

2020

AP[®]

CollegeBoard

AP[®] Seminar

Performance Task 2

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Individual Written Argument

- Scoring Guideline**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

© 2020 The College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board. AP Capstone is a trademark owned by the College Board. Visit the College Board on the web: collegeboard.org.

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: apcentral.collegeboard.org.

Performance Task 2: Individual Written Argument Scoring Guidelines

General Scoring Notes

When applying the rubric for each individual row, you should award the score for that row based solely upon the criteria indicated for that row, according to the preponderance of evidence.

0 (Zero) Scores

- 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.

Off-Topic Decision:

For the purpose of the IWA, if the response is not in any way related to a theme connecting at least two of the stimulus materials, it will be counted as off-topic and will receive a score of 0. Such responses should be rare.

- Considering the student-oriented scoring approach of the College Board, readers should reward the student who derives their ideas from the materials, even if they wandered away from them as they pursued their topic.
- If you can infer any connection to a theme derived from two or more stimulus materials, the response should be scored. A failure to adequately incorporate the stimulus materials falls under rubric Row 1, not here.

A READER SHOULD NEVER SCORE A PAPER AS OFF-TOPIC. INSTEAD, DEFER THE RESPONSE TO YOUR TABLE LEADER.

NR (No Response)

A score of NR is assigned to responses that are blank.

Word Count

The Individual Written Argument task instructions stipulate a word count of no more than 2,000 words. At times, responses might exceed this limit. Students are allowed a 10% cushion. You should score these papers by discounting the words that are over 10% (or 2,200 words).

Individual Written Argument (IWA)

48 points

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
<p>Row 1</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Context</p> <p>(0 or 5 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response does not incorporate any of the stimulus material, or, at most, it is mentioned in only one sentence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response includes a discussion of at least one of the stimulus materials; however, it does not contribute to the argument.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The response demonstrates the relevance of at least one of the stimulus materials to the argument by integrating it as part of the response. (For example, as providing relevant context for the research question, or as evidence to support relevant claims.)</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points include a reference to the stimulus material that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is tangential. • May misrepresent what the sources are discussing/arguing or may use the source in such a way that ignores its context. • Is only used for a definition or facts that could be obtained from other, more relevant sources. • Is no more than a jumping-off point for the student’s argument, no more than a perfunctory mention. • Could be deleted with little to no effect on the response. 		
<p>Typical responses that earn 5 points include a reference to the stimulus material that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects an accurate understanding of the source and demonstrates an understanding of its context (e.g., date, region, topic). <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents a reference to the source, which, if deleted, would change or weaken the argument. 		
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to stimulus materials may be included multiple times in the response; only one successful integration of stimulus material is required to earn points. 		

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
<p>Row 2</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Context</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response either provides no context. OR The response makes simplistic references to or general statements about the context of the research question.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The response explains the significance or importance of the research question by situating it within a larger context.</p>
<p>(0 or 5 points)</p>	<p>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</p>	
	<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide unsubstantiated assertions without explanations (e.g., “this is important”). • May provide contextual details, but they are tangential to the research question and/or argument. • Provide overly broad, generalized statements about context. • Provide context for only part of the question or argument. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide specific and relevant details (i.e., what, who, when, where) for all elements of the research question and/or argument. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convey a sense of urgency or establish the importance of the research question and/or argument.
	<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is usually found in the first few paragraphs. 	

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
<p>Row 3</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Perspective</p> <p>(0, 6, or 9 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response provides only a single perspective.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response identifies and offers opinions or unsubstantiated statements about different perspectives that may be overly simplified.</p>	<p>6 points</p> <p>The response describes multiple perspectives and identifies some relevant similarities or differences between them.</p>	<p>9 points</p> <p>The response evaluates multiple perspectives (and synthesizes them) by drawing relevant connections between them, considering objections, implications, and limitations.</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide only one perspective. • May use a lens or lenses that all work to convey the same point of view. • Convey alternative perspectives as personal opinions or assertions without evidence. • Provide perspectives that are isolated from each other without comparison. • Provide perspectives that are oversimplified by treating many voices, stakeholders, or stances as one. 		<p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make general comparisons between perspectives describing only basic agreement or disagreement. • Explain that disagreement/agreement exists, but they do not explain how by clarifying the points on which they agree or disagree. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborate on the connections among different perspectives. • Use the details from different sources or perspectives to demonstrate specific agreement or disagreement among perspectives (i.e., evaluate comparative strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives by placing them in dialogue).
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lens is a filter through which an issue or topic is considered or examined. • A perspective is a point of view conveyed through an argument. 			

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria								
<p>Row 4</p> <p>Establish Argument</p> <p>(0, 8, or 12 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response provides only unsubstantiated opinions or claims.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response summarizes information (no argument). The response employs inadequate reasoning due to minimal connections between claims and evidence.</p>	<p>8 points</p> <p>The argument presents a claim with some flaws in reasoning.</p> <p>The response is logically organized, but the reasoning may be faulty or underdeveloped.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response may be well-reasoned but illogical in its organization. The conclusion may be only partially related to the research question or thesis.</p>	<p>12 points</p> <p>The response is a clear and convincing argument.</p> <p>The response is logically organized and well-reasoned by connecting claims and evidence, leading to a plausible, well-aligned conclusion.</p>						
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="331 646 806 678" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 0 points:</th> <th data-bbox="806 646 1390 678" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 8 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1390 646 1948 678" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 12 points:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 678 806 1187"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base the argument on opinion(s). • Seek to explain a topic, rather than take a position (e.g., report, summary, chronicle, etc.). • Provide a contrived solution to a non-existent problem or completely lack a conclusion. </td> <td data-bbox="806 678 1390 1187"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize the argument well OR link evidence and claims well in discrete sections, but do not do both. In other words, the response may fail to explain how evidence supports a claim—i.e., it lacks commentary—OR the overall organization of the response is difficult to follow, even though it has done an adequate job of commenting on the evidence. • Provide evidence that often drives the argument, rather than contributing to the response’s argument. • Provide a conclusion/resolution that lacks either enough detail to assess plausibility or is not fully aligned with the research question. </td> <td data-bbox="1390 678 1948 1187"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize information in a way that is often signposted or explicit. • Provide commentary that explains fully how evidence supports claims (i.e., the commentary will engage with the content of the evidence to draw conclusions). • Provide an argument that is driven by student voice (commentary). • Integrate alternate views, perhaps by engaging with counterclaims or using them to demonstrate a nuanced understanding. • Provide a solution/conclusion that is fully aligned with the research question. • Present enough detail to assess the plausibility of the conclusion/solution (perhaps with an assessment of limitations and implications). </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 8 points:	Typical responses that earn 12 points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base the argument on opinion(s). • Seek to explain a topic, rather than take a position (e.g., report, summary, chronicle, etc.). • Provide a contrived solution to a non-existent problem or completely lack a conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize the argument well OR link evidence and claims well in discrete sections, but do not do both. In other words, the response may fail to explain how evidence supports a claim—i.e., it lacks commentary—OR the overall organization of the response is difficult to follow, even though it has done an adequate job of commenting on the evidence. • Provide evidence that often drives the argument, rather than contributing to the response’s argument. • Provide a conclusion/resolution that lacks either enough detail to assess plausibility or is not fully aligned with the research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize information in a way that is often signposted or explicit. • Provide commentary that explains fully how evidence supports claims (i.e., the commentary will engage with the content of the evidence to draw conclusions). • Provide an argument that is driven by student voice (commentary). • Integrate alternate views, perhaps by engaging with counterclaims or using them to demonstrate a nuanced understanding. • Provide a solution/conclusion that is fully aligned with the research question. • Present enough detail to assess the plausibility of the conclusion/solution (perhaps with an assessment of limitations and implications).
Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 8 points:	Typical responses that earn 12 points:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base the argument on opinion(s). • Seek to explain a topic, rather than take a position (e.g., report, summary, chronicle, etc.). • Provide a contrived solution to a non-existent problem or completely lack a conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize the argument well OR link evidence and claims well in discrete sections, but do not do both. In other words, the response may fail to explain how evidence supports a claim—i.e., it lacks commentary—OR the overall organization of the response is difficult to follow, even though it has done an adequate job of commenting on the evidence. • Provide evidence that often drives the argument, rather than contributing to the response’s argument. • Provide a conclusion/resolution that lacks either enough detail to assess plausibility or is not fully aligned with the research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize information in a way that is often signposted or explicit. • Provide commentary that explains fully how evidence supports claims (i.e., the commentary will engage with the content of the evidence to draw conclusions). • Provide an argument that is driven by student voice (commentary). • Integrate alternate views, perhaps by engaging with counterclaims or using them to demonstrate a nuanced understanding. • Provide a solution/conclusion that is fully aligned with the research question. • Present enough detail to assess the plausibility of the conclusion/solution (perhaps with an assessment of limitations and implications). 							
Additional Notes									

