



## **AP<sup>®</sup> European History 2007 Scoring Guidelines Form B**

### **The College Board: Connecting Students to College Success**

The College Board is a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 5,000 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves seven million students and their parents, 23,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges through major programs and services in college admissions, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Among its best-known programs are the SAT<sup>®</sup>, the PSAT/NMSQT<sup>®</sup>, and the Advanced Placement Program<sup>®</sup> (AP<sup>®</sup>). The College Board is committed to the principles of excellence and equity, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

© 2007 The College Board. All rights reserved. College Board, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Central, SAT, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board. PSAT/NMSQT is a registered trademark of the College Board and National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

Permission to use copyrighted College Board materials may be requested online at:  
[www.collegeboard.com/inquiry/cbpermit.html](http://www.collegeboard.com/inquiry/cbpermit.html).

**Visit the College Board on the Web: [www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com).**

**AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: [apcentral.collegeboard.com](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com).**

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 1—Document-Based Question**

Describe and analyze concepts of nobility in France over the period from the late sixteenth century to the late eighteenth century.

**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 may not simply restate the question.**

The thesis must suggest a minimal level of analysis or context (drawn from the documents). It need not appear in the first paragraph.

- 2. Discusses a majority of the documents individually and specifically.**

The student must use at least seven documents—even if used incorrectly—by reference to anything in the box. Documents cannot be referenced together in order to get credit for this point (e.g., “Documents 1, 4, and 6 suggest ...”). Documents need not be cited by number or by name.

- 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. Generally, errors in attempts to use point of view should not be judged as major errors.

- 4. Supports the thesis with appropriate interpretations of a majority of the documents.**

The student must use at least seven documents, and the documents used in the body of the essay must provide support for the thesis. *A student cannot earn this point if no credit was awarded for item 1 (appropriate 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 well developed

**Note:** (1) *Attribution alone is not sufficient to earn credit for point of view.* (2) *It is possible for students to discuss point of view collectively (e.g., *La Priscaudaye* and *Molière* taken together), but this counts for only one point of view.*

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 1—Document-Based Question (continued)**

**6. Analyzes documents by explicitly organizing them into at least three appropriate groups.**

A group must contain at least two documents that are used correctly. Examples of possible (not exclusive) groupings include the following:

Nobility as birthright (3, 9, 11, 12)

Nobility as burden (1, 4)

Nobility as virtue (2, 4, 6, 8)

Nobility bestowed (1, 4, 7, 11)

Nobles as soldiers (1, 5, 11)

Behavior vs. birth (2, 8)

“False” nobles (5, 12)

Money issues (1, 4, 11)

Parliament related (3, 7)

Authorship: sword noblemen (1, 2, 4, 9, 11)

Authorship: kings (6, 10)

Authorship: “others” (3, 5, 7, 8, 12, all non-nobles)

Time periods (sixteenth century: 1–3; seventeenth century: 4–10; eighteenth century: 11–12)

**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 may include the following:

- Has a clear, analytical, and comprehensive thesis
- Uses all or almost all of the documents (11–12 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
- Brings in relevant “outside” information

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 2**

Evaluate the influence of Renaissance humanism on Catholic reforms and the Protestant Reformation.

**8–9 Points**

- Explicit thesis responds fully to all prompts: humanism, Catholic reforms, and the Protestant Reformation.
- Consistently clear organization supports the argument.
- Discusses Catholic reforms and the Protestant Reformation with multiple supporting details.
- Clearly links Renaissance humanism to both Catholic reforms and the Protestant Reformation.
- Well-balanced discussion among all prompts.
- Errors do not distract from the argument.

**6–7 Points**

- Explicit thesis is responsive to the question, perhaps less fully than the 8–9 category.
- Organization is clear but may not be consistently followed.
- Essay is balanced, with humanism, Catholic reforms, and the Protestant Reformation all covered at least briefly.
- All assertions are supported by at least one piece of specific information.
- Linkage of humanism to Catholic and Protestant reforms is attempted.
- Errors may detract from the overall essay.

**4–5 Points**

- Thesis is explicit but may not respond fully to the entire question.
- Organization is less effective than in essays scored higher.
- Essay shows some imbalance. Some major topics (humanism, Catholic reforms, or the Protestant Reformation) may be seriously neglected or have minimal specificity.
- Most of the major topics are supported by at least one relevant piece of evidence.
- Suggests linkage between humanism and Catholic/Protestant reforms.

**2–3 Points**

- Thesis is not explicit or merely rephrases/repeats the question.
- Unclear, ineffective organization.
- Serious imbalance—major topics are neglected (e.g., discussion of the Protestant Reformation but no information on Catholic reforms).
- No clear linkage between humanism and both reform movements.
- Several distracting errors.

**0–1 Point**

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- One or none of the prompts (humanism, Catholic reforms, or the Protestant Reformation) is mentioned.
- No understanding of humanism or any linkage to Catholic/Protestant reforms.
- Little or no supporting evidence.
- Numerous errors that distract from the thesis.

