph merely entails a statement of possible facts.

Score = 2

#14 Beginning with differentiation, the “resolution” is found to be “moderate”, “couched in reasonable and objective terms,” and is considered to have “put . . . recent action . . . against the background of those repeated violations and provocations”; all differentiated attributes of the resolution. Furthermore, these differentiated qualities are the implicitly integrated elements of the reasons why “we could not vote against it [the resolution]”. The integration is not made explicit, but guides the author’s reasoning nonetheless.

Score = 4

#15 The opinion expressed in the second sentence is clearly differentiated from that expressed in the first.

Score = 3

#16 The word “though” and the phrase “in many ways” in the first sentence signal qualification. Otherwise, the paragraph is simply descriptive.

Score = 2

#17 There is clear differentiation between the author's description of himself and that of his brother. The last two sentences hint at integration with "he does evaluate some of his own choices in life based on my experiences" and "We live in each other's lives vicariously". Some have argued that the last sentence is a more explicit statement of integration. Such disagreement is a reminder that complexity scoring is, to a large degree, dependent upon the scorer's interpretation of the material. Such interpretation is necessary, but a good scorer is always careful not to read too much into the text. In this case, the disagreement is based on a legitimate alternate estimation of the author's intent.

Score = 4 or 5

#18 A strongly stated single perspective. Any other points of view are dismissed.

Score = 1

#19 There is a qualification in the last line (the rest is description) suggesting that an earlier viewpoint has become more flexible.

Score = 2

#20 The differentiated perspectives, how the author is "thought of" and how he sees himself, are implicitly integrated in the last sentence.

Score = 4

SET III

#1 There is differentiation, evidenced in the last sentence, between the “break the law” and “respond to the laws . . .” courses of action. There is the faintest glimmer of integration in what the person has to say in the first and last sentences, but it’s not expressed clearly enough to justify so much as a score of 4.

Score = 3

#2 It is arguable whether the second and third sentences differentiate the treatments “the immigrant” is likely to receive in the old and new countries or if they simply describe a temporal sequence. Fortunately, that argument is rendered irrelevant because there is a clearer differentiation between the different levels of outcome “if I become sick or lose my job” and the far more serious “deportation”.

Score = 3

#3 Most scorers quickly recognize the latter half of this passage as purely descriptive narrative and quotes, all unscorable. Some, however, are tricked into thinking that the first sentence expresses a differentiation because the word “also” stands out as a content flag, suggesting that the attribute “an ideal medium . . .” is distinct from some other feature of “PTV”. None can name the other feature, however, because it is not expressed; at least not in the given passage. If it isn’t present, don’t score it. There is only one perspective to be scored here. And, no, “its direct line . . .” is not the other feature; that’s the key contributing factor to the first feature.

Score = 1

#4 Scorers tempted to consider “not because they are excessively warmhearted” as differentiated from “but because they are excessively lonely and uneasy” should review the concept of inclusion/exclusion [and paragraphs 12 and 20 from Set I]. The first, the “not” statement, is a “straw man” which is quickly knocked down by the second statement. The next sentence, starting “The possibility of sudden romance . . .” is really just an extension of the previous “lonely and uneasy” idea (though some interpret it as a non sequitur), but the various elaborations enrich the concept enough to be considered further qualification beyond the basic idea.

Score = 2

#5 It is not unusual for beginning scorers to initially see this as a long description of the author’s ideas for articles. Upon closer examination, however, it becomes apparent that the author is not simply describing the material, but actually outlining the intended arguments thereof. There are several differentiated concepts throughout, with at least two integrations. For example, “the impersonal forces pushing us towards increasing centralization and governmental interference”. The entire train of thought is implicitly organized under the single superordinate schema, “discussing the potential dangers to individual liberty”, which appears in the fourth sentence, almost mid-paragraph. The schema is not well-developed enough for a score of 7, but there is definitely more complexity involved than is denoted by a score of 5.

Score = 6

#6 Most beginning scorers can, by this stage of the game, spot the obvious temporal sequence of “knocked me out” and “am now, happily, ‘as usual’”, without mistakenly attributing differentiation. More difficult is resisting the temptation to treat “happily” as a qualification, which it is not.

