

AP[®] SEMINAR 2016 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.

Begin your response to PART B on this page.

Article A succeeds in creating a more effective argument than that of Article B.

To begin with, Article A argues that games have psychological effects on their users, and they can be used for positive mental and behavior effects on their players. It supports its claim by citing numerous individual cases of this. It connects its argument to several studies involving the psychological effects of games on young adults, like where they were required to play games daily for several weeks and the effects they had were observed. Daphne Bavelier and Richard I. Davidson succeed in connecting this to their arguments and even include real life applications where the positive benefits could be used, like navigation, research, and democracy. This strengthens their argument since it not only connects to their claim, but also to real world implications of these benefits. It also causes some limitations, since the study was performed only on young adults. Next, they provide images of a brain scan for an object before and after gaming. They then connect it to their overall argument by stating that the reduced activity shows efficiency in performing a task. This greatly increases the effectiveness of their argument since it is a ~~primary~~ ^{highly credible} and unbiased source which was relevant to their claims. Also, they provide a step by step guide of how using games for positive behavioral benefits can be achieved. The guide is thorough and provides specific examples in some steps, like "Valve" which already incorporates ~~psychology~~ a psychology graduate student. The step by step plan shows that their argument is possible and can be achieved, creating numerous real world implications for it as well as strengthening the

Continue your response to PART B on this page.

validity of their argument. Lastly, they also provide ~~an~~ a counterargument saying that there is currently no way to accurately measure these effects and still required research. Despite this, they offer possible solutions to this problem, like increasing sample size, and blinding experimenters. This greatly removes any possible limitations and greatly improves the effectiveness of their argument.

Next, source B, argues that psychological insight into games has caused them to be highly addictive. The argument is based on the popular game, Candy Crush. Heaven only uses this single ~~argument~~ example throughout the argument greatly limiting the argument and therefore it's effectiveness. As it only applies to this single game, it's real world implications are limited to only those who play it, weakening his claim. Furthermore, source B ~~former~~ cites Natasha Dow Schull at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology numerous times throughout the argument. Although she is credible and gives relevant insight to Heaven's claims like that Candy Crush involves all necessary psychological factors for addiction, Heaven's reliance on a single researcher severely weakens the argument's validity and effectiveness. Source B does also cite a research study performed by behavioral psychologist B.F. Skinner. Although Skinner is credible, and the study ~~is~~ is relevant to the argument since it supports that pleasant memories and dopamine ~~are~~ cause in addiction, it still contains some limitations due to the study being from 1950 and being on rewards not games.

All in all, Article A creates a more effective argument than that of Article B. Article A cites numerous games popular

Continue your response to PART B on this page.

Today, along with current and relevant studies which support its claims, therefore removing the numerous limitations present in Article B. Furthermore, Article A provides a step by step plan on how to achieve these benefits, greatly increasing the real world implications and validity of the ~~argument~~ argument. Both of these characteristics and solutions are not present in Article B. Lastly, Article A evenly relies on numerous experts involved in the field of neuroscience or gaming while Article B relies mainly on a single scientist. Due to this, Article A provides a much stronger and more valid argument on the topic of the psychological aspects of gaming.

Although Article A still contains some limitations in the form of focused studies, they still envelope a broader scope of people, compared to Article B which solely involves players of Candy Crush.

Begin your response to PART B on this page.

The article's "Brain training: Games to do you good." and "The Obsessionees" have a lot in common. They both recognize the negative effects of playing video games extensively. In article A, the author says "Video games are associated with a variety of negative outcomes, such as obesity, aggressiveness, antisocial behaviour and, in extreme cases, addiction." In article B, the author said "She remains unconvinced that turning people into game-addicted zombies is ever justified." They also both ~~elaborate~~ elaborate on the health implications, ~~and~~ specifically psychologically. Although article A is primarily focusing on the ways ~~for~~ video games can positively impact the brain, they still use psychology to prove the point. "By contrast, action gamers are better able to deliberately allocate their attention to one part of their environment, ignoring other sources of distraction." The author then provided a visual from "Brain Game" to help further our understanding, making it very effective and credible. In article B, the author gathered research from Natasha Dow Schüll from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. She explains why Dopamine, which links to addiction, gambling, reward, ^{and} gaming ^{is important}, ~~is~~ is linked to the compulsion to repeat an activity, whether or not that activity is pleasurable. . . "Due to Schüll's credentials, the evidence is sound and reliable. Overall, both sources have a solid line of reasoning, and provided credible evidence. Article A was mainly focusing on positive impacts, while B was leaning more towards negative ramifications. They both tied in different perspectives and used ^{different aspects of the brain} ~~psychology~~ to build the argument. The limitations for both arguments are the same, consumers. They have no say over which games the consumers will purchase. However, as previously mentioned, the perspectives and implication diverge from each article."

