

2015 AP Essay Prompts from 2015 Exam (We used as Mock Exam Spring 2016)

Question 1: Then synthesize information from at least three of the sources and incorporate it into a coherent, well-developed argument for your **OWN** position on whether your school should establish, maintain, revise, or eliminate an honor code or honor system.

Source A (Cartoon)-Bacall

- Uses irony of “Big Brother” to imply that Honor Code should be “self policed”
- It implies students won’t do it on their own (B-, C, D, E, F)
- Audience is indifferent and is passively listening

Source B (Vangelli)

- Student letter from a private boarding school with high expectations
- Perspective considers issues, but ultimately supports honor codes
- Believe in/desire integrity and a place that is honorable
- It makes students more comfortable that they won’t be cheated off of
- Could be effective if students help decide implementation/punishment
- Students didn’t mind having one but they didn’t want it to be excessive
 - Signing EVERY time is cumbersome
 - Imposed from faculty removes their stake
 - Students didn’t want to snitch but will if culture is established

Source C (Diremeyer)

- Points out issues with cheating (even at Harvard)
- Slightly more negative view, but not fully-points out “flaws”
- Effectiveness depends on the student body and the consequences (culture)
- Honor code doesn’t necessarily CREATE culture (Chicken and egg)
- Risk and cost are the two key components students consider (culture)
- Enforcement-student culture depends on if they support it or not

Source D (Kahn)

- Everyone is a stakeholder in this (link to B)
- Even if an honor code is established, it needs policing (A)
- Easier to cheat because of Internet availability (culture major factor)
- Students don’t see “minor” cheating as a crime (E)
- UVa-They repeat the honor code phrase, but the words are just words
- Severe consequences (rescinding diplomas, expulsion etc.) (counter E)
- Professors blind eye to cheating

Source E (Sledge)

- Student survey from public university (not the “elite” of (B, C, D))
- Use numbers depending on what you would want to say (mostly negative)
 - 88% say that failing assignment is enough of punishment (Risk/Cost)
 - Only 8% say they would “snitch” (policing/stakeholders)
 - 40% admitted to violation (How many others don’t admit?)
- Social aspect: lack of positive culture
- Seems like they want it both ways
 - Viewed as a place of honor
 - Unwilling to police/enforce significant punishments

- Hypocritical

Source F (McCabe)

- Involves students to establish and police the honor code
- Academic journal gives it credibility
- Introduces “trivial cheating” (D, E) wherein there are levels of cheating.
 - Homework < tests
 - Social aspect

Possible Positions:

- Effectiveness depends of establishment of expectation or culture
- Effectiveness depends on views of stakeholders
 - Difficult to implement/enforce unless stakeholders unified
- Can create unified purpose or animosity
- Morally the right thing to do to develop integrity/honor

| <u>Common Student Errors</u> | <u>Fixes...</u> |
|---|---|
| Student argues that we SHOULDN'T implement because people wouldn't follow rules anyway. SO, following that logic...Let a kid stay up because he doesn't want to go to bed? | <i>Logic of implementation (cost of policing v. loss of time teaching)</i> |
| Student substitutes “honor” for “honor code” | <i>Focus on PROMPT. Honor can be PART of your argument, but NOT entire argument.</i> |
| Student cites Bloomfield or Altbach | <i>Need to cite (Source C) or (Kahn) and attribute quote to the others</i> |
| Students quotes are blocky or ill-fitting because of grammatical errors | <i>Bracketing within a quote Source B “[she] to replace “I” within the quote</i> |
| Leading off paragraphs with quotes “According to Source A this happens...” | <i>Student presents logical point. Student then follows with:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>An example of this can be seen in Source B when...</i> ● <i>OR uses an example from a source and tags it with “which is illustrated in Source B.”</i> |
| Students have ONE source per paragraph that they zero in on to make point OR No conversation among the sources OR They aren't seeing the whole issue and how all the sources contribute OR They are seeing the sources in isolation. | <i>Interconnected “ideas” of sources. Try to get two or more sources per paragraph that discuss different aspects of a point.</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Misinterpreting Source A | <i>The fact that it's a cartoon should key you in that he is trying to be funny</i> |
| Misinterpret Source E | <i>Reading closely...data is explained if you read explanations of numbers</i> |
| Reasonings were generic and vague (eg. creates a safe environment) | <i>Asking the question: safe environment for whom? Why is it safe?</i> |

Scoring:

- Scoring: avg. 4.73 out of possible 9
- Two sources it automatically goes to a 4 or below
- It's a 2 if you can't understand their thinking or grammar is incredibly poor
- We don't care if you use I/First person pronouns because of prompt
- Weaker students tend to use blocky, full sentence quotes
 - Encourage paraphrasing and then leave the quote for the direct punch
 - Cite the paraphrase though.
- Must analyze data
 - You can't just say what the source says, but why the source matters to what you're saying.

Question 2: Analyze the Rhetorical Choices of Cesar Chavez advocating nonviolence.

Students need to show:

The relationship between "What/How he does" and "why he does it", then link that to "why it would be effective". Basically how the devices/strategies/choices lead to the aspects of his purpose which relates to his "drop the mic" purpose or goal.

Example:

"What he does" is use the pronoun "we"

"Why he does it" is to create unity in the nonviolent movement.

"Why he does it" is because that unity will ultimately lead to a focused fight against oppression and victory for his movement.

This will link devices (examples in body paragraphs) to his points (topic sentences of body paragraphs) to overall purpose (thesis). It will also link speaker to audience(s) to purpose(s).

8-9 will recognize that there is more to the audience that those that are hearing him speak. His "drop the mic" purpose is change through nonviolence, and that his links to the past are specific due to the occasion (MLK anniversary) and the strength and memory of the Civil Rights Movement and the current situation.

If he gets what he wants, what does he get?...the drop the mic goal. Strong students will see that the overall goal is advocating nonviolence in order to advocate for his cause.

Non-negotiable arguments:

- His people need to advocate nonviolence resistance
 - Otherwise they lose morally high road which appeals to audience
 - Violence will escalate reactionary violence and poor will die
 - Violence doesn't work long term
- Recognizes on the 10th anniversary that progress has been slow but steady
- He aligns himself with historically accepted nonviolent followers and leaders (Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. , Gandhi, Jesus-implicitly audience is Christian)
- Appeal to "we" which creates unity amongst similar resistance and audience
- Outlines nonviolence traits and violent traits
 - Negative words that tag to violence
 - Universal tags for nonviolence: just, moral, conscience, justice, honor
- Sympathetic to plight of oppressed, but stays firm to his goal

Question 3: Take a position using a known community to argue the function of polite speech.

8/9 will make Multiple ideas/claims about its different values or aspects.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Positives:</u> Builds community Fosters the best in us Fosters relationships Presents us, as we want to be seen Promotes a common language</p> | <p><u>Negatives:</u> Could build superficiality. Fosters non-lasting relationships Presents us as a lie No intent Learned behavior No consciousness behind it No lasting purpose Could be used to deceive</p> |
|---|---|