Score = 1

#7 Few have trouble picking out the various differentiations among these descriptions of infatuation. The high style of writing and the poetic-summary-feel of the final sentence trick some into giving a score of 4 or higher, but there is no real integration, nor is it implicit.

Score = 3

#8 Right up until the last sentence, this passage epitomizes a score of 1, with statements like “It is hopeless to change it.” But, believe it or not, the descriptors “hopeless” and “highly explosive” are considered differentiated opinions of “the situation”.

Score = 3

#9 Although it looks somewhat like a list, each of the four items is elaborated and distinct enough to constitute a differentiated component, with “a spectacle of rugged warfare . . .” expressed as an implicit emergent property derived from the interaction of those components.

Score = 4

#10 Nice distinct differentiations, first between “sheer grief” and “an added pain in the cynicism of the situation”, and then between Trev’s “ideals” and the “cynical, unidealistic outlook” of the “thousands, who shelter their weakness”. The final sentence implies an integration among these.

Score = 4

SET IV

#1 Relatively obvious differentiation expressed between the “two ceaselessly recurring fights” in the last three sentences.

Score = 3

#2 In the fourth sentence, Jupiter’s distinct properties of “gravitational force” and “orbital motion” are discussed as components of the “slingshot” effect. This integrative relationship is not fully developed or explained completely enough to merit a score of 5. What separates this from mere description is the value placed upon the slingshot effect, by way of its important effect upon Pioneer and, potentially, other spacecraft.

Score = 4

#3 Abundant differentiations here. There is the comparison between Queen Elizabeth’s face and “her late grandmother’s granite features.” Related, but unique, is the differentiation “When she smiles she seems a different person, but she has not yet got that facility for smiling before crowds . . .”. Some may look for an implied integration of these differentiated features, contributing to the sullenness of the Queen’s face, but the relationship is merely descriptive and does not constitute anything like a conceptual synthesis, implicit or otherwise.

Score = 3

#4 Although it includes many different descriptors (“unacceptable and illegal means”, “united and steadfast in their position”), this remains a singular statement regarding the outrage of the Republic of Argentina.

Score = 1

#5 A well-written 5. Many differentiated dimensions are gradually brought together and the integration is explicitly stated in the final sentence. Not developed or elaborate enough to constitute an over-arching premise or schema, but certainly a clear expression of mutual influence and interdependence.

Score = 5

#6 This paragraph elaborates upon the complex trade-off reasoning behind the Chinese economy. This is a good example of the give-and-take strategy described under “Negotiation” in the scoring manual section devoted to a score of 5.

Score = 5

#7 A number of differentiated points are made regarding similarities between the U.S. and Canada. Attempts at integration in the first, second, and last sentences fall short and merely describe similarities in an implicitly integrated fashion. The author says “We stand together” based on these similarities, but offers no further elaboration upon trade-offs or other interactions involved in that togetherness.

Score = 4

#8 On one level, “It is not constantly or brutally disturbing but” is a qualification of the author’s opinion of his or her “incapability of understanding”. In addition, there is differentiation between the inability to understand violence and the disturbing nature of that inability.

Score = 3

#9 This is almost entirely just a description of events. Were it not for the qualitative statements regarding the pope’s “graciousness” and “friendly statements”, this paragraph would be unscorable.

Score = 1

#10 The phrase “. . . a unity and strength is developing” establishes an emergent property arising from the integration of the differentiated qualities elaborated both before and after this phrase. As an aside, some scorers see integration even earlier, in the previous sentence, but the most that alone could indicate is a score of 4.

Score = 5

#11 Although there are many definitive, inflexible statements (e.g., “There is no other way”), there is qualification in the fourth and fifth sentences (e.g., “if not perfect, should be satisfactory”).

Score = 2

#12 Differentiations include: “how wonderful the things I produce are” versus “how ‘me’ they are”, the author’s view versus that of “People”, and “finite amount to give” versus “a monster to hide” as possible reasons why people are “afraid to give of themselves”.

Score = 3

#13 The last sentence of this paragraph describes the novel products (the author’s characteristics; differentiated themselves, by the way) of the synthesis of the author’s exposure to his parents’ differentiated personality characteristics.