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row 5 Select and Use Evidence (0, 6, or 9 points)	0 points Any evidence presented in the response is predominantly irrelevant and/or lacks credibility.	6 points The response includes mostly relevant and credible evidence.	9 points The response includes relevant, credible, and sufficient evidence to support its argument.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include many sources that are not credible for the context in which they are used. • Include no well-vetted sources (i.e., scholarly, peer-reviewed, credentialed authors, independently verified) beyond the stimulus materials. • May include a well-vetted source that is not used effectively (e.g., trivial selection, not aligned with claim, misrepresented). 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draw from a variety of sources that are relevant to the topic and credible for the context in most cases, but those sources are primarily non-scholarly. • Include many sources that are referenced rather than explained. • Provide evidence that does not fully support claims (e.g., there are some gaps and trivial selections). • May cite several scholarly works, but select excerpts that only convey general or simplistic ideas OR include at least one piece of scholarly work that is used effectively. 	Typical responses that earn 9 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that fully supports claims. • Effectively connect evidence to the argument, even if the relevance of the evidence is not initially apparent. • Provide purposeful analysis and evaluation of evidence used (i.e., go beyond mere citation or reference). • Make purposeful use of relevant evidence from a variety of scholarly work (e.g., peer-reviewed, credentialed authors, independently verified, primary sources, etc.).
Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the Bibliography or Works Cited. • Review individual instances of selected evidence throughout (commentary about the evidence). • General reference guides such as encyclopedias and dictionaries do not fulfill the requirement for a well-vetted source. 			

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria								
<p>Row 6</p> <p>Apply Conventions</p> <p>(0, 3, or 5 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response is missing a bibliography/works cited OR the response is largely missing in-text citations/footnotes.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>The response attributes or cites sources used through the use of in-text citations or footnotes, but not always accurately. The bibliography or works cited references sources using a generally consistent style with some errors.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The response attributes, accurately cites, and integrates the sources used through the use of in-text citations or footnotes. The bibliography or works cited accurately references sources using a consistent style.</p>						
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="331 529 821 565" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 0 points:</th> <th data-bbox="821 529 1381 565" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 3 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1381 529 1950 565" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 5 points:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 565 821 857"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). • Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited). </td> <td data-bbox="821 565 1381 857"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide some uniformity in citation style. • Include unclear references or errors in citations (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url). • Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references. • Provide some successful attributive phrasing and/or in-text parenthetical citations. </td> <td data-bbox="1381 565 1950 857"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain few flaws. • Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. • Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing and/or in-text parenthetical citations. <p>Note: The response cannot score 5 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 3 points:	Typical responses that earn 5 points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). • Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide some uniformity in citation style. • Include unclear references or errors in citations (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url). • Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references. • Provide some successful attributive phrasing and/or in-text parenthetical citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain few flaws. • Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. • Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing and/or in-text parenthetical citations. <p>Note: The response cannot score 5 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p>
Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 3 points:	Typical responses that earn 5 points:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). • Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide some uniformity in citation style. • Include unclear references or errors in citations (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url). • Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references. • Provide some successful attributive phrasing and/or in-text parenthetical citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain few flaws. • Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. • Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing and/or in-text parenthetical citations. <p>Note: The response cannot score 5 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p>							
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In AP Seminar, there is no requirement for using a particular style sheet; however, responses must use a style that is consistent and complete. • Check the bibliography for consistency in style and inclusion of fundamental elements. • Check for clarity of in-text citations. • Check to make sure all in-text citations match the bibliography (without extensive search). 									

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
<p>Row 7</p> <p>Apply Conventions</p> <p>(0, 2, or 3 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response has many grammatical flaws, is difficult to understand, or is written in a style inappropriate for an academic audience.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>The response is mostly clear but may contain some flaws in grammar or a few instances of a style inappropriate for an academic audience.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>The response creates variety, emphasis, and interest to the reader through the use of effective sentences and precision of word choice. The written style is consistently appropriate for an academic audience, although the response may have a few errors in grammar and style.</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain multiple grammatical errors that make reading difficult. • Use an overall style that is colloquial or in other ways not appropriate for an academic paper. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain some instances of errors that occasionally make reading difficult. • Lapse into colloquial language. • Demonstrate imprecise word choice. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain few flaws. • Use clear prose that maintains an academic or scholarly tone. • Use words and syntax to enhance communication of complex ideas throughout. 	
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readers should focus on the sentences written by the student, not those quoted or derived from sources. 			

Preventing Mental Illness: Why Genetic Editing Is Unfeasible

Word Count: 2056

According to the National Institute of Mental Health, approximately 46.6 million adults in the United States currently live with a mental illness; that is almost a fifth of the country's population (2017). Following the increasing prominence of mental health issues in modern society has come more research on the origins of these disorders. In addition to environmental factors, genetics have been found to play a large role in people's likelihood of developing a mental illness (Hyman, 2000, pg. 455). For example, the serotonin transporter gene 5-HTTLPR has been discovered to have a relationship with depression and overall life satisfaction, as stated by Jan-Emmanuel De Neve, a professor of economics at the London School of Economics, and his colleagues of Harvard Medical School, the University of California's Department of Medicine, and Warwick Business School respectively (2012, pg. 193). Gene testing and modifying technology has swiftly developed alongside this research; most notably, a new tool called CRISPR/cas9 has recently emerged. Jana Murovec of the Biotechnical Faculty at University of Ljubljana and her colleagues in the Department of Genetics, Development and Cell Biology at Iowa State University (2017) report that this new genetic editor is much more precise than any previous available technology and has opened new doors for the possibilities of DNA modification in a variety of organisms (pg. 917).

These simultaneous developments beg the question: to what extent might genetic editing be a practical preventive treatment for mental illness? Surrounding this query, there exists a wide range of opinions on the morality, safety, and applicability of germline genome editing in humans (Lawrence & Applebaum, 2011, pg. 315). According to Kelly Ormond, a professor in the Department of Genetics and Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics at Stanford University (2017), germline genome editing is a revision of the human genome that occurs in a germ cell or

embryo and results in heritable altered traits that would likely be passed onto offspring (pg. 167). Despite the potential benefits that preventative treatments like this could provide for those highly susceptible to mental illness, genetic editing is largely believed by the scientific community to be ethically dubious, difficult to regulate, too complex to be reliably successful, and have a high potential for abuse, as reported by professor in the Office of Health and Safety at Hokkaido University Tetsuya Ishii (2015). At this point in time, the various concerns associated with germline gene editing outweigh its possible usefulness and likely make it too impractical to be successfully implemented.

