

2024



---

# AP<sup>®</sup> Seminar End-of-Course Exam

## Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary Set 1

### **Inside:**

#### **Part A**

- Scoring Guidelines**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

© 2024 College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of College Board. AP Capstone is a trademark owned by College Board. Visit College Board on the web: [collegeboard.org](https://collegeboard.org).

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: [apcentral.collegeboard.org](https://apcentral.collegeboard.org).

## End-of-Course Exam: Part A

15 points

### General Scoring Notes

- When applying the scoring guidelines, you should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence (i.e. best fit).
- Except where otherwise noted, each row is scored independently.

### 0 (Zero)

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.

**Question 1: Argument, main idea, or thesis**

**3 points**

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 1	<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
Understand and Analyze Argument	Does not meet the criteria for one point.	The response misstates the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.	The response identifies, in part and with some accuracy, the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.	The response accurately identifies the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.
(0-3 points)	<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>			
	<b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b>	<b>Typical responses that earn 1 point:</b>	<b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b>	<b>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are irrelevant to the argument (do not even relate to the topic or subject of the text)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Misidentify the main argument or provide little or no indication of understanding of any part of the main argument.</li> <li>Just state the topic of the argument.</li> <li>Restate the title or heading.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurately identify only part of the argument (part is omitted or is overgeneralized).</li> <li>Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correctly identify all of the main parts of the argument.</li> <li>Demonstrate understanding of the argument as a whole.</li> </ul>
		<b>Examples that earn 1 point:</b> <b>Misidentify the main argument</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Humor in the workplace does damage to the environment.”</i></li> </ul> <b>Restate the title or heading</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Laughter is good.”</i></li> </ul>	<b>Examples that earn 2 points</b> <b>Identify only part of the argument</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Laughter increases immune and cardiovascular function.”</i></li> <li><i>“Laughter increases the ability to focus and boosts morale, innovation, and employee retention.”</i></li> </ul> <b>Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Laughter in the workplace benefits the body, mind, and organization.”</i></li> </ul>	<b>Examples that earn 3 points:</b> <b>Include all parts of the argument</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Laughter benefits our immune and cardiovascular function as well as the workplace by increasing our ability to focus, boosting morale and innovation, and increasing employee retention.”</i></li> </ul>
	<b>Additional Notes</b> <b>The argument/thesis has three main parts:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Laughter benefits the workplace (e.g., should be encouraged).</li> <li>Laughter benefits the employee’s physical health, cognitive functioning <b>and/or</b> emotional health (e.g. immune and cardiovascular function, ability to focus/reducing stress). (Accept any one of the three benefits or examples of benefits)</li> <li>Laughter benefits workplace effectiveness/environment (by boosting morale, innovation, productivity, and employee retention).</li> </ol>			

**Question 2: Explain line of reasoning****6 points**

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria											
<b>Row 2</b>  <b>Understand and Analyze Argument</b>  <b>(0-6 points)</b>	<b>0 points</b> Does not meet the criteria for two points.	<b>2 points</b> The response correctly identifies at least one of the author’s claims.	<b>4 points</b> The response provides a limited explanation of the author’s line of reasoning by accurately identifying some of the claims AND identifying the connections or acknowledging a relationship among them.	<b>6 points</b> The response provides a thorough explanation of the author’s line of reasoning by identifying relevant claims and clearly explaining connections among them.								
<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="306 573 720 602" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 0 points:</th> <th data-bbox="720 573 1129 602" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 2 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1129 573 1535 602" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 4 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1535 573 1948 602" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 6 points:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="306 602 720 862"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do not identify any claims accurately.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="720 602 1129 862"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify only one claim.</li> </ul>           OR           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1129 602 1535 862"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions.</li> </ul>           AND           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning).</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1535 602 1948 862"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify most of the claims.</li> </ul>           AND           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 2 points:	Typical responses that earn 4 points:	Typical responses that earn 6 points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do not identify any claims accurately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify only one claim.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify most of the claims.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).</li> </ul>
Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 2 points:	Typical responses that earn 4 points:	Typical responses that earn 6 points:									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do not identify any claims accurately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify only one claim.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify most of the claims.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).</li> </ul>									
<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A response may evaluate sources and evidence in the second part (Row 2), and/or analyze the argument in the third part (Row 3). Credit should be awarded for this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Author’s claims</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In some organizations humor is seen as detrimental to professionalism. (Sets up an argument that will be refuted.)</li> <li>2. It is possible to have a workforce that’s both committed and has fun. (States the author’s overall position.)</li> <li>3. Having fun at work benefits the body, mind, and organization. (Outlines the three big benefits that around which the rest of the argument is organized.)</li> <li>4. Laughter improves immune function by increasing immune cells and antibodies and can also improve the elasticity and function of blood vessels, protecting against cardiovascular disease. (Benefits to the body.)</li> <li>5. Production of endorphins created by laughter benefits our minds by helping us focus, reduce stress levels, and achieve balance. (Benefits to the mind.)</li> <li>6. Laughter in an organization is a guaranteed morale booster that can build trust. (Benefits to the mind/organization.)</li> <li>7. An environment infused with humor can also increase innovation, productivity, and employee retention. (Benefits to the organization.)</li> <li>8. Laughter is still somewhat of a mystery to modern science. (Concedes the difficulties with researching laughter.)</li> </ol>												

