

AP[®] SEMINAR

2015 SCORING GUIDELINES

AP SEMINAR END OF COURSE EXAM RUBRIC: SECTION I, PART B

CONTENT AREA	PERFORMANCE LEVELS		
1 Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence	The response lists little evidence. There is superficial determination of relevance and/or credibility. 2	The response analyzes various pieces of evidence in terms of credibility and relevance, but may do so inconsistently or unevenly. 4	The response successfully analyzes various pieces of evidence from both articles in terms of their relevance and credibility. 6
2 Understanding and Analyzing Argument	The response fails to identify the authors' lines of reasoning and/or contains either no comparison or an unfounded or inaccurate comparison. 2	The response identifies the authors' lines of reasoning but is limited in its evaluation of weaknesses and/or strengths in the authors' arguments. It contains some comparison. 4	The response explains, analyzes and compares the authors' lines of reasoning and their validity by evaluating weaknesses and/or strengths in the authors' arguments. 6
3 Understanding and Analyzing Argument	A discussion of the authors' lines of reasoning may be unsound or missing. The response may be unrelated to one or both authors' lines of reasoning. 2	The response identifies implications and/or limitations of the two arguments. It may provide a flawed evaluation. 4	The response identifies and provides a reasonable analysis and evaluation of the implications and/or limitations of the two arguments. 6

ADDITIONAL SCORES: In addition to the scores represented on the rubrics, readers can also assign scores of **0** (zero) and **NR** (No Response).

0 (Zero)

- A score of **0** is assigned to a single row of the rubric when the response displays a below-minimum level of quality as identified in that row of the rubric.
- Scores of **0** are assigned to all rows of the rubric when the response is off-topic; a repetition of a prompt; entirely crossed-out; a drawing or other markings; or a response in a language other than English.

NR (No Response)

- A score of **NR** is assigned to responses that are blank.

PART B

1BQ1

When it comes to social media, everyone has a differing opinion on its merits versus what it takes away from the user. Is there a single, true answer that says definitively if social media is a net negative or a net positive? The evidence points to somewhere in the middle between Google glasses and an abacus; like most things, ~~the~~ social media has benefits and drawbacks, and it is the user's choice to decide whether he/she will use it as a positive or a negative. The two articles presented are heavily polarized between "good" and "bad" social media, but the evidence and claims provided in the pro-social media article (Article B) make it a more credible and effective argument.

In Article A, the anti-social media viewpoint, the author uses primarily first-person sources and biased figures in order to create his argument. The author defines his argument as the revolt against social networking - "antisocial networking" - through the use of personal electronic devices which were originally used for social networking. The author counters his own argument throughout the entire article by mentioning primarily apps that can revolt against social networking. The creation of an antisocial app, which one assumes is for use on a computer or a smartphone, is almost inherently oxymoronic, as it attaches the user to a social media device perhaps more than they were already attached. The suggestion of Cloak, Split, Whisper, or Secret (all websites/apps) as an "antisocial networking" device therefore provides little in terms of effectiveness for this author's argument. In addition, his primary sources are almost entirely the creators of these apps themselves! These speakers, Chris Baker and Udi Dagan, are obviously biased towards their own creations in the revolt against social media, which helps reduce the effectiveness of author Rubin's argument. Finally, the little evidence Rubin does provide in terms of statistical data carries almost no weight - the University of London study does not even have a date/year, only "recent". In addition, ~~the~~ the author does not address how the ~~article~~

1BQ1

PART B (CONTINUED)

Study is conducted - are the results self-reported? Were the questions asked only to people age 40+? - that could possibly affect the outcome of the study. Finally, the piece of data for the site Anomo that is offered ~~is~~ almost negates the author's argument for the popularity of anti-networking sites: "Around 100,000 people have signed up worldwide." Although this number sounds large, 100,000 out of 7,000,000,000 is almost ~~entirely~~ entirely insignificant. 100,000 is only a tenth of the population in Tucson, Arizona, and there are many more Facebook users per capita than there are Anomo users, even in tiny cities like Tucson. These pieces of evidence combine to work against the author in Article A, thereby creating an incredible and ~~and~~ ineffective argument.