The most prominent issue with DNA modification in humans is the controversy around its morality. Mary Todd Bergman, a correspondent at the Harvard Gazette, reports that there is a general sense among some of the public that it is inherently unethical to “play God” and alter the very fabric of what makes us up as people (2019). This often includes religious groups such as the 23 million Christians living in the United States (Pew Research Center). Therefore, any use of germline genome editing would likely result in widespread backlash among both the general public and the scientific community, as well as in few people being willing to participate in developmental research or the eventual treatment itself. There is also thought to be a high potential for abuse with genetic modification. Tetsuya Ishii (2015) describes how gene editing could easily transition from only being used for disease or disability prevention, as in the case of mental illnesses, to more cosmetic and medically unnecessary purposes, such as genetic enhancement (pg. 50). This would include parents being able to alter their unborn child’s traits such as height, pigmentation, or athletic ability without the child’s consent, even if this were not necessarily in their child’s best interest; in past discussions, these children of the future have

been referred to as “designer babies” (Ishii, 2015, pg. 51). This phenomena could lead to discrimination based on genetics or even the implementation of eugenics as was seen in the past in Nazi Germany (Ormond, 2017, pg. 170). Thus, the scientific community should continue to refrain from conducting research on human genome modification in order to prevent dangerous outcomes such as this.

Several countries around the world already have legislation outlawing germline genome editing, though it varies in leniency and intensity of enforcement (Ishii, 2015, pg. 53). According to Eric Juengst, the director of the UNC Center for Bioethics and a Professor in the Departments of Social Medicine and Genetics at the University of North Carolina (2017), if a scientific consensus were reached that DNA modification could be effectively and ethically used exclusively for the prevention of diseases or mental disorders, a massive overhaul of global regulations on this subject would be required (pg. 16). Japan, the U.S., China, and Russia in particular would be forced to confront the social concerns surrounding genetic editing and create regulatory policies despite their different stances on its legality. (Ishii, 2015, pg. 53). Enforcing these policies would surely be a challenge, as well. The outlawing of genetic enhancement may create an illegal market for this type of editing, subsequently forcing law enforcement officials to try to identify if individuals have been genetically enhanced merely from observing their external traits (Juenst, 2017, pg. 21). This probable inability to create and enforce successful regulatory legislation for DNA modification further contributes to why its implementation is risky in any capacity.

However, despite the controversy surrounding this idea, genetic alterations to reduce vulnerable people’s predisposition to mental illness have the potential to be very effective if

carried out responsibly. Steven Hyman, the director of the Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research and a member at the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, as well as a Harvard University Distinguished Service Professor of Stem Cell and Regenerative Biology (2000) reports that recent research has been able to identify certain genes or gene combinations that influence the transportation of neurotransmitters between neurons as well as the proteins that make up the brain's synaptic structure, both of which substantially contribute to mental health (pg. 455). He states, "Family, twin and adoption studies have shown that, for schizophrenia, autism, manic depressive illness, major depression, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, panic disorder and other mental illnesses, the transmission of risk is due to heredity" (2000, pg. 456). This means that genetic modification could likely edit those inherited genes to significantly reduce the probability that an individual will develop one of the aforementioned illnesses. Additionally, a study conducted by Han-Na Kim, a professor of the Department of Biochemistry of the School of Medicine at Ewha Womans University (2013), found specific genes that influence the different personality profiles of women (pg. 667). This also indicates that traits such as neuroticism, which influence mental health, can potentially be successfully altered by genetic editing. This method would attack the source of mental disorders before they could even arise, making it a valuable tool to consider regardless of its drawbacks and the other disputes surrounding it.

Yet, in spite of the potential of this preventative approach to heritable mental health issues, concerns still remain about the actual applicability of genetic editing even with its hypothetical usefulness. Hyman (2000) explains that although certain specific genes have been identified to significantly influence one's risk of developing particular mental illnesses, inherited

predisposition is still very genetically complex. This means that multiple genes most likely interact in a variety of ways to produce traits like vulnerability, or lack thereof, to mental illness, and would therefore be difficult to isolate and successfully edit (pg. 457). Additionally, the notion that genetic modification would meaningfully reduce the prominence of mental disorders does not take environmental factors into account; these factors include external influences such as one's childhood, past experiences, stress, relationships, diet, exercise, and other elements, as reported by researcher Minae Niwa of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine (2013, pg. 335). Environmental factors also mean the places that people find, or do not find, mental wellbeing in their individual lifestyles, like certain routines or media consumption. Andrew O'Hagan, novelist and Visiting Professor of Writing at King's College London, shows one example of this in stating, "[Disney's] contribution gives life to the notion that happiness is a creation, something made rather than inherited" (2015). This exemplifies why genes are only partially responsible for mental health. Hyman summarizes, "Gone is the notion that there is a single gene that causes any mental disorder or determines any behavioural variant. [This concept] has been replaced by that of genetic complexity, in which multiple genes act in concert with non-genetic factors to produce a risk of mental disorder" (2000, pg. 455). Thus, the potential effectiveness of genetic editing is undercut by the intricacy of causative genes as well as the major impact of environmental components on mental health.

Concurrent developments in the fields of psychology and genetics have recently revealed valuable insights on both how genes influence human susceptibility to mental illnesses as well as how to edit the genomes of certain organisms with tools such as CRISPR/cas-9. Exploring the

possibility of genetic modification as a preventative treatment in order to lower predisposition for mental illnesses therefore presents a pertinent discussion. Despite the speculative potential of this method, several concerns have been presented that arguably outweigh its practicality. Gene modification, particularly germline genome editing in humans, is generally viewed as ethically questionable in the scientific community as well as within the informed public. It has a high potential for future abuse for purposes such as unnecessary genetic enhancement or eugenics. If somehow implemented responsibly, it would still be a hassle to create functional regulatory legislation and to enforce it around the world. Furthermore, the genetic editing that is currently possible might not even be successful in changing mental health outcomes because of the genetic complexity and unaccounted environmental factors that also affect vulnerability to mental illness. Hence, the conclusion of the Second International Summit on Human Genome Editing supports that the use of gene modification to reduce predisposition to mental disorders in at-risk individuals is an inappropriate and ineffectual approach at this point in time (National Academy of Sciences, 2018). Until more research and organized public discussion is conducted, it will remain unfeasible.

References

- Bergman, M.T. (2019). *Perspectives on gene editing*. The Harvard Gazette.
<https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2019/01/perspectives-on-gene-editing/>
- De Neve, J.E., Christakis, N.A., Fowler, J.H., & Frey, B.S. (2012). Genes, economics, and happiness. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics*, 5, 193-211.
- Hyman, S.E. (2000). The genetics of mental illness: Implications for practice. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 78, 455-463.
- Ishii, T. (2015). Germ line genome editing in clinics: The approaches, objectives and global society. *Briefings in Functional Genomics*, 16, 46-56.
- Juengst, E.T. (2017). Crowdsourcing the moral limits of human gene editing?. *Hastings Center Report*, 47, 15-23.
- Kim, H.N, Roh, S.J., Sung, Y.A., Chung, H.W., Lee, J.Y., Cho, J., Shin, H., & Kim, H.L. (2013). Genome-wide association study of the five-factor model of personality in young Korean women. *Journal of Human Genetics*, 58, 667–674.
- Lawrence, R.E., & Appelbaum, P.S. (2011). Genetic testing in psychiatry: A review of attitudes and beliefs. *Psychiatry*, 74, 315-331.
- Murovec, J., Pirc, Z., & Yang, B. (2017). New variants of CRISPR RNA-guided genome editing enzymes. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 15, 917-926.
- National Academy of Sciences. (2018). *Statement by the organizing committee of the second international summit on human genome editing*. National Academies.
<https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2018/11/statement-by-the-organizing-committee-of-the-second-international-summit-on-human-genome-editing>

National Institute of Health. (2017). *Mental illness*.

https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/mental-illness.shtml#part_155771.

Niwa, M., Jaaro-Peled, H., Tankou, S., Sheshadri, S., Hikida, T., Matsumoto, Y., Cascella, N.G.,

Kano, S., Ozaki, N., Nabeshima, T., & Sawa, A. (2013). Adolescent stress–induced epigenetic control of dopaminergic neurons via glucocorticoids. *Science*, *6117*, 335-339.

O'Hagan, A. (2015). *The happiness project*. The New York Times Style Magazine.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/17/t-magazine/happiness-project-disneyland.html>

Ormond, K.E., Mortlock, D.P., Scholes, D.T., Bombard, Y., Brody, L.C., Faucett, W.A.,

Garrison, N.A., Hercher, L., Isasi, R., Middleton, A., Musunuru, K., Shriner, D., Virani, A., & Young, C.E. (2017). Human germline genome editing. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, *101*, 167-176.