**Question 3: Evaluate effectiveness of the evidence** **6 points**

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<b>Row 3</b>  <b>Evaluate Sources and Evidence</b>  <b>(0-6 points)</b>	<b>0 points</b> Does not meet the criteria for two points.	<b>2 points</b> The response identifies little evidence. It makes a superficial reference to relevance and/or credibility but lacks explanation.	<b>4 points</b> The response explains various pieces of evidence in terms of credibility and relevance, but may do so inconsistently or unevenly.	<b>6 points</b> The response evaluates the relevance and credibility of the evidence and thoroughly evaluates how well the evidence is used to support the author’s argument.
<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>				
	<b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Misidentify evidence or exclude evidence from the response.</li> <li>AND</li> <li>Provide no evaluative statement about effectiveness of evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify at least one piece of evidence (or source of evidence) but disregard how well it supports the claims.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>Offer broad statements about how well the evidence supports the argument without referencing ANY specific evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a vague, superficial, or perfunctory assessment of how well at least two pieces of evidence support the argument.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>Explain the relevance of evidence or credibility of sources presented, but explanations lack detail.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide detailed evaluation of how well the evidence presented supports the argument by                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>AND</li> <li>Evaluating the relevance of specific evidence, and credibility of sources of specific pieces of evidence presented.</li> </ul>
	<b>Additional Notes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A response may evaluate sources and evidence in the second part (Row 2), and/or analyze the argument in the third part (Row 3). Credit should be awarded for this.</li> <li>Responses which solely evaluate sources of information and not specific pieces of evidence presented from those sources cannot score 6 for Row 3.</li> </ul>			

