Question 1 —Document-Based Question (DBQ)

Analyze changing conceptions of French national identity and culture in the period since 1960.

Historical background: In the wake of the Second World War, France became increasingly integrated into the global economy. Beginning in the 1960s, France also experienced growing rates of immigration, mostly from former French colonies.

BASIC CORE: 1 point each to a total of 6 points

1. Provides an appropriate, explicitly stated thesis that directly addresses all parts of the question. Thesis must not simply restate the question.
   The thesis must make at least minimal reference to changing conceptions in identity and/or culture. The thesis must suggest a minimal level of analysis drawn from the documents. The thesis may appear in either the introduction OR the conclusion.

2. Discusses a majority of the documents individually and specifically.
   The student must discuss at least six documents—even if used incorrectly—by reference to anything in the box. Documents can be cited by number or by name, or they can be referenced in other ways that make it clear which document is being discussed. Documents cannot be referenced together in order to get credit for this point (e.g., “Documents 1, 4, and 6 suggest …”) unless they are also discussed individually.

3. Demonstrates understanding of the basic meaning of a majority of the documents (may misinterpret no more than one).
   A student may not significantly misinterpret more than one document. A major misinterpretation is an incorrect analysis or one that leads to an inaccurate grouping or a false conclusion. An essay cannot earn this point if no credit was awarded for point 2 (discusses a majority of the documents).

   A document that is erroneously grouped with other documents is considered a misinterpretation.

4. Supports the thesis with appropriate interpretations of a majority of the documents.
   The student must use at least six documents correctly, and the documents used in the body of the essay must provide support for the thesis.
   An essay cannot earn this point if no credit was awarded for point 1 (appropriate thesis).
   An essay also cannot earn this point if no credit was awarded for point 2 (discusses a majority of the documents).
   An essay can earn this point even if no credit was awarded for point 3, as long as appropriate interpretations of the majority of the documents support the thesis.
5. **Analyzes point of view or bias in at least three documents.**
The student must make a reasonable effort to explain why a particular source expresses the stated view by:
- relating authorial point of view to author’s place in society (motive, position, status, etc.); OR
- evaluating the reliability of the source; OR
- recognizing that different kinds of documents serve different purposes; OR
- analyzing the tone of the documents; must be clear and relevant.

Note: 1. Attribution alone is not sufficient to earn credit for point of view (POV).
   2. It is possible for essays to discuss point of view collectively (include two or three documents in making a single POV analysis), but this counts for only one point of view.

6. **Analyzes documents by explicitly organizing them in at least three appropriate groups.**
   A group must contain at least two documents that are used correctly and individually. Groupings and corresponding documents may include the following (not exclusive):

   **Desire for a distinct French culture/identity**: 1, 3, 6, 8, 9  
   Challenges of modernization for France: 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9

   **Antiglobalization**: 1, 3, 6

   **Anti-American**: 1, 3 (implied)

   **The role of language in culture**: 6, 7

   **Tolerance for diversity**: 2, 7, 10, 11

   **Anti-Immigration**: 4, 5, (8), (10)

   **Immigrant perspective**: 2, 10, 11

   **By author**:
   - Politicians/Ministers of Culture: 3, 4, 6
   - Intellectuals: 1, 7, 8, 9

   **By document type** (if analyzed productively for message, purpose, and audience):
   - Newspaper pieces: 1, 4, 6, 11
   - Pieces of propaganda: 2, 5
   - Interviews: 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11

   **By themes within decades/chronology** (if analyzed productively):
   - 1960s–1980s: 1, 2, 3, 4
   - 1990s: 5, 6, 7, 8,
   - 2000s: 9, 10, 11
Question 1 —Document-Based Question (continued)

EXPANDED CORE: 0–3 points to a total of 9 points

Expands beyond the basic core of 1–6. The basic score of 6 must be achieved before a student can earn expanded core points. Credit awarded in the expanded core should be based on holistic assessment of the essay. Factors to consider in holistic assessment may include:

- Has a clear, analytical, and comprehensive thesis
- Uses all or almost all of the documents (10-11 documents)
- Uses the documents persuasively as evidence
- Shows understanding of nuances of the documents
- Analyzes point of view or bias in at least four documents cited in the essay
- Analyzes the documents in additional ways (e.g., develops more groupings)
- Recognizes and develops change over time (body paragraphs that consistently address changing conceptions)
- Brings in relevant “outside” information
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A Closer Look at the Thesis Statement

Examples of acceptable and unacceptable theses:

**Stronger theses:**
- “Though the aftermath of World War II brought with it a wave of new cultural ideas that worried some French politicians and natives during the Cold War era (between two places who were prone to imposing their own influence on other countries) and resulted in animosity toward the newly-arrived immigrants and their distinct cultural identities, the decades following demonstrated a growing toleration and acceptance of this cultural assimilation. Effectively, the formation of a new French national identity was constructed.”