Pew Research Center. (N.D.) *Religion*. <https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/>

How does living in a low-income household affect children in the United States?

Word count: 1995

Introduction

Jairo Gomez lives in a one-bedroom apartment with eight other family members. His family made \$30,000 a year, which according to the federal government, is \$15,000 below the poverty line. When he was in tenth grade, he stayed home from school to take care of his siblings, making his attendance and grades suffer. He claimed if he didn't get an education, he'd be in poverty like his parents. According to UCDAVIS, a center for poverty research, "The official poverty rate is 12.3 percent, based on the U.S. Census Bureau's 2017 estimates. That year, an estimated 39.7 million Americans lived in poverty according to the official measure" (UCDAVIS, 2018). Poverty means that the income level from employment in a household is so low that basic daily needs cannot be met. Poverty has a significant impact on families, especially on children. Families in poverty struggle with providing their children proper nutrition, clothing, housing, and education as well. Daniel Kahneman states, "When entered in multiple regression model to predict well-being along with other aspects of life circumstances (marital status, age, education), the effects of household income are almost invariably both statistically significant and quantitatively important" (Kahneman, 2010). Growing up in poverty can damage children's well-being as well as their academic potential. In addition, low income, debt, and poor quality housing put children at a much higher risk of developing mental health problems, such as depression and anxiety. Like Jairo Gomez, many children living in poverty who have younger siblings are required to stay home from school to take care of them, so parents would not have to spend their remaining money on babysitters. This results in a lack of education which can harm a child's future as well as their happiness and life satisfaction. Children who are a part of a low income household are also exposed to a greater risk of family violence. According to Dr. Katherine Maurer, a 2013 Center for Poverty Research Visiting Graduate Scholar, "Poverty and

the increased stress it causes can increase the risk for family violence, which suggests that economic downturns like the Great Recession may contribute to this stagnation” (Maurer).

Family violence has social, physical, and psychological impacts on children. Low income affects children negatively as they are at risk for mental health issues due to feelings of shame, bullying, and social exclusion. They are also at risk for future academic failure and physical abuse.

Social Lens

Social issues, such as child abuse and social exclusion, have a significant impact on children in low income households. According to May Bulman, a social affairs correspondent, “Children in low-income families are going hungry and experiencing feelings of shame and social exclusion due to lack of money and food” (Bulman, 2019). Due to this feeling of shame, children living in poverty are embarrassed to be around their peers since they cannot afford food at school. They also experience bullying, which can be a great detriment to their mental health. Adding on to Bulman, Kirrily Pells, who teaches on the MA Sociology of Childhood and Children's Rights, states, “In the qualitative interviews children described verbal bullying that made direct reference to their impoverished circumstances, whether through name-calling and insults such as ‘child of a destitute’ or through making fun of the poor quality of their clothing or their lack of shoes” (Pells, 2016). Poor children have to go through harsh comments and insults every day because of how they dress, even though it is never their fault. This can lead to depressing thoughts. Other than social exclusion and bullying, children in poverty are heavily exposed to child abuse and family violence. Maren K. Dale, staff attorney at U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit Victims of Physical Abuse, “The incidence rate of abuse for children in low-SES families is more than three times the rate for children not in low-SES families” (Dale, 2014). Low socioeconomic status (SES) has a significant impact on child abuse.

Since parents are so stressed out about their income level, they tend to take it out on their children. Child maltreatment can have awful effects on a child's physical and mental well being. In agreement, Dr. Katherine Maurer, as previously mentioned, states, "A lack of steady work can cause problems in the home. Unemployment is a high risk factor for IPV and is associated with double the risk of PCA, as well as triple the severity of injury" (Maurer). Physical child abuse (PCA) can lead to damage to a child's physical health, which is particularly frightening. Shame and child abuse are two of the many social challenges children in poverty face, and can harm a child's physical and psychological well-being.

Scientific Lens

Many kids who live in a low-income household struggle with mental health issues, as mentioned earlier. Those who spent more time in poverty in early childhood are likely to develop psychiatric disorders while approaching adulthood. According to Dhruv Khuller, a physician at New York-Presbyterian Hospital and a researcher at the Weill Cornell Medical College Department of Healthcare Policy and Research, "Americans living in families that earn less than \$35,000 a year are four times as likely to report being nervous and five times as likely to report being sad all or most of the time, compared to those living in families earning more than \$100,000 a year" (Khullar, 2018). These feelings can develop early in life and can be transmitted across future generations. Children living in deep poverty experience various consequences throughout their childhood such as depression and anxiety. Similarly to Khullar, Mary Elizabeth Dallas, a journalist who covers issues on pediatric health and behavior, states, "Growing up in poverty exposes children to greater levels of stress, which can lead to psychological problems later in life, a new study suggests" (Dallas, 2017). There is a strong link between poverty and health, and there are many factors that are associated with it. For example, due to poverty,

families have a lack of access to important things like health insurance which can lead to bad habits such as smoking because of stress. Contributing to Dallas and Khullar, Jim Dryden, who covers psychiatry and neuroscience, states “Children raised in poverty tend to have poorer cognitive and educational outcomes and are at higher risk for psychiatric illnesses, including depression and antisocial behaviors” (Dryden, 2016). Depression can really take a toll on a child and can lead to thoughts of suicide. Child poverty continues to be a major source of mental health issues that remain unsolved.

Futuristic Lens

Poverty has long-lasting effects on children’s future academic successes. ChildFund International, a child development organization, shows that “Children from lower-income families are more likely than students from wealthier backgrounds to have lower test scores, and they are at higher risk of dropping out of school. Those who complete high school are less likely to attend college than students from higher-income families” (ChildFund, 2013). Since many children in poverty cannot afford college, they have a less chance of leading rewarding, productive lives. In addition, children living in a poor household with many siblings have an obligation to miss days of school to take care of them when their parents cannot, in order to save money on babysitters. Jennifer Graham, covering ethics, parenting and family finance, states, “In low-income families in particular, ‘youth may be called on to care for sick family members or stay home with younger siblings when a parent or primary caregiver is sick or cannot take time off work’” (Graham, 2019). Children who stay home to take care of their younger siblings miss the opportunity for education compared to those who live in a higher income household. Because of this, children may not be able to get into college and could end up in poverty like their parents. Operation Warm Inc., a corporation that creates brand new winter coats and gives them

away to children in need, helping to improve self-confidence, peer acceptance, school attendance, and overall wellness, continues to prove this stating “Nearly 30 percent of poor children do not complete high school, which limits future economic success and potential employability, leading to poverty as an adult” (Operation Warm Inc., 2018). Parents with low incomes have less time to help their children with school and less stable home environments, which can result in a lack of preparation for future academic hardships. There are many major long-term impacts of poverty on children, and educational attainment is one of them.

Can Low Income Families Be Happy?

Although money can be essential to one’s happiness, many families actually say having a lower income brought them closer together and helped them build stronger relationships with each other. Susan Scutti, an Atlanta-based writer who covers daily medical and science news for *CNN Health*, states, ““They really prioritize relationships because of their reduced resources, and so they are more likely to really focus on emotions that bind them to one another and find satisfaction and delight in relationships through compassion and love”” (Scutti, 2018). The emotions that highly contribute to well-being are those of love and compassion. The Dalai Lama proves this, stating “What characterizes happiness at this deeper level is the sense of fulfillment that you experience. While the joy of the senses is brief, the joy at this deeper level is much longer lasting. It is true joy” (Lama, 2016). Despite the fact that true contentment comes from relationships and love, children in low income households are still considered unhappy due to the stress, shame, and lack of education they tend to experience. Opposing Scutti, Elizabeth Bruenig, opinion columnist focusing on politics, religion and morality in public life, states, “The researchers also controlled for stress—the poor suffer a great deal more of it—and concluded that the psychological burdens of poverty don’t sufficiently explain the greater sadness endured

by the poor” (Bruenig, 2015). Money may not buy happiness, but it definitely has a significant impact on emotional well being. A higher salary certainly gives more emotional benefit than a lower one.