## Summary of Evidence

Source (as provided in text)	Credibility	Evidence/Relevance to claims
Alison Beard, “Leading with Humor”	2014 <i>Harvard Business Review</i>	<i>a 40-year-old adult laughs four times per day, despite exposure to a much greater array of stimuli.</i>
Rogers, J., “Humor Helps the Boss’s Bottom Line”	<i>The Gold Coast Bulletin</i> , 2002	<i>More than half [of employees] would take a wage cut in order to have more fun at work.</i> Supports the claims it is possible to have a workforce that’s both committed and has fun and that laughter in an organization is a guaranteed morale booster that can build trust.
Harter, Jim. “Mondays Not so Blue for Engaged Employees”	<i>Gallup</i> , 2012	<i>People who are not engaged in their workplace laugh less during the workweek than weekends.</i> Provides context for the benefits of laughter in the workplace.
Berk, L. S., et al. “Neuroendocrine and Stress Hormone Changes during Mirthful Laughter.”	<i>The American Journal of the Medical Sciences</i> , 1989	<i>Laughter increased the production of cells that help the body to fight infection.</i> Supports claim: Laughter improves immune function by increasing immune cells and antibodies.
Michael Miller, William F. Fry, “The Effect of Mirthful Laughter on the Human Cardiovascular System.”	<i>Med Hypotheses</i> , 2009.	<i>Laughter impacts endothelium, the tissue that makes up the inner lining of blood vessels, allowing it to more readily dilate and expand, increasing blood flow to the heart, lungs, and brain.</i> Supports claim: Healthy laughter can also improve the elasticity and function of blood vessels, protecting against cardiovascular disease.
Mobbs, D, et al. “Humor Modulates the Mesolimbic Reward Centers”	<i>Neuron</i> , 2003 (research conducted at Stanford)	<i>Humor also helps the brain normalize dopamine levels, which has positive effects on motivation, attention span, mood, and learning. Participants looked at funny cartoons - components of the limbic system were stimulated.</i> Supports claim: Production of endorphins created by laughter benefit our minds by helping us focus, reduce stress levels, and achieve balance.
Christopher Robert, Wan Yan, “The Case for Developing New Research on Humor and Culture in Organizations: Toward a Higher Grade of Manure”	<i>Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management</i> , 2007	<i>Humor is something that is generated from inconsistency, the same thing that occurs in the creative mind—putting unlike variables together.</i> Supports claim: An environment infused with humor can also increase innovation.
Christopher Robert, Wan Yan, “The Case for Developing New Research on Humor and Culture in Organizations: Toward a Higher Grade of Manure”	<i>Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management</i> , 2007	<i>Productivity and employee retention is positively impacted by humor.</i> Supports claim that laughter in an organization is a guaranteed morale booster that can build trust.
Jessica Mesmer Magnus, David J. Glew, Chockalingam Viswesvaran, “A Meta Analysis of Positive Humor in the Workplace”	<i>Journal of Managerial Psychology</i> , 2012	<i>Humor is connected with several positive workplace outcomes, including improved performance, enhanced employee satisfaction, better workgroup cohesion, healthier employees, less burnout, and reduced stress.</i> Supports the claim that laughter has a positive outcome on physical and mental health.

Write your response to **PART A, QUESTION 1** on this page only. Do not skip lines.

Though some organizations see humor as unprofessional, humor and laughter in the workplace should be accepted and seen as positive as they significantly benefit the body, mind, and organization, including improving immune function, cardiovascular health, focus, morale, creativity, and productivity.

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

0010163



Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

Malone begins his article by contextualizing the importance of his topic: humor in the workplace. He claims it to be a "double-edged sword" and introduces both perceived positives, such as humor being an indicator of taste, and negatives, the fact that humor detracts from professionalism. Though the title of the article, "Go Ahead, Laugh!", indicates the fact that the author advocates for humor in the workplace, his first claim describes what many consider to be the cons of humor and stigma surrounding it and that some see those who engage in humor as unserious or incapable. This claim goes to show the importance of the author's argument, presenting a counterclaim before introducing the article's main idea is introduced.

The author's next claim is that adults laugh less than children, which is described by the author as sad, cluing in to the author's later support for humor within classically adult settings and providing reasoning behind why the workplace may not encourage laughter.

Then, it is claimed that more than half of adults in Australia would take a cut in wages for more fun in the workplace, suggesting that many find humor important and desire it in their jobs, despite sacrificing money, ~~then however~~ in many cases the reason why people work at all.

The author then reaches their ~~the~~ thesis, or main claim: it is possible to have a committed workforce and one that has fun in the office, and fun brings benefits to the body, mind, and organization. The use of a three-prong thesis sets up the rest of the article to describe the benefits of laughter as each pertain to the body, mind, and organization.

Concerning the body, Malone describes the fact that laughter increases immune function by increasing immune cells and infection-fighting antibodies. Additionally, laughter improved the function of blood vessels, protecting against cardiovascular disease. Both of these positive factors support the idea that laughter is good for your body, corroborating the author's thesis, and as the workforce is made up of people, it

Page 4

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.



Continue your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

logically goes to show that improving people's health can improve the workforce.

To prove that humor benefits the mind, Malone claims that humor normalizes dopamine levels in the brain which positively impacts motivation, attention, and learning. Humor also produces endorphins, which boost focus, reduce stress, and enhance mental energy. At this point in the article, the author corrects the ~~claims~~ claims regarding physiological and mental benefits by describing that the resulting balance of mind, body, and emotion can ~~then~~ increase inspiration, hope, and engagement with others, all factors that improve work. This claim is corroborated in the author's last section of their argument regarding the benefits of humor on an organization, as organizations rely on engagement with others.