- “In late 20\textsuperscript{th} century France, the country experienced a paradigm shift from the strong, traditional French national identity because of globalization and immigration in post–World War II years. The French feared the deterioration of French culture due to less emphasis on traditional food and language; however, this deterioration also united the country according to some. The French believed that the main threat to their national identity and unique culture was the United States and globalization. Immigration also caused an upheaval of traditional French culture, with some people who accepted the new diversity and others who rejected it. French national identity and culture has been greatly adjusted due to globalization, shifts in culture, and immigration.”

**Adequate theses:**
- “The national identity and culture of France changed significantly after 1960 with people and groups seeing French nationalism thrive despite a mass immigration in the country, a belief that French culture would maintain its identity regardless of the influence, while at the same time believing that the French culture was dying or lost.”

- “Although it was necessary for the French to join the global economy, the reactions since 1960 have been mixed. Some conceptions include the necessity of France to stay French, the immigrants invade the country, but also, the immigrants grow the culture of France and strengthen it.”

- “France went through phases of analyzing their own loss of culture, extreme rejection of immigrants to retain their culture, and powerful movements to retain their culture.”
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- **Inadequate theses:**
  - “Although decolonization is mostly seen from the colonies' point of view, this retreatment back to France introduced many different conceptions of its own national identity and culture.”
    (Change is not addressed, nor are multiple conceptions of culture and identity articulated.)
  - “French national identity and culture changed post 1960 to become more nationalistic in economic, political, and social ways.”
    (“More nationalistic” is a single conception; the “ways” do not count toward addressing the prompt.)
  - “After WWII and decolonization, France became a ground zero for a mixture of races and cultures to thrive. However, some French, such as Jacques Toubon, believe outside influence is undermining French culture.”
    (France as “ground zero” is not a change beyond the historical background provided; that leaves only one “changing conception”: the undermining of French culture.)

**A Closer Look at Misinterpretations**

**Examples of major misinterpretations or incorrect usage coming from the documents:**

- “This is a poster from the French Democratic Confederation of Labor which is the largest trade union organization in France. Therefore they may see this as an opportunity to increase trading and have the perspective of a company, not as citizens.”
  (Shows misunderstanding of trade union’s identify and purpose; not a corporation.)

- “Even so, French citizens are openly showing their disapproval towards immigration by putting up posters. (Doc. 5)”
  (Shows misunderstanding of the poster’s intent.)

**Examples of minor errors:**

- Mistaking a male for a female source.
  “Maurice Arreckx is of a high political position and she feels obliged to publically [sic] announce to the French community what they have all been thinking about the immigrants.”

**A Closer Look at Point of View**

There are many means by which a student can demonstrate point-of-view analysis.
*The following examples are not meant to be exhaustive.*

**Examples of ACCEPTABLE point-of-view analysis:**

Relating authorial point of view to an author’s place in society

- “With him [Arreckx] living on [sic] a port city on the Mediterranean, the city most likely has a significant amount of North African immigrants, showing he has dealt with the problem first hand.”

- “As an important leader in French culture, Lang probably feels particularly obligated to protect the culture in order to defend his position as Minister of Culture.”
Question 1 —Document-Based Question (continued)

- “The mother shows bias in her statement because, as one can assume her kids have been called a beur, she clearly wants to remove her children from an environment where they would be harassed or taunted due to their ethnicity. She is a firsthand witness to the racial issues in France and believes that French people must unite and learn to accept each other’s differences in order to advance as an entire society.”

Evaluating the reliability of the source

- “He says that, ‘there is only one immediate danger for Europe, and that is American civilization.’ This can be seen from the observation of the major pressure America put on the world as a major superpower emerging from World War Two.” (Historical context provides a degree of reliability.)

- “Duverger’s interview took place in 1964, when the Cold War was in full effect and the USA and USSR were pushing their beliefs onto other countries. In such a stressful environment, the French identity needed to be strong to preserve itself, which Duverger believes is true.” (Historical context evaluates the reliability of Duverger’s perspective.)

Recognizing that different kinds of documents serve different purposes

- “However, this poster may be biased because the trade union wants to increase membership, and showing unity will boost membership.” (Poster serves as propaganda.)

- “Le Figaro obviously wants to put subjects out that will catch the eye of potential readers. With only being given the cover, there is no way to know what the people actually believed.” (Magazine headlines are incomplete in communicating article contents.)