Continue your response to **PART B** on this page.

Both articles were effective in delivering their message, even though they were supporting different sides of the argument.

Begin your response to PART B on this page.

Both of the Article are arguing ~~that~~ ^{whether} video games or just games are or aren't for people to play all the time.

In Article A they were saying that video games are the reason on kids/teens are so rough or anti-social or just bad behavior. When I feel like it's not true well it can be true but not all kids are anti-social because of a game now we have headphones that goes with the game you can talk through it and kids/teen starts to make friend or just be on there with friends.

The behavior part sometimes the game shows kids that it is okay that hurting people because you are mad is okay when it's not. Article B is

saying not all games are bad ~~or~~ influence but some games are hard to stop playing well that is true that games well some games are hard to stop playing. Both article are arg-

Continue your response to PART B on this page.

sing that ~~video~~ video game
~~are~~ ~~video games~~ and game
are distracting and show
kids/ ~~teens~~ teens that its okay
to do some stuff.

AP[®] SEMINAR

2016 SCORING COMMENTARY

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

Overview

Section IB assessed students' ability to:

- Evaluate and compare two articles by analyzing the line of reasoning in each;
- Detect the strengths and weaknesses of the articles;
- Compare implications and limitations of each argument;
- Address and analyze various pieces of evidence for credibility and relevance;
- Think critically about information and its validity; and
- Write cogently and coherently to communicate ideas.

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 SAMPLE RESPONSE

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence - Row 1

This response earned a 6 because it incorporates a sophisticated analysis of the credibility and relevance of evidence in both articles. For example, the response states: "[Article A] provides images of a brain search[ing] for an object before and after gaming....This greatly increases the effectiveness of the argument since it is a highly credible and unbiased source which was relevant to their claim"-not only does this assess the evidence's relevance, but it also explains credibility in the context of supporting the argument. The response also does this for Article B: "Although Skinner is credible, and the study is relevant to the argument...it contains some limitations due to the study being from 1950."

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument - Row 2

This response earned a 6 due to its discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of both authors' lines of reasoning. In addition to identifying the authors' main arguments, the response also evaluates the effectiveness of their strengths and weaknesses. The response provides a meaningful comparison of the two arguments. For example, "Article A evenly relies on numerous experts involved in the field of neuroscience...while Article B relies mainly on a single scientist."

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument - Row 3

This response earned a 6 because it clearly identifies and evaluates the implications and/or limitations of both articles. For example, for Article A, the response states the possible benefits for "navigation, research, and chemistry" as "real world implications." It also notes the limitation that the study was performed only on young adults. Regarding Article B, the response evaluates the "real world" limit of the article's application by its reliance on only Candy Crush, which "limit[s] the argument...to only those who play [the game]."

AP[®] SEMINAR
2016 SCORING COMMENTARY

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

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

MEDIUM SAMPLE RESPONSE

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence - Row 1

The response earned 4 points for this row because it assesses some evidence from both articles (the visual display of the brain and the evidence of the MIT researcher, respectively) for relevance and credibility, but it omits discussion of other evidence.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument - Row 2

The response earned 4 points for this row because while it identifies the authors' lines of reasoning (the first article emphasizes the possible positive effects of video gaming, the second article emphasizes the negative), its discussion of the articles' arguments' strengths is limited and discussion of the articles' arguments' weaknesses is missing.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument - Row 3

The response earned 4 points for this row because it identifies a possible implication of both articles for video gamers' health and/or a limitation of both articles due to the role of consumer choice in purchasing games. However, the response does not evaluate both articles in terms of a strength and/or weakness of the implication and/or limitation.

Sample: C

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence - Row 1 Score: 0

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 0 points for this row because it does not list any evidence from either article, nor does it speak to relevance and/or credibility of evidence, resulting in a below-minimum level of quality.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument - Row 2

The response earned 2 points for this row because it misinterprets both articles' lines of reasoning and does not attempt comparison. The response identifies Article A's argument as, "video games are the reason kids/teens are so anti-social," but neglects the article's content on the potential benefits of video gaming. It superficially states Article B's argument as, "not all games are [a] bad influence but some games are hard to stop playing."

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument - Row 3

The response earned 2 points for this row because it does not explain the implications and/or limitations of both articles (or either article). The response makes points unrelated to the articles' arguments about the psychological effects of video gaming (e.g., "Because of a game, now we have headphones that...you can talk through").