The benefits in the workplace are claimed to be boosted morale, increased innovation, and positively impacted productivity and employee retention. All of these benefits seen within a workplace clearly improve the company or organization that possess them, and these claims are supported by previous descriptions of physical and mental benefits of laughter in individuals. It is logically sound to conclude that healthy employees with solid mental states ~~will~~ will work more productively and are more likely to be retained.

The author concludes that laughter is still a scientific mystery, as it is difficult to test. ~~However~~ It is described as a natural reaction and as such can be hard to <sup>quality</sup> ~~see~~ in controlled settings. However, the author's argument overall is provided that humor is positive in the workplace.

Page 5

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

0010163



Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

~~In the last several years, trends in mental health have made it apparent that America's youth are in a mental health crisis. Progresses for mental illnesses, particularly depression and anxiety, have skyrocketed since the early 2000s, and according to~~

The author uses a myriad of peer-reviewed sources and scientific studies to corroborate their claims. Their first claim, however, regarding the socially accepted negative outlook on humor in the workplace, has no source, and is simply put into the article for contextualization. The author uses a source from Harvard Business Review to describe the fact that adults laugh less than children, which is a strong piece of evidence as Harvard is a trustworthy source, ~~yet is not a source that~~. Then, to support the author's claim that adults want to laugh in the workplace, the author quotes a study that a survey showed more than half of a sample of Australians would choose a pay cut if it meant more laughter in their job. The author simply quotes "Gallup" as the founder of the study, yet does not provide credentials for this individual. Additionally, a survey with only 2,500 respondents may not accurately gauge the attitudes of individuals that Malone chooses to generalize in his article, which is all adults. Malone then claims, without evidence, that it is possible to have a workforce that is both committed to their jobs and has fun. He uses very specific, well-chosen evidence to prove his claims regarding physiological benefits of laughter. Studies from The American Journal of Medical Sciences, from two ~~reputable~~ researchers from reputable universities claim with empirical evidence that laughter supports immune function. Then, a study from medical researchers at U Maryland's School of Medicine suggest that laughter can increase blood flow, and scientifically explain their results. These pieces of evidence are strong. Next, Malone quotes a research at Stanford to claim that humor is good for dopamine and motivation. He is vague on the type of research done, and does not quote a specific study of researchers, detracting from the credibility

Page 6

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

Continue your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page. Do not skip lines.

of this claim. Malone later claims that endorphins from laughter improve focus, yet he does not provide a source or study to corroborate this claim. Malone discusses that laughter is "a guaranteed morale booster", and though some may see this as a common-sense claim, he provides no evidence to back up his claim, not even anecdotal.

To discuss that laughter increases innovation, Malone cites Chris Robert, from the University of Missouri-Columbia to explain reasoning that inconsistency generates laughter, indicating an implied link between creativity and humor. While the logic is sound, it is not clear who Chris Robert is, whether he is a professor of a specific subject or some sort of researcher, which reduces credibility.

Malone's next claim, that productivity is improved by humor, is also ~~backed~~ backed by Robert's research.

The claim that summarizes Malone's argument is that humor is connected with several positive workplace outcomes, is backed by a 2012 study from the Journal of Managerial Psychology. While the publishing in a journal implies a peer-reviewed quality and credibility, no name or corresponding university is mentioned, ~~and~~ detracting from the ~~study's~~ study's accountability. However, the study is quoted by year, 2012, which would be relevant to the 2016 article by Malone himself.

The final claim is simply logic-based, the claim that laughter is a mystery to modern science, and not backed by evidence.

Page 7

END OF PART A

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

0010163



Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 1 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

Patricia Malone's main argument is that ~~laughter~~<sup>humor</sup> is a crucial part to building a healthy work environment, despite the negative stigma around it. The author overall argues that basic humor & fun with laughter can have many benefits in the workplace and that it should not be seen as unprofessional.

