

## 2006 Compare & Contrast Annotated Rubric: Russian, Chinese, & Mexican Revolutions

Note to teachers:

This Annotated Rubric is specifically designed for the College Board's AP World History course, but could also be helpful in any world history survey course. The best source of information about how to teach essay skills is the AP World History Course Description, (aka the "Acorn" Book), published every 2 years by the College Board. It can be downloaded for no cost at

[http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/teachers\\_corner/4484.html](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/teachers_corner/4484.html)

Another great source of learning how to teach good writing skills is by being an Essay Reader. You'll have direct, first-hand experience reading essays, and get an unforgettable amount of insight into the most common writing techniques, both effective and otherwise. You'll also enjoy meeting other dedicated, talented, and resourceful World History teachers from around the world who will encourage and challenge you in a myriad of ways. You can apply to be an AP Reader at

<http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/homepage/4137.html>

The discussions on the AP World History Electronic Discussion Group (EDG) heavily influenced the comments & insights in this Annotated Rubric. The EDG is a great way to ask questions of 1,800+ world history professionals. You can register for the EDG at

<http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/homepage/7173.html>

This Annotated DBQ Rubric is by no means intended as a "turn-key" solution to improving your students' writing. If you want the *real* training as to how to teach a good AP World History course, go to an 1-day AP Workshop or a 5-day Summer Institute. See

<http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/Pageflows/InstitutesAndWorkshops/InstitutesAndWorkshopsController.jspf>

### How to use this Annotated Rubric

The overall goals for this document are to help students improve their writing and to reinforce the "Habits of Mind" discussed in the Acorn book. In my high school, I am fortunate to have an excellent English department that teaches students the importance of clear thesis state-

ments and good writing mechanics. My job is made far easier in that "all" I have to do is to show the students how to apply what they've already learned in their English classes to AP World History.

I've tried to show 3 levels of answers to each Rubric category: 1) an unacceptable response that fails to meet the criteria; 2) an acceptable response; and 3) an excellent response that demonstrates mastery of the required skill. Only you know your students' writing strengths and weaknesses. The danger here is that some students may see the excellent examples and give up, thinking, "I can't possibly do that." Encourage them to take it one step at a time, to improve incrementally towards mastery, and eventually they WILL master the subject. Keep in mind that there are five different categories on the Generic Rubric, with seven possible points. The national median score, at the *end* of the academic year, was 2.60.<sup>1</sup> A student who scores "only" three points on their first attempt should be heartily encouraged, and should not despair that they'll never achieve all seven points on the generic rubric.

Even though this question was from the 2006 test, I've used the Generic Rubric from the current Acorn book to illustrate the grading criteria. Given that this is the direction the World History Test Development Committee is moving, I think it's only appropriate to use the current standards, even though the actual rubric at the time was slightly different.

I hope this teaching tool helps your students to write and think better, and helps you enjoy grading their writing more.

### Bill Strickland

East Grand Rapids HS

East Grand Rapids, MI

[bstrickl@egrps.org](mailto:bstrickl@egrps.org)

[http://moodle.egrps.org/mod/resource/view.php?id=1855&subdir=/Annotated\\_Rubrics](http://moodle.egrps.org/mod/resource/view.php?id=1855&subdir=/Annotated_Rubrics)

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/members/exam/exam\\_questions/2090.html](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/members/exam/exam_questions/2090.html)

**Question:** Compare and contrast the goals and outcomes of the revolutionary process in TWO of the following countries, beginning with the dates specified: Mexico, 1910; China, 1911; Russia, 1917  
*Note that the question only specifies a beginning date, allowing students potentially to compare different subsequent periods of the ongoing revolutionary process.*