Analyzing the tone of the documents

- “The headline of the cover was ‘immigration or invasion’ describing a poll collected from the public on the issue (5). The tone and wording of the issue just yells tension, for the ethnic problems in France were becoming an ethnic issue.”

- “This sweeping generalization of immigrants as worthless ‘deadbeats’ speaks to the reactionary right’s fear of growing closeness to the EU and that the associated obligation of inclusion and unity undermines its history.”

Examples of UNACCEPTABLE point-of-view analysis:

- “Jacques Toubon is biased because he is a Minister of Culture.”
  - Why is this unacceptable? This is merely attribution with no attempt at further analysis beyond the stated information from the document itself; the statement does not explain why a Minister of Culture might be biased in favor of French-only documents. (Authorial POV and reliability)

- “Maurice Arreckx might be stretching the truth in Document 4 because he knows his statements will be in a newspaper article.”
  - Why is this unacceptable? The statement does not explicitly analyze how an account written in a newspaper article might influence the veracity of the author’s account. (Documents serving different purposes)
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- “Also, a Tunisian immigrant mother said in a radio interview that she hates the term ‘beur’ for her kids as they were born in France so they are French, although she may have bias because she is an immigrant from North Africa herself.”
  o Why is this unacceptable? The statement does not explicitly analyze how the source’s national origin may affect her account. (Authorial POV and reliability)

- “Because Jacques Toubon is the French Minister of Culture, he is trying to show the Los Angeles Times about the real French experience, so he may be making the French people sound more solid and whole than they really are.”
  o Why is this unacceptable? The statement is clumsy and does not adequately analyze how Toubon’s place in society may affect his account. (Authorial POV and reliability)

- “Being a football captain, Zinedine Zidane may be trying to gain respect from a larger audience by announcing both his heritage and citizenship which might make more people watch his sport.”
  o Why is this unacceptable? The statement is clumsy and contrived, and it does not adequately analyze how Zidane’s place in society may affect his account. (Authorial POV and reliability)
Question 2

Analyze the ways in which Napoleon Bonaparte both supported and undermined the main goals of the French Revolution during his rule of France (1799–1815).

9–8 Points
• Thesis is explicit and analyzes the ways Napoleon both (a) supported and (b) undermined the French Revolution’s (FR) main goals.
• Organization is clear and develops the ways Napoleon supported and undermined the FR’s main goals.
• Essay is well balanced; it demonstrates both tasks, which are explicitly linked to specific FR goals.
• All major assertions for both tasks are supported by multiple pieces of specific evidence.
• May contain errors that do not detract from the argument.

7–6 Points
• Thesis is explicit and discusses the ways Napoleon both (a) supported and (b) undermined the FR’s main goals.
• Organization is clear, but linkage between the FR’s main goals and Napoleon’s support and undermining may not be fully developed.
• Essay is balanced; deals with the ways Napoleon supported and undermined the FR’s main goals.
• All major assertions are supported by some specific evidence.
• May contain an error that detracts from the argument.

5–4 Points
• Thesis is explicit but may be less developed on the ways Napoleon both (a) supported and (b) undermined the FR’s main goals.
• Organization is basic; arguments that support or undermine the FR’s main goals may have limited development.
• Essay shows imbalance — one task (Napoleon’s support OR undermining) may be more fully developed; linkage to the FR’s main goals may be more fully developed for one task than the other.
• Some of the major assertions are supported by evidence or simply list the ways Napoleon both supported and undermined the FR’s main goals.
• May contain a few errors that detract from the argument.

3–2 Points
• No explicit thesis or a thesis that merely repeats/paraphrases the prompt.
• Organization is ineffective.
• Essay shows serious imbalance; the ways Napoleon supported OR undermined the FR’s main goals may be addressed with little or no linkage to those goals.
• Little relevant evidence supports the argument.
• May contain several errors that detract from the argument.

1–0 Points
• No discernible attempt at a thesis.
• No discernible organization.
• The ways Napoleon both supported and undermined the FR’s main goals are neglected.
• Minimal or no supporting evidence is used.
• May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.
Question 3

Analyze the ways in which the development of the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s both reflected and departed from the ideas of Marxism.

9–8 Points
• Thesis is explicit and analyzes how the development of the Soviet Union during the 1920s and 1930s reflected and departed from Marxist ideas.
• Organization is clear; develops Marxist ideas and Soviet policies pursued by Lenin and Stalin.
• Essay is well balanced; clearly connects Marxist ideas to Soviet policies.
• All major assertions are supported with specific references to Marxist ideas and Soviet policies.
• May contain errors that do not detract from the argument.