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 3**

Referring to specific individuals or works, discuss the ways in which TWO of the following expressed the concept of nationalism in the nineteenth century.

Artists  
Composers  
Writers

**8–9 Points**

- Explicit thesis responds fully to all prompts: nationalism and at least two example categories.
- Consistently clear organization supports the argument.
- Shows clear understanding of nationalism (may be contextual).
- Clearly links the two chosen areas with nineteenth-century nationalism.
- Uses specific and relevant examples from the two chosen areas.
- Well-balanced discussion among all prompts.
- Errors do not distract from the argument.

**6–7 Points**

- Explicit thesis is responsive to the question, perhaps less fully than in the 8–9 category.
- Organization is clear but may not be consistently followed.
- Discussion of nationalism and the two chosen areas is balanced, although perhaps stronger in one area than the other.
- All assertions are supported by at least one piece of specific information.
- Attempts an understanding of nationalism.
- Linkage between nationalism and the two chosen areas is suggested.
- Errors may detract from the overall essay.

**4–5 Points**

- Thesis is explicit but may not respond fully to the entire question.
- Organization is less effective than in essays scored higher.
- Essay shows some imbalance. Some major topics (nationalism or one of the two chosen areas) may be seriously neglected or have minimal specificity.
- At least one of the chosen areas is supported by one relevant piece of evidence.
- Attempts some linkage between nationalism and the two chosen areas but with a simplistic or unconvincing explanation.

**2–3 Points**

- Thesis is not explicit or merely rephrases/repeats the question.
- Unclear, ineffective organization.
- Serious imbalance—major topics are neglected (e.g., uses only one of the example categories).
- No clear linkage between nationalism and the chosen areas.
- Overly generalized information.
- Several distracting errors.

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 3 (continued)**

**0–1 Point**

- No discernable attempt at thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- Only one or none of the prompts (nationalism or one of the two areas) is mentioned.
- No understanding of nationalism or shows no linkage to the chosen areas.
- Little or no supporting evidence.
- Numerous errors that distract from the thesis.

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 4**

Using the two Dutch paintings above and your historical knowledge of the period, discuss how the paintings reflect the economy and culture of the Netherlands in the seventeenth century.

**8–9 Points**

- Explicit thesis responds fully to both prompts: Dutch economy and culture.
- Consistently clear organization supports the argument.
- Shows clear understanding of *both* Dutch economy and culture.
- Clearly links *both* topics with the two paintings.
- Uses specific and relevant examples about *both* Dutch economy and culture.
- Well-balanced discussion among all prompts.
- Errors do not distract from the argument.

**6–7 Points**

- Explicit thesis is responsive to the question, perhaps less fully than in the 8–9 category.
- Dutch economy and culture may be conflated as concepts or within the details.
- Organization is clear but may not be consistently followed.
- Essay includes discussion of both Dutch economy and culture, though perhaps far more on one than the other.
- All assertions are supported by at least one piece of specific information.
- Linkage between the paintings and Dutch economy and culture is suggested.
- Errors may detract from the overall essay.

**4–5 Points**

- Thesis is explicit but may not respond fully to the entire question.
- Organization is less effective than in essays scored higher.
- Essay shows some imbalance. Some major topics (economy and/or culture) may be seriously neglected or have minimal specificity.
- Makes some reference to the paintings and Dutch economy or culture.
- May demonstrate some confusion chronologically or geographically.

**2–3 Points**

- Thesis is not explicit or merely rephrases/repeats the question.
- Unclear, ineffective organization.
- Serious imbalance—weak attempts at discussing either the economy or culture.
- No clear linkage between the paintings and the topics.
- Overly generalized information; may rely exclusively on description of paintings.
- Several distracting errors.

**0–1 Point**

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- Only one or none of the prompts (Dutch economy or culture) is mentioned correctly.
- No understanding of the connection between the paintings and the topics.
- Little or no supporting evidence.
- Numerous errors that distract from the thesis.

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 5**

To what extent did the structure of Russian government and society affect its economic development in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries?

**8–9 Points**

- Explicit thesis responds fully to all prompts: Russian government, society, and economic development.
- Consistently clear organization supports the argument.
- Demonstrates an understanding of Russian government and society during the period.
- Clearly links both Russian government and society to economic development in this era.
- Evidence connecting government and society to economics is explicit.
- Errors do not distract from the argument.

**6–7 Points**

- Explicit thesis is responsive to the question, perhaps less fully than in the 8–9 category.
- Organization is clear but may not be consistently followed.
- Essay is balanced, with equal emphasis on Russian government and society (perhaps conflated) and economic developments of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
- All assertions are supported by at least one piece of specific information.
- Linkage of Russian government and society to economics is attempted.
- Errors may detract from the overall essay.