Conclusion

Overall, low income households influence children in various detrimental ways. It is important that mental health practitioners and health care providers are aware of the potential threats low income can pose to children so that they can provide them with proper recommendations and guidance. A potential solution to help child poverty would be granting social protection. UNICEF, a United Nations agency responsible for providing humanitarian and developmental aid to children worldwide, defines social protection as “...cash transfers, such as child benefits to shield children from the worst impacts of poverty, as well as integrated systems to provide vulnerable children and families with the extra support and care they need.” (UNICEF, 2019) Investing in children and social protection can prevent, manage and overcome the poverty that threatens children’s mental state. However, too many children are still denied social protection. This is due to limited budgets and resources, and the most vulnerable children are not receiving the benefits to which they are entitled. Nevertheless, those who do gain extra support which can benefit their emotional well-being. In addition, free tutoring systems should be created in poorer areas to keep children in poverty on track academically. This would not only help children receive higher test scores and fewer failures, it would help them reach academic achievement in the future. Nicholas Schuller, the Regional Manager of the nonprofit tutoring organization Achieve Learning and Resource Center (ALRC), states, “High quality tutoring needs to be available to low-income students. Without the support of a strong tutor, poor students face a struggle if they wish to graduate from high school prepared to attend college” (Schuller,

2010). However, these tutoring systems are very expensive as tutors would need to be paid. Since many lower-class families cannot afford to get their kids tutors, this free tutoring program would definitely keep kids from falling behind and have a significant impact on their future successes. The challenges children in poverty face can plague them throughout their lifespan, which is why they need the most support they can get. Otherwise, future generations would be impacted as well.

References

- Bulman , May. “Children in Low-Income Families Facing 'Hunger and Shame', Study Finds.” *The Independent*, Independent Digital News and Media, 2 Apr. 2019, www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/hild-poverty-uk-children-hunger-hungry-meals-low-income-families-benefits-a8848041.html.
- Bruenig, Elizabeth. “Wealth Doesn't Make the Rich Happier, But Poverty Makes the Poor Sadder.” *The New Republic*, 27 Jan. 2015, newrepublic.com/article/120859/money-doesnt-buy-happiness-poverty-increases-sadness-study.
- Dale, Maren K. “Addressing the Underlying Issue of Poverty in Child-Neglect Cases.” *American Bar Association*, 2014, www.americanbar.org/groups/litigation/committees/childrens-rights/articles/2014/addressing-underlying-issue-poverty-child-neglect-cases/.
- Dallas, Mary Elizabeth. “The Toll Poverty Takes on Children's Mental Health.” *CBS News*, CBS Interactive, 10 Jan. 2017, www.cbsnews.com/news/poverty-children-mental-health/.
- “The Effects of Poverty on Education in the United States.” *ChildFund International*, 2013, www.childfund.org/Content/NewsDetail/2147489206/?hss_channel=tw-26086784

“Ending Child Poverty.” *UNICEF Europe and Central Asia*, 2019,

www.unicef.org/eca/what-we-do/ending-child-poverty.

Graham, Jennifer. “More than 1 in 10 Kids Are Chronically Absent from School. Here's

Why Doctors Are Now Saying Some Sick Kids Should Head to Class.” *Deseret News*, Deseret News, 30 Jan. 2019, www.deseret.com/2019/1/30/20664539/more-than-1-in-10-kids-are-chronically-absent-from-school-here-s-why-doctors-are-now-saying-some-sic.

Kahneman D, Deaton A. High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional

well-being. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2010;107(38):16489–16493.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1011492107

Khullar, Dhruv. “Health, Income, & Poverty: Where We Are & What Could Help.”

Health, Income, & Poverty: Where We Are & What Could Help | Health Affairs, 4

Oct. 2018, www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hpb20180817.901935/full/.

Lama, Dalai., *The Book of Joy: Lasting Happiness in a Changing World*. [New York] :

[Westminster, MD]: Penguin Random House, 2016.

“Long-Term Impacts of Poverty on Children: Health & Education.” *Operation Warm*

Inc., 27 June 2018, www.operationwarm.org/blog/long-term-impacts-of-poverty-on-children-health-education/.

Maurer, Katherine. “Income Support May Reduce Violence for Poor Families.” *UC*

Davis Center for Poverty Research, poverty.ucdavis.edu/policy-brief/income-support-may-reduce-violence-poor-families.

Pells, Korrily. "Poverty, Inequity and Children's Experiences of Bullying."

Wwww.younglives.org.uk, 21 Oct. 2016, www.younglives.org.uk/content/poverty-inequity-and-children%E2%80%99s-experiences-bullying.

"What Is 'Deep Poverty'?" *UC Davis Center for Poverty Research*, 2018,

poverty.ucdavis.edu/faq/what-deep-poverty.

Schuller, Nicholas. "Why Low-Income Students Need Tutoring – Poverty Insights."

Poverty Insights Why LowIncome Students Need Tutoring Comments, 2010, www.povertyinsights.org/2010/05/27/why-low-income-students-need-tutoring/.

Scutti, Susan. "Less Money Can Mean More Contentment, Study Says." *CNN*, Cable

News Network, 28 Feb. 2018, www.cnn.com/2017/12/18/health/poor-rich-happiness-study/index.html.

Shouldn't Individual's" Perception be Similar When Being in the Same Surrounding?

AP Seminar

2020

Word count: 2073

Individuals will experience different emotions in different surroundings. The brain will naturally have a trigger causing an emotional reaction. What is an emotional reaction? “ A reaction of the body to a situation primarily by another influence such as other individuals, groups, things or entities” (Mike, 2005). Behavior is determined by emotions whether the individual is feeling excited, worried, happy, etc. A relevant example comes from an article called “The Happiness Project” O'Hagan describes the excitement being at Disney seeing how the house had amazing colors that would light you up inside. Another example is when O'Hagan said “When foreigners think about Scotland they often think of the beautiful mountains and deep shadowy glens, apple-cheeked girls wearing tartan, men in kilts drinking whisky and starting bravely into the future”. Meaning that Individuals will have a triadic structure causing their behavior to change in certain situations. However, if a group is nervous for an event coming up that does not mean that the others will feel as nervous as the particular individual. This does not always mean happiness this can also mean when they are not comfortable in a situation, they can be scared or sad etc... it all comes naturally. “Perception is the recognition and interpretation of sensory stimuli based upon memory. In other words, it is the way individuals interpret data around others” (Human Relations). Individuals' behavior will be affected anywhere either it's their environment, social or a culture, it doesn't matter where they are it is the way they are feeling in a situation. This also means that their behavior will also affect their personality. Personality “refers to a person's general way of thinking, feeling, and behaving based on underlying motivations and impulses (Culture, Personality, and Perception). The behaviors that an individual has are how their personality is made.