For Article B, the author's line of reasoning and evidentiary claims create a much more credible and effective argument. Standage, the author, begins by addressing the common concern that social networking sites are "the enemies of productivity". He supports this claim with an infographic showing the profit that social media takes from the American economy each year. Although he does not have a source for the supposed \$650 billion deficit, he remarks that although popular, the infographic may not be entirely accurate, as it is a ~~product~~ ^{product} of the Internet itself. He then goes on to talk about coffeehouses in England in the 1600's and their relation to the modern-day social networking site. The author claims that although these coffeehouses were seen as a drain on students' studies, they had the opposite effect of bringing into being new ideas on a new networking platform. He ~~gives~~ gives credibility to this argument by providing entries from Samuel Pepys's diary. As a government official in the 1600's, Pepys's diary discusses going "thence to the coffeehouse" and listening in to conversations had there, from legal proceedings to alcohol storage to medical treatment

PART B (CONTINUED)

1BQ1

arguments. The author discusses how these coffeehouses were "crucibles of creativity" by giving examples of the people who could be found speaking at these coffeehouses - ordinary people, lords, members of government, scientists... Although the author has no source, he is able to state that Newton wrote "Principia Mathematica" after being inspired by a coffeehouse argument. The author draws this back to the modern age by suggesting that there have been studies performed that show students learn better when engaged with other learners. This principle can be applied to the role of social networking in modern society - although first scorned, social networking throughout the ages has been a creative period. The author's evidence here - wide-ranging subjects and time period - help lend more credibility to his argument.

Although either author's viewpoint could be considered "wrong" according to the ~~viewer~~ reader, the evidence in Article B provides a much more compelling and credible argument for the merits of social media rather than the self-contradictory argument of the anti-social networking article.

PART B

1BQ1

Article A and Article B both discuss the impact of social networking on people and society as a whole. Article A speaks mainly on the anti-social aspect of networking that is growing while Article B is about how networking effectively helps people learn and work together. On the contrary, whilst A focuses on the present and B focuses on the positive impacts of the present on the past.

Article A, written by Garreth Rubin speaks from a complete social perspective. Rubin implies that people now are sick of being social and judged, ~~so there~~ which causes ~~the~~ people to join "anti-social" networks. He quotes Chris Baker, the founder of a ~~big~~ large, successful news platform on the ~~fact that~~ how "Antisocial stuff is on the rise. Social has had its moment in the sun. Now people are beginning to revolt." (Article A) Baker is ~~an~~ reliable because he is someone who founded a large component of media and networking. Rubin then quotes another social platform creator, Udi Dagan on how "Social networking has got to a stage where we have all realised this is too much. We need to regain our lives." (Article A). Article A continues by quoting many other social platform founders. Lastly, though, Rubin refers to ~~an~~ a study by the University of London that proved his point about people being fearful of judgment.

Article B on the otherhand, written by Tom Standage is ~~an~~ of ~~both~~ a social, historical and economic perspectives. Standage starts off by telling the reader \$650 billion ~~and~~ a year is spent on Facebook, Twitter and other social networking sites. This source is not as credible due to the fact that he says "if questionable" ~~after~~ popular infographic. He then goes to speaking about coffeehouses from the 1650s and now ~~much it has changed the~~ they have changed over time. Now instead of meeting at a coffeehouse and interacting with each other, people ~~to~~ just meet online. Standage does not have much evidence to help support his claim, and it is limited to historical impacts versus technology now.

~~Article A definitely had the better~~ Rubin definitely wrote the more effective argument. He was able to use many present people as sources. Although that did limit his ~~paper to~~ article to a mainly present view, he still talks about how

1BQ1

PART B (CONTINUED)

networking is progressively changing. Standage did not offer enough evidence for his argument since the first source he used was not even credible enough to be stated in his article. Rubin's ~~written~~ line of reasoning makes more sense due to how he focused on one main perspective - social, while Standage did not focus on a main one, but ~~was~~ on a few that did not connect to each other.