Point #	Generic Description <i>Explanation/Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
1 Thesis	<p>Has acceptable thesis. (1 pt)                      (Addresses comparison of the issues or themes specific to the question.)</p> <p><i>The thesis:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot be split</li> <li>• Must be located in either the introductory paragraph or the conclusion.</li> <li>• Cannot simply repeat the question</li> <li>• Cannot count for credit (“double dip”) in any other category</li> <li>• The thesis must address                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ BOTH countries,</li> <li>▶ BOTH a similarity and a difference</li> <li>▶ EITHER goals or outcomes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia and China had similarities and differences in their revolutions’ goals and outcomes.” <i>This merely parrots the question, and is too vague to count for anything.</i></li> <li>• Russia and China’s revolutionary goals and outcomes were very similar. Both countries aimed to change their political structure, economic controls, and social freedoms. <i>Addresses both countries, vaguely summarizes goals and outcomes, but does not include any differences.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Minimally Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Russia and China had different goals for their own revolutions, but ultimately their outcomes were quite similar.” <i>While this thesis was accepted at the reading, it is hardly the ‘target’ that students and teachers should aim for.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revolutionary movements in Mexico in 1910 &amp; Russia in 1917 had similarities and differences. Both movements emphasized industrialization greatly. But unlike Mexico, Russia turned to communism under Stalin while Mexico had people fighting to get out of dictatorship.</li> </ul> <p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both China and Mexico began the 20<sup>th</sup> century as a pawn of foreign powers. While the leaders of Mexico’s revolution focused on ending U.S. domination of Mexican politics and economy by armed rebellion, China instead initially concentrated on adopting ‘foreign ways’. By the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, both countries experienced political success, but differed in their degree of economic independence.</li> </ul>

Point #	Generic Description <i>Explanation/Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
2 Parts of the Question	<p>Addresses all parts of the question, though not necessarily evenly or thoroughly. <b>(2 pts)</b>  <i>Student must address:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• two countries</li> <li>• both a similarity AND a difference</li> <li>• at least one goal AND at least one outcome</li> </ul> <p>(Addresses most parts of the question: for example, deals with differences but not similarities.) <b>(1 pt)</b>  <i>Student must address:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• two countries</li> <li>• either a similarity OR a difference</li> <li>• either one goal OR one outcome</li> </ul> <p>-----  <i>Students CANNOT use thesis statement as this point.</i></p>	<p><i>Note: “Addresses all parts of the question” is a broad description. Satisfying this requirement could be accomplished in a single sentence, but often students used an entire paragraph to deal with one country.</i></p> <p><i>Readers quickly developed a mental “checklist” of the bulleted points at left.</i></p> <p><i>To gain points for this category, the student’s statements must be accurate, but not necessarily specific. General statements are acceptable, if correct (e.g., “Mexico wanted to improve its government” would count as addressing one country.)</i></p>

Point #	Generic Description <i>Explanation/Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">3 Evidence</p>	<p>Substantiates thesis with appropriate historical evidence. <b>(2 pts)</b> <i>Students must include at least one accurate piece of evidence for each country.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Include a minimum of FIVE accurate pieces of evidence <u>related to goals and/or outcomes.</u></i></li> </ul> <p>(Partially substantiates these with appropriate historical evidence. <b>1 pt)</b> <i>Students must include at least one accurate piece of evidence for each country.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Include a minimum of THREE accurate pieces of evidence <u>related to goals and/or outcomes.</u></i></li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <p><i>Note: Evidence CAN appear in the same sentences that are counting towards “Addresses Parts of the Question” OR “Direct Comparisons.”</i></p> <p><i>The minimum requirement for how many pieces of evidence is determined by the reader/teacher, NOT the student.<sup>2</sup></i></p>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russians were still bound to the land and the oppressive Tsars all the common people no say in the government. <i>While accurate, this ‘evidence’ is not related to the goals or outcomes of the revolutionary process.</i></li> <li>• The Chinese people had enough of the Ming dynasty and put a communist in power like their neighbor, Russia.</li> </ul> <p><b>Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “In China, the Qing dynasty was ineffective and squandering what remained of its wealth... In Russia, the Czars were no longer effective and WWI had put a huge strain on Russia socially, politically and economically... Due to all of this, both China and Russia were seeking to replace their existing governments with new ones that would bring their countries out of the slump they were in.” <i>Here, the evidence of causation can be counted as evidence only because it is subsequently tied to revolutionary goals. If the essay had not added the last sentence, the earlier background details, while accurate, would not count as evidence.</i></li> <li>• Both Russia and China tried to limit and reduce outside influences so the focus would remain on their own nation. <i>This statement would “double dip” for both Evidence (related to goals), and a Similarity between two revolutions.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Excellent</b> <i>Provides ample historical evidence to substantiate the thesis.</i></p>

<sup>2</sup> This illustrates an important teaching point. This rubric is designed to spell out the bare minimum that students must do to get a point when the national exam is graded. In the classroom, teachers should aim higher. Ideally, students should do every part of this rubric to every question or document they ever read. That is part of the teacher’s responsibility in training students in the historian’s craft. So how many should teachers demand in the classroom as ‘enough’? College Board Consultant Bard Keeler’s advice is the “Rule of 3.” No matter what the category, give three examples: 3 pieces of evidence for each country; 3 similarities & 3 differences; 3 Changes & 3 Continuities; (for COT essays); 3 POV’s; 3 Groups; (for DBQ essays) etc. This “Rule of 3” not only helps students earn full credit for Evidence, but also requires students to Address all Parts of the Question (Point #2).