Influences are constrained by the dominant view of the representation of the world. Assumed that individuals will understand the world through the 5 senses in their mind (Bickhard, 1992). The 5 senses are touch, sight, sound, smell and taste that an individual should be

capable of understanding how the world goes around. University of Minnesota studies show that the environment can facilitate or discourage interactions among people and the subsequent benefits of social support. The environment can influence peoples' behavior and motivation to act. For example, There's trash all over a public park and no one wants to pick it up and since everyone one else is leaving trash everywhere they will also. As in if a group of people decide to keep their community clean others will be motivated to help and keep it clean. The environment can also influence the mood. For example, the results of several research studies reveal that rooms with bright light, both natural and artificial, can improve health outcomes such as depression agitation, and sleep (Impact Does the Environment). Each individual has their own unique and will see and think in a different way. As a person who loves outdoors will be happy to get fresh air as others might dislike outdoors won' t be excited to see nature. Air pollution can also affect behavior but this air pollution is not outside instead this pollution is indoors. Causing highly negative effects of their behavior from anxiety, stress or simply daily headaches. Most individuals have their own daily routines but could begin to change themselves to help them stay motivated. "Behavioral potentials set the limits within which our dispositions can vary... different behavioral dispositions are related to our motivations, to our basic needs, attitudes and interests" (R.J. Rummel). Starting a new routine by doing new activities that get people more motivated for example going on outdoor adventures such as a hike or canoeing that will have them feeling good inside. According to Jessica Stillman she came up with some simple solutions that science proved that can change a personality for the better. The examples she used were 1. Before going to bed reflects something positive that happens during the day. 2. Being polite and saying hello to new people. 3. Find a volunteer organization to help others without getting anything in exchange. If an individual feels neurotic another of her tips was 1. When waking up tell yourself "I will be happy today" 2. Open up to someone and tell them how

you feel. 3. Instead of thinking about the negatives, think of the things that make you feel relaxed or happy (J. Stillman). Experiencing new things will change an individual's personality. Individuals will find their motivation in what they love doing the most. These simple tasks can be beneficial if they decide they want a better personality and attitude. The work has to be put in for it to actually happen if the individual just decides they want to change to have a more positive personality and do nothing about it to change it then the most simple thing is nothing will change and will stay the way they are.

Individuals have a hard time with physical appearance and try living with high expectations in society. Afraid they will be judged by others and not be able fit in with the world. A study has shown that "Others pay more attention to a person's race and religion, and still others attend a person's height or weight" (Principles Of Social Psychology). Each individual is different; they will see and think differently. Interactions and origins will affect an individual trying to fit in. The surrounding of these people will change their behavior pending the group of peers they associate with. Pending on the groups of peers they decide to hang out with can either have positive or negative impacts on their personality. For example, high school students will try to be someone who they are not having a negative impact on themselves. The individual might not agree with the things they do but if their peers are doing it the individual feels peer pressured into doing it just to fit in with them because they are worried to be alone in society. This is because when an individual tries to fit in with society and feels that the only option is to hang out with peers that are bad influences. If they don't do as they demand they will not want the individual to hang out with them causing their personality to change into a negative behavior getting them in trouble. In addition, hanging with a group of peers will motivate them to do better, keep them out of trouble and to have a positive personality. According to Mellissa and Bargh a research was done that "Numerous theorists have argued that behavior is mentally

represented in a similar way to other social information such as judgments and attitude". The perception of the individual views the group of peers they associate will determine their behavior and action. Being worried of physical appearance or being judged by others shouldn't matter because each human is unique in their own ways. Another example is when individuals get plastic surgery because others judge their appearance or do not accept themselves for who they are. They feel that getting plastic surgery will make them feel more acceptable in today's society and will boost their self-confidence. It is mostly females that have plastic surgery to get the curves they see on models. A lot of the surgeries that are now done in today's generation are liposuction, tummy tuck, breast augmentation and laser hair removal. Dr. Adrain Furnham states that "Females with low self-esteem, low life satisfaction, low self-rated attractiveness are more likely to undergo cosmetic surgery" (A. Furnham). No one should be ashamed of the way they were born. Every human on this planet is perfect that way they are and they do not have to change anything about themselves just to feel more acceptable in today's society. But others will not think the same and therefore is why they get plastic surgery done to feel more acceptable.

Many humans come from different countries meaning they have their own culture and way of viewing things. Once an individual moves to a different part of the country they will also bring their culture with them. An individual culture can have a different language, meals, music, art, sounds and clothing. Culture can affect the perceptions that others make such as race, gender, sexual orientation, class, ability, nationality, religion and age. Individuals can tend to be scared to show off their culture because they are afraid of getting judged. "Culture involves how a person lives, speaks, interacts with others and what individuals create, but perception is considered on how the individual sees the world" (G. Arnold). What this means is that they were raised to see the world different. For example, in a hispanic culture the Lady of Guadalupe

remains a powerful symbol of faith. As for others they might not even know who the Lady of Guadalupe is or what she represents. Even if they know they will not view her the same as a hispanic culture would see her because they grew up in a culture where she is represented. Each individual will have a different perception of a culture and they will have different opinions on how they see things. This can affect an individual's behavior either they are comfortable in the situation they are in. Since they are not used to a certain kind of culture it will be a new experience for them. Another example, are religions there are approximately 4200 religions around the world. Each religion there has a different belief in worship. Each person believes what they want to believe and the religion they want to be. They say there is only one original religion but every religion says that they are the one. A Christianity will have a different perception than a Judaism because they both share a common thing and it is worship but they have two different ways of viewing the world. Each individual has the right to believe in what they want without getting judged by others. "A poet once said, "There are plenty of ruined buildings in the world but no ruined stones." But who can live in a world of stones? One might argue... the reality is we love us the reality we brought into" (A. O'Hagan). This can be many themes but the one of themes is the way an individual will and wants to see the world. There are no right or wrong answers; it is a personal opinion of their perceptive. The choices that an individual takes is the behaviors and attitude they decide they want.

Each individual has their own unique. Each individual will have their different behaviors and their own ways of seeing the world. Their surroundings will affect their emotions depending if they are comfortable in the situation or not. This will determine the behavior they will have in the situation. The way an individual perspective of a surrounding can affect their overall behavior is getting out of their daily routine. Trying something new or experiencing something they never thought of even doing. Each individual is responsible for their life which means that

they have the freedom to do whatever they want. Having a positive mindset to everything an individual will do. There will always be different aspects of the world and everyone will see it differently and it should not stop anyone from believing in what they believe in. There will always be different perceptions to everything and that does not mean that someone is right or that someone is wrong it just means that everyone has a different opinion about the way they see things. This also does not mean that they need to bring each other instead support each other with anything because we are all humans and no one is perfect in this world. As O'Hagan describes the excitement when he went to Disney. He would mention what he saw and how he saw things and how he felt at the moment. He explained it in his perfection as others will explain a different emotion and will feel a different way and this is because we are different and have a unique way of thinking. In the real world we all see things differently and have our own opinions about different things. No one should bring on another down because of their appearance, culture or anything in general and accept everyone for who they are.

Citations

**Authors Ron Refaeli, et al. "How Do Emotions Work?" *Frontiers for Young Minds*,
kids.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/frym.2017.00069**

**Chu, Melissa. "Why Your Environment Is the Biggest Factor in Changing Your
Life." *Inc.com*, Inc., 21 Aug. 2017,
[www.inc.com/melissa-chu/its-possible-to-design-your-environment-to-help-yo.ht
ml](http://www.inc.com/melissa-chu/its-possible-to-design-your-environment-to-help-you.html).**

**Furnham, Adrian, and James Levitas. "Factors That Motivate People to Undergo
Cosmetic Surgery." *The Canadian Journal of Plastic Surgery = Journal Canadien
De Chirurgie Plastique*, Pulsus Group Inc, 2012,
www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3513261/.**

**Furnham, Adrian, and James Levitas. "Factors That Motivate People to Undergo
Cosmetic Surgery." *The Canadian Journal of Plastic Surgery = Journal Canadien
De Chirurgie Plastique*, Pulsus Group Inc, 2012,
www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3513261/.**

**Mike Schnoor. "Emotional Response." *Mike Schnoor*, Mike Schnoor
[Https://Mikeschnoor.com/Upload/2018/05/mikeschnoor_logo_website.Png](https://mikeschnoor.com/Upload/2018/05/mikeschnoor_logo_website.Png), 18 May
2007, mikeschnoor.com/2005/03/05/emotional-response/.**

Multicomfort.saint,
multicomfort.saint-gobain.com/news/how-your-personal-environment-can-affect-
your-mood-and-mental-health.

PERCEPTION AND BEHAVIOR, www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/TCH.CHAP7.HTM.

Stillman, Jessica. “20 Simple Activities That Science Proves Can Change Your
Personality for the Better.” *Inc.com, Inc.*, 12 Nov. 2018,
www.inc.com/jessica-stillman/this-is-how-to-change-your-personality-for-better-according-to-latest-research.html.