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

0061376



Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

The author supports their main argument that humor is crucial in the workplace by refuting the idea it is unprofessional and the general stigma around it, ~~to~~ to show common misconceptions, and then getting into subclaims that contradict said misconceptions. The author claims humor & laughter is so important, people would take cut wages in order to have more fun at work. The author then uses this notion to claim that there is a healthy medium of work and play, then showing why that balance is so important through the physical benefits of laughter. The author claims that laughter can greatly benefit the physical & mental health of people in the workplace, noting it can actually increase productivity, motivation, attention span, mood, and learning. The author uses these claims to demonstrate why laughter is beneficial, and how the effects of it could also be beneficial in the workplace, throughout all its manifestations. The author also claims humor can provide better sense of community & commitment. Overall, the author's claims support their main argument that humor & laughter is important in the workplace, by listing all of its benefits that can lead to an overall better working environment.

Page 4

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

The author supports their main argument that humor in the work place is important, by referencing a study from ~~2002~~ that took place in Australia. The study found that 2,500 Australians would rather take cut wages ~~than~~ to have more humor in the work place. While this is an interesting anecdote, the evidence does not support the author's sense of credibility. Seeing as this article was written in 2016, this does make the study about 14 years old, which can make some weary, as a lot can change in over a decade, people could feel a lot differently since then. The author then goes on to use supporting evidence from William Fry from Stanford University in the American Journal of the Medical Sciences. The evidence states that laughter impacts the body's ability to make cortisol, determining that laughter increases body's ability to fight infections. The author merely uses this evidence to support the claim that laughter & humor is good for biological benefits. By using evidence from someone from a renowned university builds the evidence's credibility, as well as the journal's credibility supports the evidence's validity.

Page 6

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.



Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

Patrick's line of reasoning is that humor ~~can~~ can sometimes demage the work space, since not everyone has the same humor; can find it as a distraction. Although having a good laugh is a benefit especially as you get older ~~and~~; can actually benefit your body.

Page 4

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.



Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

It is stated that laughing actually benefits your body, it helps your immune cells & fighting antibodies too function better. Loma Linda University and Fry Stanford also came up with the conclusion that a healthy amount of laughter can help expand blood flow to your heart and brain. Although ~~pro~~ Patrick thinks its distracting in the workplace, laughing / humor actually helps morale boosters & since it helps build trust between the individuals and that benefits the workspace. Robert also states that having a more positive workspace helps people get more work done and improves performance. In conclusion, Although humor dose have a chance of bad workspace, it's more likely for humor to not just benefit the workspace but the peoples bodies & minds.

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

## **End-of-Course Exam**

### **Part A: Short Answer**

**Note:** Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

#### **Overview**

This task asked students to read and understand an argument, explain the line of reasoning, and evaluate the credibility and relevance of the evidence advanced by the author in support of that argument.

#### **Sample: A**

**1 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 3**

**2 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 6**

**3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 6**

#### **Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **3** points for identifying all three parts of the argument: “humor and laughter in the workplace should be accepted and seen as positive” (part 1), laughter has benefits “including improving immune function, cardiovascular health” (part 2) as well as workplace benefits such as increased “focus, morale, creativity and productivity” (part 3).

#### **Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **6** points for identifying most of the claims (e.g., “many consider to be the cons of humor and [the] stigma surrounding it,” “it is possible to have a committed workforce and one that has fun in the office,” “fun brings benefits to the mind, body and organization,” “laughter increases immune function by increasing immune cells and infection-fighting antibodies,” “humor normalizes dopamine levels in the brain which positively impacts motivation, attention and learning,” “humor also produces endorphins, which boost focus, reduce stress, and enhance mental energy,” and “the benefits in the workplace are claimed to be boosted morale, increased motivation, and ... productivity”). The response connects these ideas recognizing that these benefits “support the idea that laughter is good for your body.” The response goes on to provide a detailed chronology highlighting the line of reasoning with phrases like “the author connects these claims regarding physiological and mental benefits by describing that the resulting balance of mind, body and emotion...,” “this claim goes to show the importance of the author’s argument, presenting a counterclaim before introducing the article’s main idea...,” “at this point in the article, the author connects the claims regarding physiological and mental benefits...,” and finally “it is logically sound to conclude that healthy employees with solid mental states will work more productively...” thus providing a detailed analysis of the author’s line of reasoning. Because the response provides a thorough evaluation of the author’s line of reasoning by accurately identifying the relevant claims and clearly explaining the connections among the claims, it earned 6 points.