## 2006 Compare & Contrast Annotated Rubric: Russian, Chinese, & Mexican Revolutions

### Examples of Relevant Evidence & Information

Often students feel that teachers are unreasonable demanding “too many” specific examples by name. Below is a list of POSSIBLE historical evidence examples students could use. It is NOT exhaustively complete. Obviously, no student could possibly include ALL of these examples. The point is that there’s more than enough evidence available. Note: this list was NOT used by readers at the official reading.

Reminder: all evidence must relate to revolutionary goals and/or outcomes.

Acceptable Evidence		
Mexico	China	Russia
Porfirio Diaz Venustiano Carranza PRI (Institutional Revolutionary Party) continued <i>caudillo</i> hegemony U.S. & European “dollar diplomacy” through 20 <sup>th</sup> century economic “miracle” (oil industry) in 1980s NAFTA & reaction Vicente Fox (PAN)	Sun Yat-sen Chiang Kai-shek (Jiang Jieshi) May 4 <sup>th</sup> Movement Chinese Communist Party (CCP) Nationalists/Kuomintang → Taiwan Great Leap Forward Gang of Four Li Ping Tiananmen Square 3 Gorges Dam	Czar Nicholas II Vladimir Lenin Joseph Stalin collectivization of farms Ukranian starvation, 1932-33 military purges E Europe “satellites” Hungary, 1956 Khrushchev & de-Stalinization Brezhnev Mikhail Gorbachev Vladimir Putin
Unacceptable Evidence		
Santa Ana Alamo Cinco de Mayo Guadalupe Hidalgo Benito Juarez	footbinding Treaty of Nanjing Boxer Rebellion Self-Strengthening Movement	Opium War Taiping Rebellion Open Door Policy Decembrist Revolt Bloody Sunday Emancipation of Serfs Assassination of Alex II Russo-Japanese War

Point #	Generic Description <i>Explanation/Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
<p>4 Direct Comparisons</p>	<p>Makes at least 1 or 2 relevant, direct comparisons between or among societies. (1 pt)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students must make the comparison/contrast between countries explicit and relevant to revolutionary goals or outcomes.</i></li> <li>• <i>It is not sufficient to make statements that would be obvious from the question (e.g., “Both Mexico and Russia wanted political change in the 1910s.”)</i></li> <li>• <i>Mere parallel construction is not enough to earn this point.</i></li> <li>• <i>The direct comparison must be distinct from the thesis statement.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “... both countries were in a time of turmoil.” <i>A direct comparison must do more than state the obvious.</i></li> <li>• Russia set about redistributing land and wealth. Mexico fell under the further domination of wealthy foreign-dominated industrialists and domestic military warlords. <i>This is an example of parallel construction. The comparison is implied (“This happened here. That happened there,”) without any direct linkage between ‘this’ and ‘that,’ ‘here’ and ‘there.’ A small change can make this comparison direct/explicit. Instead of a period between these two sentences, substitute a comma, and add “while.”</i></li> <li>• Different from Mexico, Russia was closer to industrialization but the majority of citizens were peasants. <i>While this IS a direct comparison, it is NOT tied to either the goals or outcomes of the revolutions.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia can be considered a more democratic state, whereas China is still communist. <i>This sentence contains: a difference; an outcome; two pieces of evidence; and a direct comparison.</i></li> <li>• One of the common goals in both the Russian and Chinese revolutions was that of getting rid of monarchy-type governments. <i>Note that the question does not specify the Bolshevik Revolution for Russia. Eliminating the monarchy was a goal of the February Revolution.</i></li> <li>• Once in power Lenin created a communist society with only part in rule (a great dictatorship). Mexico differed from this because after the revolution they did not adopt Marxist values nor communist ambitions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Excellent</b> <i>Makes several direct comparisons consistently between countries, and/or relates comparisons to the larger global context.</i></p>