STUDY.COM,
study.com/academy/lesson/cultural-perception-definition-examples.html.

STUDY.COM,
study.com/academy/lesson/how-emotions-affect-behavior.html.
Support, Lumen Learning. “SPCH 1311: Introduction to Speech
Communication.” *Lumen,*
courses.lumenlearning.com/atdcoursereview-speechcomm-1/chapter
/culture-personality-and-perception/.
“What Impact Does the Environment Have on Us?” *Taking Charge of Your Health*
& Wellbeing,
[www.takingcharge.csh.umn.edu/explore-healing-practices/healing-environment/w](http://www.takingcharge.csh.umn.edu/explore-healing-practices/healing-environment/what-impact-does-environment-have-us)
[hat-impact-does-environment-have-us.](http://www.takingcharge.csh.umn.edu/explore-healing-practices/healing-environment/what-impact-does-environment-have-us)

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Index of Scores for Samples

Sample Reference	Row 1	Row 2	Row 3	Row 4	Row 5	Row 6	Row 7
A: Genetic Editing	5	5	9	12	9	5	3
B: Low Income and Children	0	0	6	8	6	3	2
C: Perception	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Sample A

Preventing Mental Illness: Why Genetic Editing Is Unfeasible

Sample Scores: 5, 5, 9, 12, 9, 5, 3

On- or Off-Topic Decision

The response was determined to be on-topic. By exploring the practice of gene editing as it relates to mental health, the topic of the response is firmly situated in the broader topic of mental wellness and emotional happiness.

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context (Stimulus Material)

The response earned 5 points in Row 1. On the first page, the response integrates information from “Genes, Economics, and Happiness” in a paraphrase that references research on a particular gene that has “a relationship with depression and overall life satisfaction.” This is an example of a successful integration of the source as context for the research question. Selecting this evidence from the stimulus sources also reflects an accurate understanding of the material while harnessing the evidence to present the relationship between genes and mental wellness. Although later on page 6 the response cites O’Hagan, this inclusion from “The Happiness Project” does not reflect an accurate interpretation of the source material. By presenting this quote as justification for how “genes are only partially responsible for mental health,” the response inaccurately suggests that O’Hagan’s article about Disney World was also about genes. Had this been the only integration from the stimulus sources, the response would not have earned any points for this rubric row because it would reflect an inaccurate understanding, and this bit of information did not further the argument in any meaningful way.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Context

The response earned 5 points in Row 2. In its introduction, the response cites 2017 statistics from the National Institute of Mental Health: “approximately 46.6 million adults in the United States currently live with a mental illness.” The response then presents evidence that reflects the increased research into causes of mental illness, stating that “genetics have been found to play a large role in people’s likelihood of developing a mental illness,” thus linking gene research to mental illness. The importance of this scientific connection for this specific group of people successfully situates the research question in context, asking, “[T]o what extent might genetic editing be a practical preventative treatment for mental illness?”

Row 3: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The response earned 9 points in Row 3. The response not only includes multiple perspectives, but also brings those perspectives into thoughtful dialogue. On page 3, the response presents Bergman, reporting that some believe “it is inherently unethical to ‘play God’ and alter the very fabric of what makes us up as people,” and ties this in general terms to religious groups and more specifically to the Ishii source about the potential abuses of genetic editing, including “more cosmetic and medically unnecessary purposes, such as genetic enhancement.” The response introduces different perspectives such as the “countries around the world [that] already have legislation outlawing germline genome editing.” Adding an alternative perspective, the response notes, “despite the controversy surrounding this idea, genetic alterations to reduce vulnerable people’s predisposition to mental illness have the

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

potential to be very effective if carried out responsibly.” The response adds evidence from Hyman and Kim to support this perspective. The response also acknowledges the commonly understood counter-perspective, which prioritizes environmental influences. It is not just the number of perspectives, but also the ways in which the response situates them in conversation with each other—and its own voice—that elevate this paper to the highest score for this row.

Row 4: Establish Argument

The response earned 12 points in Row 4. The response organizes the argument logically, moving from the research question about the extent to which genetic editing could be used to prevent mental illness to stating the range of opinions on genetic editing, including “the morality, safety, and applicability of germline genome editing in humans.” The response then cites evidence about the topic’s moral controversy and the “high potential for abuse with genetic modification.” The response concludes, “Despite the speculative potential of this method, several concerns have been presented that arguably outrule its practicality.”

In the supporting paragraphs, the response provides commentary that clearly links the evidence to claims. For example, on page 4, about the countries who have legislation against genetic editing, the response moves from Ishii’s acknowledging the variety of enforcement practices in the different countries to Juengst’s recognizing the need for “a massive overhaul of global regulations” if the scientific community reached a consensus on acceptable use of DNA modification. The response draws conclusions from these pieces of evidence on the practical challenges of regulating genetic editing and reasons, “This probable inability to create and enforce successful regulatory legislation for DNA modification further contributes to why its implementation is risky in any capacity.”

After an examination of the limitations, the response provides sufficient detail to recognize the plausibility of its conclusion: “Until more research and organized public discussion is conducted, it [genetic editing to prevent mental illness] will remain unfeasible.”

Row 5: Select and Use Evidence

The response earned 9 points in Row 5. The response includes several credible, scholarly sources including the Journal of Human Genetics, the Plant Biotechnology Journal, and the American Journal of Human Genetics. Likewise, the response includes information from the Bulletin of the World Health Organization and a report from the National Academy of Sciences as evidence specifically relevant to this topic. Beyond the stimulus materials and peer-reviewed articles, the response purposefully incorporates statistical information from the Pew Research Center and the National Institute of Mental Health and commentary from more popular publications. For example, the response cites a review by Lawrence & Applebaum in *Psychiatry* about the range of opinions on gene editing, followed by a scientific definition of germline genome editing by Ormand from a peer-reviewed journal. It then connects both of these references to Ishii’s conclusion that “genetic editing is largely believed by the scientific community to be ethically dubious, difficult to regulate, too complex to be reliably successful, and have a high potential for abuse.” In doing so, the response demonstrates both purposeful use and appropriate selection of sources.

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Citation and Attribution)

The response earned 5 points in Row 6. The response includes a properly formatted Reference page with all entries corresponding to in-text citations, showing consistent evidence of linking sources to evidence. The internal citations consistently provide either attributive phrasing such as, “According to Eric Juengst,” and, “a study conducted by Han-Na Kim, a professor of the Department of Biochemistry,” or include appropriate in-text parenthetical citations.

Row 7: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style)

The response earned 3 points in Row 7. The response maintains an academic tone throughout by demonstrating a mastery of effective word choice, appropriate terminology, and clear and concise sentence structure. The response consistently uses transitional phrases to move into new paragraphs and strong transitional words to move from one idea to another within paragraphs. Take, for example, the terms “additionally,” “yet,” “furthermore,” “hence,” and “however” within sentences and phrases such as, “[t]he most prominent issue...” and, “[t]his also indicates...” between ideas and paragraphs.

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Sample B

How does living in a low-income household affect children in the United States?

Sample Scores: 0, 0, 6, 8, 6, 3, 2

On- or Off-Topic Decision

The response was determined to be on-topic, clearly connecting to the theme of well-being.

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context (Stimulus Material)

The response earned 0 points in Row 1. The response’s use of Kahneman’s quote, taken from a text about the impact of money on happiness, presents a conclusion drawn from a “multiple regression model.” Although attempts to integrate it do not reflect a wholly inaccurate understanding of it, the response also does not indicate a full comprehension of this text. Attempts to apply the multiple regression model to the “academic potential” of children in poverty, perhaps conflating potential with achievement, obscure the fact that the stimulus document did not cover the effect of poverty on children.