7–6 Points
• Thesis is explicit and suggests how the development of the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s reflected and departed from Marxist ideas.
• Organization is clear; identifies Marxist ideas and Soviet policies pursued by Lenin and/or Stalin.
• Essay is balanced; deals with Marxist ideas and Soviet policies at least briefly.
• All major assertions are supported by some evidence concerning Marxist ideas and Soviet policies.
• May contain an error that detracts from the argument.

5–4 Points
• Thesis is limited; may deal thinly with how the development of the Soviet Union reflected and/or departed from Marxist ideas.
• Organization is basic; may include simplistic references to Marxist ideas and Soviet policies.
• Essay shows imbalance; limited references to Marxist ideas and Soviet policies.
• Some of the major assertions are supported by references to Marxist ideas and Soviet policies.
• May contain a few errors that detract from the argument.

3–2 Points
• No explicit thesis or a thesis that merely repeats/paraphrases the prompt.
• Organization is ineffective.
• Essay shows serious imbalance; Marxist ideas or Soviet policies may be omitted.
• Little relevant evidence; may appear disorganized.
• May contain several errors that detract from the argument.

1–0 Points
• No discernible attempt at a thesis/off task.
• No discernible organization.
• Marxist ideas and Soviet policies are neglected.
• Minimal or no supporting evidence is used.
• May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.
Question 4

Analyze the ways in which the formation of overseas colonial empires benefitted and harmed the interests of European states in the period 1850 to 1914.

9–8 Points

- Thesis is explicit and analyzes how colonial empires benefitted and harmed the interests of European states from 1850 to 1914.
- Organization is clear and develops both the benefits and the harms to European states’ interests.
- Essay is well balanced; it demonstrates both benefits and harms to the interests of European states.
- All major assertions about benefits and harms are supported by specific evidence; reference to European states may be generic or specific.
- May contain errors that do not detract from the argument.

7–6 Points

- Thesis is explicit and discusses how colonial empires benefitted and harmed the interests of European states from 1850 to 1914.
- Organization is clear, but argument linkage between examples and European states may not be fully developed.
- Essay is balanced; it discusses benefits and harms to European interests at least briefly.
- All major assertions are supported by some specific evidence, or a combination of some specific evidence and some generic evidence, but may offer more on benefits than on harms.
- May contain an error that detracts from the argument.

5–4 Points

- Thesis is less developed and may deal superficially with benefits and harms to the interests of European states.
- Organization is basic; argument on benefits or harms may be superficial.
- Essay shows imbalance; may offer far more on benefits OR harms.
- Some of the major assertions are supported by references to European states, and the evidence offered may be more generic than essays scored a 6 or 7.
- May contain a few errors that detract from the argument.

3–2 Points

- No explicit thesis or a thesis that merely repeats/paraphrases the prompt.
- Organization is ineffective.
- Essay shows serious imbalance, benefits OR harms to European states’ interests may be mentioned.
- Little relevant evidence.
- May contain several errors that detract from the argument.

1–0 Points

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- Impact of benefits or harms is neglected.
- Minimal or no supporting evidence used.
- May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.
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Question 5

Analyze the ways in which the expansion of the market economy and new financial practices affected European society in the period 1450 to 1750.

9–8 Points

- Thesis is explicit and analyzes the links between the market economy, new financial practices, and European society and is specific regarding multiple effects on society.
- Organization is clear, consistently followed, and effective in support of the argument. Market economy and new financial practices need not be discussed separately or compartmentalized.
- Essay is well balanced; all major topics suggested by the prompt are all covered at some length.
- All major assertions in the essay are supported by multiple pieces of relevant evidence.
- May contain errors that do not detract from the argument.

7–6 Points

- Thesis is explicit and discusses the effects of the market economy and new financial practices.
- Organization is clear, effective in support of the argument, but not consistently followed.
- Essay is balanced; does not focus exclusively on one period, region, or topic; it may discuss economic or financial aspects more than effects on society, or vice versa.
- All major assertions in the essay are supported by at least one piece of relevant evidence.
- May contain an error that detracts from the argument.

5–4 Points

- Thesis is explicit, but not fully responsive to the question; it may mention only market economy or new financial practices, or effects on society. It may be very general or limited.
- Organization is clear, effective in support of the argument, but not consistently followed.
- Essay shows some imbalance; some major topics suggested by the prompt are neglected. Essays in this category may deal only with overseas expansion, even if they effectively link it to effects on society.
- Most of the major assertions in the essay are supported by least one piece of relevant evidence.
- May contain a few errors that detract from the argument.

