

# 2010 AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

## EUROPEAN HISTORY SECTION II

### Part C

(Suggested planning and writing time—35 minutes)

Percent of Section II score—27 1/2

**Directions:** You are to answer ONE question from the three questions below. Make your selection carefully, choosing the question that you are best prepared to answer thoroughly in the time permitted. You should spend 5 minutes organizing or outlining your answer. Write your answer to the question on the lined pages of the Section II free-response booklet, making sure to indicate the question you are answering by writing the appropriate question number at the top of each page.

Write an essay that:

- Has a relevant thesis.
- Addresses all parts of the question.
- Supports thesis with specific evidence.
- Is well organized.

5. Compare and contrast how TWO of the following states attempted to hold together their empires in the period circa 1850 to 1914.

Austria-Hungary

Russia

Ottoman Empire

6. Compare and contrast the goals and achievements of the feminist movement in the period circa 1850–1920 with those of the feminist movement in the period 1945 to the present.
7. Analyze the ways in which the theories of both Darwin and Freud challenged traditional European ways of thinking about religion, morality, and human behavior in the period circa 1850–1950.

**STOP**

**END OF EXAM**

# AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Question 5

Compare and contrast how TWO of the following states attempted to hold together their empires in the period circa 1850 to 1914.

- **Austria-Hungary**
- **Russia**
- **Ottoman Empire**

#### 9–8 Points

- Thesis is explicit and fully responsive to the question, mentions both countries specifically and is balanced. Shows some sophistication in addressing the comparison/contrast aspect.
- Organization is clear, consistently followed and effective in support of the argument.
- Argument focuses on attempts to hold the empire(s) together, rather than solely on the problems encountered.
- All major assertions in the essay are supported by multiple pieces of relevant evidence. These may include domestic reforms, diplomatic maneuvers and alliances, appointments – the countries need to be actors, not objects of action.
- Should compare *and* contrast to some extent.
- May contain errors that do not detract from the argument.

#### 7–6 Points

- Thesis is explicit and responsive to the question but: need not be as sophisticated as an essay scored at level 8.
- There is more variation in the level of comparison and contrast; one may be implied.
- Organization is clear, effective in support of the argument but not consistently followed (may jump around a bit).
- 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.
- May compare or contrast and do so implicitly (parallel argument).
- Organization is clear, effective in support of the argument but not consistently followed.
- Essay shows some imbalance. The essay is likely to be stronger on one country than the other, may treat one country superficially, or may focus more on problems encountered than actions taken.
- Some of the assertions in the essay are supported by at 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: may be faulty or difficult to discern.
- Organization is unclear and ineffective.
- Essay shows serious imbalance; may address one country only.
- Only one or two major assertions are supported by relevant evidence.
- Little attempt to compare or contrast.
- May contain several errors that detract from the argument.

# **AP<sup>®</sup> EUROPEAN HISTORY 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES**

## **Question 5 (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 supporting evidence is used.
- May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.