**End-of-Course Exam**  
**Part A: Short Answer**

**Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence**

The response earned **6** points for effectively evaluating multiple pieces of evidence in terms of relevance and credibility. The response critiques evidence, first acknowledging that the “Gallup” study “does not provide credentials” for the author, also suggesting a limitation to the Australian study by indicating “a survey of only 2,500 respondents may not accurately gauge the attitudes of individuals Malone chooses to generalize in his article.” The response goes on to commend the strength of studies from “American Journal of Medical Sciences” because of “researchers from reputable universities” as well as “Maryland’s School of Medicine” because they “scientifically explained their results.” The response offers more critical language that “not providing the type of research or quoting a specific study” detracts from the claim supported by the Stanford study. Also noted is the absence of support for additional claims “not even anecdotal”, and no “name or corresponding university” for the 2012 peer-reviewed study from “The Journal of Managerial Psychology” detracting from the study’s accountability. Because the response provides a thoughtful evaluation of the effectiveness of the evidence in supporting the author’s argument, it earned 6 points.

**End-of-Course Exam**  
**Part A: Short Answer**

**Sample: B**

**1 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 2**

**2 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 4**

**3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 4**

**Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **2** points for identifying two parts of the argument. The response identifies the argument that “humor is a crucial part to building a healthy work environment” (part 3) and “humor ... can have many benefits in the workplace” (part 1). The response did not identify part 2 of the argument, about the mental and physiological benefits of laughter, so it does not earn 3 points.

**Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **4** points for identifying some of the claims (e.g., “by refuting the idea that laughter is unprofessional,” “there is a healthy medium of work and play,” “laughter can greatly benefit the physical and mental health of people in the workplace,” and “humor can provide a better sense of community and commitment.”). Rather than demonstrating how the claims are connected, however, the response provides a limited explanation of the line of reasoning and connects these ideas superficially with broad statements such as the author asserts “subclaims that contradict” the idea that humor is unprofessional, or “the author uses these claims to demonstrate,” and “overall, the author’s claims support” the idea that laughter is beneficial. The response demonstrates an emerging understanding of the relationships between the claims but could more clearly articulate those relationships. Because the response correctly identifies some of the claims and provides only superficial connections between them, it does not earn 6 points.

**Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence**

The response earned **4** points for unevenly evaluating how well the evidence supports the argument. The response evaluates the source from a study in “2002 that took place in Australia” that suggested that people would be willing to take less pay in exchange for a better workplace but identifies it as an “interesting anecdote” that does “not support the authors sense of credibility.” The evidence is clearly identified, but the evaluation of the credibility is limited to a statement rather than an explanation. The response goes on to mention that the article draws from a study in the *American Journal of Medical Sciences* by paraphrasing the evidence and asserting that “this evidence supports the claim that laughter and humor is good for biological benefits.” This statement aligns the evidence with the claim but makes no judgement for how well the evidence supports the claim. In addition, the credibility of this source is described as “evidence from someone from a renowned university,” which demonstrates an understanding of where credibility in a source can come from but lacks the detail seen in a high scoring evaluation. The response demonstrates an uneven application of the evaluation skills and so does not earn 6 points.

**End-of-Course Exam  
Part A: Short Answer**

**Sample: C**

**1 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 1**

**2 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 2**

**3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 2**

**Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **1** point because it does discuss the topic of “laughter in the workplace” but misidentifies the argument as “laughter in the workplace causes damage.” The response does not accurately identify any part of the author’s argument but earned more than zero points since it was on topic.

**Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **2** points for identifying at least one of the correct claims: “having a good laugh ... can actually benefit your body.” Since the response provides no explanation of the connections between claims (the author’s line of reasoning), it cannot earn more than 2 points.

**Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence**

The response earned **2** points because it vaguely identifies two pieces of evidence. However, it makes no evaluative statements about the evidence’s relevance or credibility. The response identifies the source “Loma Linda University and Fry Stanford” with a paraphrase of the conclusions from the study. In addition, the name “Robert” is referenced as a source, along with cursory descriptions of his conclusion. As evidence and sources are identified without any evaluation of the evidence, the response cannot earn more than 2 points.