3–2 Points

- No explicit thesis or a thesis that merely repeats/paraphrases the prompt.
- Organization is unclear and ineffective.
- Essay shows serious imbalance, most major topics suggested by the prompt are neglected; it may discuss only economic developments, or may deal only with overseas empires and expansion with no links to societal impact.
- Only one or two major assertions are supported by relevant evidence.
- May contain several errors that detract from the argument.

1–0 Points

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- Only one or none of the major topics suggested by the prompt is mentioned.
- Little or no supporting evidence is used.
- May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.
Analyze the ways in which the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Reformation affected the culture of Europe in the period 1500 to 1700.

9–8 Points
- Thesis explicitly and fully identifies specific cultural effects of both Protestant Reformation (PR) and Catholic Reformation (CR).
- Analysis of specific cultural effects of PR and CR effectively and consistently organized.
- Balanced treatment of PR and CR that analyzes specific cultural effects at length.
- Multiple pieces of relevant evidence used to support analysis of specific cultural effects.
- May contain errors that do not detract from the argument.

7–6 Points
- Thesis explicitly mentions cultural effects of PR and CR with mixed specificity.
- Analysis of specific cultural effects of PR and CR effectively organized, though not consistently.
- Balanced treatment of PR and CR that briefly analyzes specific cultural effects.
- One piece of relevant evidence employed to analyze a specific cultural effect of both PR and CR.
- May contain an error that detracts from the argument.

5–4 Points
- Thesis may invoke cultural effects of PR and CR with little specificity.
- Organization of analysis of specific cultural effects of PR and CR is not consistently followed.
- Imbalanced analysis of cultural effects that lacks specificity.
- Relevant piece of evidence analyzes at least one specific cultural effect.
- May contain a few errors that detract from the argument.

3–2 Points
- No explicit thesis beyond a passing mention of cultural effects of PR and/or CR; restates prompt.
- Analysis of specific effects of PR and CR is ineffectively organized and insufficient.
- Discussion lacks specificity about cultural effects of PR and CR.
- Relevant pieces of evidence support up to two assertions, but not about specific cultural effects of PR and CR.
- May contain several errors that detract from the argument.

1–0 Points
- Confused or indiscernible attempt at a thesis about the cultural effects of PR and CR.
- Analysis of effects of PR and CR lacks discernible organization.
- At best one specific effect is discussed but not analyzed appropriately.
- Little evidence offered to support discussion of effects of PR and CR.
- May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.
Question 7

Analyze the ways in which scientific and philosophical developments affected religion in Europe in the period 1600 to 1750.

9–8 Points
• Thesis is explicit and addresses how religion was affected by both scientific and philosophical developments between 1600 and 1750.
• Organization is clear and demonstrates both scientific and philosophical developments and how they directly affected religion in the period.
• Essay is well balanced and addresses the effect on religion by both scientific and philosophical developments.
• All major assertions in the essay are supported by multiple pieces of relevant evidence of both scientific and philosophical developments and are linked to at least one specific example of an effect on religion.
• May contain errors that do not detract from the argument.

7–6 Points
• Thesis is explicit and suggests how both scientific and philosophical developments affected religion.
• Organization is clear, but linkage between scientific and philosophical developments and their effect on religion may not be fully developed.
• Essay is balanced, addressing the effect on religion to some degree of both scientific and philosophical developments.
• All major assertions in the essay are supported by multiple pieces of relevant evidence of scientific and philosophical developments (at least one each) and are linked to an effect on religion.
• May contain an error that detracts from the argument.

5–4 Points
• Thesis is less developed and may deal vaguely with the effect on religion of both scientific and philosophical developments.
• Organization is basic; analysis of scientific and philosophical developments on religion may be thin.
• Essay shows some imbalance; it may deal unevenly with scientific and philosophical developments and their effect on religion, but it must address all to some degree.
• Some of the major assertions in the essay are supported by at least one piece of relevant evidence supporting scientific or philosophical developments and are linked to an effect on religion.
• May contain a few errors that detract from the argument.

3–2 Points
• No explicit thesis or a thesis that merely repeats/paraphrases the prompt or does not acknowledge an effect on religion.
• Organization is unclear and ineffective.
• Essay shows serious imbalance; it focuses on only scientific or philosophical developments or an effect on religion.
• Only one or two major assertions are supported by relevant evidence.
• May contain several errors that detract from the argument.
Question 7 (continued)

1–0 Points
- No discernible attempt at a thesis.
- No discernible organization.
- One or none of the major topics suggested by the prompt is mentioned.
- Little or no relevant evidence is used.
- May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.