**4–5 Points**

- Thesis is explicit but may not respond fully to the entire question.
- Organization is less effective than in essays scored higher.
- Essay shows some imbalance. Some major topics (Russian government/society and economic development) have little specificity.
- May be almost totally dependent on an analysis of government OR society.
- May venture outside the time period or ignore one of the time periods.
- Most of the major topics are supported by at least one relevant piece of evidence.
- Suggests linkage between government/society and economic development.

**2–3 Points**

- Thesis is not explicit or merely rephrases/repeats the question.
- Unclear, ineffective organization.
- Shows little knowledge of Russian government and/or society for the period.
- Shows little knowledge of Russian economic development during the period.
- Serious imbalance—major topics are neglected. No clear linkage between Russian government/society and economic development.
- Almost totally outside the time period.
- Several distracting errors.



**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 5 (continued)**

**0–1 Point**

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- Only one or none of the prompts (eighteenth- or nineteenth-century government, society, or economics) is mentioned.
- No understanding of any of the question's prompts.
- Significant chronological errors and does not address the given time period.
- Little or no supporting evidence.
- Numerous errors that distract from the thesis.

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 6**

“In the second half of the nineteenth century, most European governments were conservative.” To what extent is the quotation above an accurate statement? Use specific examples from at least TWO countries.

**8–9 Points**

- Explicit thesis responds fully to all parts of the prompt.
- Consistently clear organization supports the argument.
- Demonstrates an accurate understanding of conservatism as it related to nineteenth-century Europe.
- Clearly develops two relevant and specific examples.
- Evidence connecting examples and conservatism is specific.
- The concept of “extent” of the quote’s accuracy is addressed in the argument.
- Errors do not distract from the argument.

**6–7 Points**

- Explicit thesis is responsive to the question, perhaps less fully than in the 8–9 category.
- Organization is clear but may not be consistently followed.
- Suggests an understanding of nineteenth-century conservatism (may be contextual).
- All assertions are supported by using at least two countries (one assertion may be more developed than the other).
- “Extent” of accuracy may be more implied than specific.
- Errors may detract from the overall essay.

**4–5 Points**

- Thesis is explicit but may not respond fully to the entire question.
- Organization is less effective than in essays scored higher.
- Demonstrates a simplistic understanding of nineteenth-century conservatism.
- Utilizes relevant examples, but examples lack specificity.
- Makes some attempt to link the quote to chosen examples, but linkage is tenuous or underdeveloped.

**2–3 Points**

- Thesis is not explicit or merely rephrases/repeats the question.
- Unclear, ineffective organization.
- Shows little knowledge of nineteenth-century conservatism.
- Fails to generate relevant examples in one or two countries.
- Serious imbalance—makes little attempt to connect the examples to the quote.
- Several distracting errors.

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 6 (continued)**

**0–1 Point**

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- Little or no understanding of nineteenth-century conservatism.
- Does not correctly use two examples of European countries.
- Little or no supporting evidence.
- No attempt to explain the relationship of conservatism and the given examples, or has false linkage.
- Numerous errors that distract from the thesis.

**AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY**  
**2007 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)**

**Question 7**

Analyze how the Balkan crises from 1903 to 1914 and the crises in central and eastern Europe from 1935 to 1939 threatened Europe's balance of power.

**8–9 Points**

- Explicit thesis responds fully to all prompts: Balkan crises, central/eastern European crises, balance of power.
- Consistently clear organization supports the argument.
- Discusses specific and relevant information about the Balkan crises *and* the crises of central/eastern Europe.
- Demonstrates clear understanding of balance-of-power relationships during *both* periods.
- Provides specific evidence that links crises to threats in Europe's balance of power.
- Well-balanced discussion among all prompts.
- Errors do not distract from the argument.

**6–7 Points**

- Explicit thesis is responsive to the question, perhaps less fully than in the 8–9 category.
- Organization is clear but may not be consistently followed.
- Discussion is balanced among Balkan crises and central/eastern crises, with perhaps more information on one era.
- All assertions are supported by specific information.
- Shows an understanding of balance of power of the two eras, but with less specificity than in the 8–9 category.
- Attempts linkage between the two crises and the effect on balance of power.
- Errors may detract from the overall essay.

**4–5 Points**

- Thesis is explicit but may not respond fully to the entire question.
- Organization is less effective than in essays scored higher.
- Essay shows some imbalance. May fail to develop one or both periods with adequate specificity.
- Suggests an understanding of balance of power, but may depend on generalities.
- Superficial linkage of crises with threats in balance of power.

**2–3 Points**

- Thesis is not explicit or merely rephrases/repeats the question.
- Unclear, ineffective organization.
- Offers little specific information about crises in either time period.
- Does not demonstrate a clear understanding of balance of power.
- Makes little attempt to link crises to balance of power.
- Several distracting errors.

**0–1 Point**

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- No discernable organization.
- Minimal supporting evidence. May ignore one aspect of the question entirely.
- No understanding of balance of power.
- Makes no attempt to link crises to balance of power.
- Numerous errors that distract from the thesis.