The response also uses a quote taken from *The Book of Joy* to support a claim related to emotional wellbeing, expanding the conversation to “true joy” and unsuccessfully attempting to relate that to low-income households. This tangential inclusion of the stimulus material does not further the response’s argument in any meaningful way.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Context

The response earned 0 points in Row 2. The unmanageably broad topic is evident in the research question and is far too complex to be addressed in this task. The hypothetical example of Jairo Gomez is unsubstantiated, and the information provided about this hypothetical student is not detailed. For example, “he stayed home from school...making his attendance and grades suffer.” The 2017 Census Bureau estimate of how many Americans live in poverty is sound evidence, but fails to capture the relevance of this number to American children specifically, thereby only partially addressing the question. The statistic provided later in the response, “[n]early 30 percent of poor children do not complete high school,” might have been used to begin building context for a narrower response, but the breadth of this response is only partially contextualized with this information. Many claims that appear to exist to provide evidence for the significance of the question are either unsubstantiated or too obvious to indicate an understanding of demonstrating appropriate context for a research-based argument. Evidence of this can be found throughout the introduction.

Row 3: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The response earned 6 points in Row 3. The response offers multiple perspectives through evidence from stakeholders: students, a teacher of psychology, a staff attorney, a physician, a researcher, journalists, and organizations. However, there are only general comparisons among perspectives. For example, on page 2, the response attempts to connect two pieces of evidence, “Adding on to Bulman, Kirrily Pells,” but does nothing more than insert the general agreement word “adding.” Page 3 offers “In agreement,” but again offers no commentary that elaborates on those connections. The response pulls together numerous stakeholders to explore poverty’s effect on children; they all have general

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

agreement that poverty is detrimental to children. One dissenting voice, Susan Scutti, contributes that children in poverty have closer families, which can only be described as revealing basic disagreement.

Row 4: Establish Argument

The response earned 8 points in Row 4. The response demonstrates an attempt to provide a logical organizational structure, but that structure suffers from the unmanageable breadth and depth of the topic. Since the response tries to encapsulate so many topics (bullying, social exclusion, academic failure, and physical abuse), the argument devolves into a list of ways in which being poor hurts children, with disparate pieces of evidence used to imply the response’s argument that poverty hurts children. As such, the response demonstrates an understanding of how evidence should support claims, but the overly broad nature of the paper’s topic prevents the argument from coming together to support any feasible conclusion.

The response arrives at the conclusion that low-income households “influence children in various detrimental ways” in the last paragraph and offers humanitarian aid and tutoring as possible solutions, without sufficient detail for a reader to assess its plausibility.

Row 5: Select and Use Evidence

The response earned 6 points in Row 5. The response includes evidence from multiple scholarly and journalistic sources, though relevance and credibility are rarely explained and so must be surmised through the References page. Additionally, the use of those sources is often misaligned with the evidence provided. For example, on page 4, Operation Warm, described as “providing winter coats to needy children,” provides evidence of the percentage of poor children who do not complete high school with no explanation for why Operation Warm is a relevant or credible source for that information. Finally, on page 5, Elizabeth Bruenig, an opinion journalist, is employed to discuss an otherwise unreferenced study.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Citation and Attribution)

The response earned 3 points in Row 6. The response is mostly uniform in citation style. The Reference page is, for the most part, formatted correctly. The in-text citation UCDAVIS, unsuccessfully linked to a citation in the References section, could be either Maurer or “What is ‘Deep Poverty’?” Also, the in-text citation UNICEF is unclearly linked to the References citation “Ending Child Poverty.” Finally, Dryden is referenced in the paper but does not appear in the list of references. While there is uniformity with citation style and overall successful linking in citations, the errors in citation demonstrate a mid-level mastery.

Row 7: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style)

The response earned 2 points in Row 7. While the response is mostly clear, there are lapses into colloquial language. For example, the response states that “parents are so stressed out.” The response also displays moments of syntactical awkwardness. For example, on page 2, the awkward transition from the Bulman source into the Pells source says, “Adding on to Bulman.” Additionally, the response attempts to address too many disparate ideas in the space of a sentence. For example, on page 4, the response discusses shame and abuse together in one sentence without using punctuation appropriately to clarify and separate ideas.

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Sample C

Shouldn't Individual's Perception Be Similar When Being in the Same Surrounding?

Sample Scores: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0

On- or Off-Topic Decision

The response was determined to be on-topic. Although the integration of the stimulus material is unsuccessful, the response is broadly related to the theme of happiness and “emotional reaction[s],” especially through behaviors. For example, the response states, “Behavior is determined by emotions whether the individual is feeling excited, worried, happy, etc.”

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context (Stimulus Materials)

The response earned 0 points in Row 1. Although the response references “The Happiness Project” article more than once, it does so in ways that are contrived or otherwise fail to demonstrate an accurate understanding of the stimulus material. For example, the response says O’Hagan “describes the excitement being at Disney seeing how the house had amazing colors that would light you up inside,” which does not correspond with the assumed research question: “The behaviors that an individual has are how their personality is made.” Then the response interprets a quote from the same passage about Scotland as evidence of how “[i]ndividuals will have a triadic structure causing their behavior to change in certain situations,” thereby providing an inaccurate reading of the source.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Context

The response earned 0 points in Row 2. The response opens with the overly broad statement, “Individuals will experience different emotions in different surroundings.” The response does not narrow the context from unspecified “individuals,” “people,” and “humans” throughout. Later in the narrative, the response does provide examples using “high school students” and “females,” but does not provide evidence or explanation to place any claims in a larger context. The response appears to discuss a topic about the relationship between behavior, personality, and perception without explaining why this question requires academic attention.

Row 3: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The response earned 0 points in Row 3. The response presents an oversimplified opinion that individuals have emotions relative to their surroundings. While the response attempts to consider the role of the five senses on individuals’ emotions and shifts to a discussion of physical appearance (i.e., “Individuals have a hard time with physical appearance and try living with high expectations in society”), these diversions are not distinct perspectives.

Row 4: Establish Argument

The response earned 0 points in Row 4. The response fails to make an argument regarding the idea of individuals and their emotions. While the response considers various constructs such as “[i]nfluences are constrained by the dominant view of the representation of the world” and “[m]any humans come from different countries,” the response does not move beyond the vague notion of connecting individuals and their emotions. Attempting to substantiate this idea late in the narrative, the response lists instructive ideas individuals may try in an attempt to understand their emotions (e.g., “[t]rying

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 2
Individual Written Argument (IWA)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

something new,” “[h]aving a positive mindset”), ending with the somewhat disconnected directive, “No one should bring on another down because of their appearance, culture or anything in general...”

Row 5: Select and Use Evidence

The response earned 0 points in Row 5. The response presents sources that are not credible and seems to rely on commercial websites for evidence without the use of well-vetted sources. For instance, the Citations page lists two sources each from Inc.com and Study.com, but the response does not link these sources to identifiable in-text citations. The most credible source is a journal article by Dr. Adrian Furnham republished by the National Institutes of Health, but the response uses one quote from this source (“Females with low self-esteem, low life satisfaction, low self-rated attractiveness are more likely to undergo cosmetic surgery”), which is only tangentially relevant to the topics of behavior, perception, and emotion.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Citation and Attribution)

The response earned 0 points in Row 6. While the Citations page is alphabetized, the response provides little evidence of successful linkage of sources to in-text citations. The Citations page contains several errors, such as one entry labeled “Authors Ron Refaeli, et al,” the repetition of the Furnham source, the use of the author’s first name for the Schnoor source, and several sources with only a URL listed in the entry. Several in-text citations do not link to an entry on the Citations page, including “Human Relations,” “Culture, Personality, and Perception,” G. Arnold, and R. J. Rummel. These errors combine to display a lack of mastery of the skill of applying bibliographic conventions.

Row 7: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style)

The response earned 0 points in Row 7. The response contains several grammatical errors, such as sentence fragments (e.g., “Causing highly negative effects of their behavior from anxiety, stress or simply daily headaches”) and a number of run-on sentences (e.g., “There will always be different perceptions to everything and that does not mean that someone is right or that someone is wrong it just means that everyone has a different opinion about the way they see things”). The response contains mostly short sentences that convey an overall choppy tone. The response’s persistent use of contractions and preponderance of errors place the tone in a less formal style that shows a lack of mastery of writing for an academic audience.