Score = 5

#14 This paragraph is comprised of a series of differentiations. There is essentially one distinct perspective per sentence. No integration.

Score = 3

#15 It is fairly weak, but the first sentence is an attempt at integration of the differentiated dimensions in the second sentence. Thus the “inability to distinguish permanent love from a two-week siege of fat-headed bliss” makes infatuation “the despair of all its participants”.

Score = 4

SET V

#1 The phrase “there are degrees of how close a friendship is and this affects the components in a friendship” is an implicit integration of the differentiated friendship components discussed in the rest of the paragraph.

Score = 4

#2 To show how even expert scorers can be imperfect, this paragraph has been listed for years as a “3” because one differentiation was seen as comprising the bulk of the paragraph: “Advances made in the chemistry of antiseptics” as contrasted from “An alert and courageous system . . .” and related time savings, both considered factors contributing to the saving of lives during the war. At a workshop in May of 2000, however, it was decided that the final sentence hints at an over-arching schema, enough to allow a score of 4. This score garners further support from the phrase “not wholly responsible” in the first sentence.

Score = 3 or 4

#3 Although this paragraph seems to describe purely factual information, “may well replace” indicates a tolerance for ambiguity.

Score = 2

#4 The differentiated experiences of “lots of love and sharing” and “nursing” are clearly integrated into “my present firm belief”, a novel product of that synthesis.

Score = 5

#5 Some scorers grasp at glimmers of qualification in this paragraph, but they require a lot of “reading in”. The phrase “I could describe myself” is a colloquial expression, which cannot be scored, just like clichés. It is not a true qualification.

Score = 1

#6 The differentiations in the first five sentences of this paragraph loosely establish a trade-off between economics and political popularity. The last three words indicate the necessity for withholding judgment, which further supports a score of 4.

Score = 4

#7 The first and second sentences of this paragraph rather explicitly establish the integrative approach which encompasses the differentiations spread throughout. These can be summed into one main differentiation: that between the ineptitude of the imperialists on one hand and the determination of the revolutionaries on the other.

Score = 5

#8 There are two differentiations in this paragraph: (1) the two ways provided in which cars are like actresses, and (2) a consideration of the inconvenience versus benefit of going to the dealer’s lot during the day.

Score = 3

#9 There is an implied integration in this paragraph in that the policy decisions of “we” and the United Kingdom, though controversial in their own differentiated ways, are seen to work towards the same ultimate goals.

Score = 4

#10 The first sentence of this paragraph sets up an integration in the form of mutual influence and interdependence between U.S. and Canadian “policies and ideas.” The primary differentiated factors are the relative powers of the two countries and their effects upon international relations.

Score = 5

#11 Most beginning scorers have a difficult time assigning a high enough score to this paragraph. Perhaps they rely overmuch on the idea that integration often involves an emergent product. Instead, the integration in the present paragraph, as with the last one and #5 from Set IV, is expressed as mutual influence and interdependence. The differentiated components of the present relationship involve the need to “exercise firm authority” (also differentiated from “not let them run wild”) and the fact that “This will not require severity or even strictness”. These are integrated in the final sentence.

Score = 5

#12 This paragraph features a series of instances of the single qualification attempted at the outset with “Yet dropout and intelligence are not necessarily related.” This first sentence is not enough of a qualification (partly because its antecedent referent is not present), but full qualification is achieved with the sentence “That boy wasn’t a typical dropout, but there are enough like him to be worth worrying about.”

Score = 2

#13 There are two differentiations in this paragraph. First there are the differentiated targets upon which the successful negotiation must have an effect: “not only on the future of Korea, but on European and cold war problems generally”. Then there are the differentiated outcomes “an easing of fear and tension, and a peace which will be . . .” The final sentence implies an integration between these political benefits and the more elemental benefits to be gained by Koreans.

Score = 4

#14 There is a differentiation between the advance of science on the one hand and the lack of progress in government on the other. There is also differentiation between “Records are destroyed” and other tragedies. The tragedies are given as the evidence for the lack of progress, an integration established by the three sentences following “What is the reason?”

Score = 5

#15 Everything in this paragraph is description until “you ought to have prepared how to dispose of your money—perhaps you have.”

Score = 2