~~Overall, with his use of effective and reliable evidence, Rubin wrote the stronger argument compared to Standage's ¹⁶⁵⁰ coffeehouse versus the present~~

Although both ~~articles~~ ^{authors} made valid points ~~in their~~ for their arguments, Rubin had the stronger, more effective one because he is able to ^{clearly} ~~specifically~~ ~~of only~~ the present technology and how it is changing socially, while Standage was unable to convey his argument clearly.

PART B

1BQ1

These two articles both focus on the topic of social networking. Article A criticized the use of social ~~networking~~ sites such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Article B doesn't so much criticize social networking but compares ~~the~~ social networking in the past to that of today. Based on the two articles I would conclude that Article B is the most effective.

Article A is very biased. The author supports the idea that social networking sites, such as Facebook, are too open. These sites allow an individual too much access to the information & lives of another individual. The author has the indirect claim that social networking is one of the main causes of "increased jealousy ~~and other~~ obsessive behavior." The author concluded that the best way to

AP[®] SEMINAR

2015 SCORING COMMENTARY

End-of-Course Exam — Section I, Part B

Overview

This question assessed the students' ability to:

- Evaluate the quality of two different arguments in terms of their lines of reasoning;
- Join two texts in a dialogue with one another, producing a comparative analysis of each source's line of reasoning;
- Articulate their understanding of credible vs. weak evidence; and
- Read and critically evaluate the effectiveness of arguments in various genres or types of texts.

Sample: A

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Row 1 Score: 6

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 2 Score: 6

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 3 Score: 6

HIGH RESPONSE EXAMPLE

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Row 1

The response earned 6 points for this row because it exhibits both an implicit and explicit analysis of evidence successfully in terms of credibility and relevance.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 2

The response earned 6 points for this row because it creates a highly evaluative and reasonable analysis of the authors' lines of reasoning and their validity by evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of both authors' arguments.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 3

The response earned 6 points for this row because it discusses both articles equally with the use of effective analogies not mentioned in the articles (e.g., "Google glasses and an abacus"). These references show a broad perspective beyond the confines of the articles themselves. The response explains and compares the validity of the two arguments and evaluates the strengths and weaknesses with concrete evidence that yields sophisticated commentary.

Sample: B

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Row 1 Score: 4

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 2 Score: 4

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 3 Score: 4

MIDDLE SAMPLE RESPONSE

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Row 1

The response earned 4 points for this row because it analyzes various pieces of evidence in terms of their credibility and relevance; however, it does not do so successfully, consistently, or evenly.

AP[®] SEMINAR
2015 SCORING COMMENTARY

End-of-Course Exam — Section I, Part B

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 2

The response earned 4 points for this row because it is limited in identifying the authors' lines of reasoning and contains some comparison. Weaknesses and strengths also receive a limited evaluation.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 3

The response earned 4 points for this row because it provides a flawed analysis. For example, the response uses the text "if questionable" in a flawed manner. This statement by the author, Tom Standage, is not an issue of credibility but is provided to establish the author's counterargument, not challenge the validity of a source. It does identify limitations and implications

Sample: C

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Row 1 Score: 2

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 2 Score: 2

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 3 Score: 2

LOW SAMPLE RESPONSE

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Row 1

The response earned 2 points for this row because it lists "little" evidence. Therefore, it receives a 2. In addition, the determination of evidence is superficial.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 2

The response earned 2 points for this row because it fails to identify both lines of reasoning and contains no comparison.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Row 3

The response earned 2 points for this row because a discussion is missing. In addition, the response does not fully discuss a line of reasoning.

Note: Since the response introduces and briefly discusses the appropriate topic, it cannot be assigned a 0 (zero).