Point #	Generic Description <i>Explanation/Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
5 Analysis	<p>Analyzes at least one reason for a similarity or difference identified in a direct comparison.</p> <p><i>In regards to goals or outcomes, students must explain why a similarity or a difference occurs, or why a similarity or a difference is significant.</i></p> <p><i>Analysis of goals or outcomes within one country is not sufficient for this point.</i></p>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b> <i>Virtually any narrative that can be summarized as ‘This happened. That happened,’ without breaking down the <u>reasons behind the events</u> is NOT analysis.</i></p> <p>Perhaps the reason for Mexico and China’s differences are because they have traded or come in contact very little with each other since the dawn of trade and are located in very different and far parts of the world. <i>While this statement is accurate, it is not directly relevant to the question (goals and outcomes).</i></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b> Through the revolution Mexico tried to industrialize, and establish itself as a developed nation, whereas China adopted Communism. The economic outcomes of the revolutions were very different. Mexico accepted help from the U.S. and then became dependent on foreign investments, never reaching its goal of becoming a developed nation. China, on the other hand, adopted Communism ... and came to the verge of becoming a super power nation. <i>This paragraph not only earns Analysis credit, but also makes a Direct Comparison between the outcomes of the Mexican &amp; Chinese revolutions.</i></p> <p>One difference between the two was who the revolution focused on. The Chinese focused on the peasants, because there were the outstanding majority in China. The Russians focused on the proletariat, or working class, like Karl Marx had called for in the Communist Manifesto. <i>The use of historical background to explain the similarity/difference of a goal or outcomes is one type of direct comparative analysis.</i></p> <p>Lenin pulled Russia out of WWI, and then centralized his communist government. He also began to take steps to eliminate any resistance. Lenin’s steps in his communist takeover assured a long-lasting regime. This shows that eliminating resistance helps to create an effective government after a revolution. This is something that Sun Yat-sen did not do, a factor which led to the quick end of his new government. <i>This example extends the explanation for a similarity or difference to include the long-term impact, result, or outcome.</i></p> <p>Stalin had the secret police to take out his opposition in Russia had the Red Guard. They killed them or sent them to labor camps to “reform” them. This occurred in both areas because the theory of communism requires that everyone must cooperate for the system to work. Since some wouldn’t cooperate under this false-communism, the leaders got rid of them. <i>An effects example of explaining a similarity.</i></p> <p><b>Excellent</b> <i>Consistently analyzes causes and effects of relevant similarities and differences.</i></p>

### What *IS* Analysis?

The pursuit of Analysis is a perennial quest of AP students (and teachers!) Students who consistently analyze earn high marks on the AP World History Exam. Monica Bond-Lamberty, a teacher at Northwood High School in Silver Spring, MD, and a former member of the AP World History Test Development Committee puts it this way:<sup>3</sup>

Analyze: determine their component parts; examine their nature and relationship.<sup>4</sup> Bloom's Taxonomy refers to "the ability to break down material into its component parts so that its organizational structure may be understood. This may include the identification of parts or components, examination of the relationship between parts, recognition of hidden meanings and detection of the organizational principles or patterns involved."

So when doing historical analysis what is being done is breaking down the item being analyzed into its parts which generally include (depending on what is being analyzed):

- historical actors: events, processes, institutions, ideas, etc. (examination of multiple causation which looks at cause and effect relationships)
- evidence (determining the significance and reliability of various perspectives like when point of view is analyzed)
- interpretations of what happened (comparing and contrasting changing versions of developments or theories)
- underlying structures (determining how all the processes, institutions, ideas, events, actors, motives, evidence, interpretations are connected and related and affect each other)
- overall process of change and continuity (connecting different regions and eras)

This is different from just explaining because of the need to look at multiple causation.

We need to work with students to help them distinguish between analysis and just a simple explanation of causation or a really good description.

---

<sup>3</sup> Monica Bond-Lamberty's AP World History EDG message, 7/1/2005.

<sup>4</sup> AP World History Course Description, p. 32.  
[http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/teachers\\_corner/4484.html](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/teachers_corner/4484.html)



## General Notes

Most students have been writing Compare and Contrast essays for several years, but often don't understand how to structure/organize their essay. Ellen Bell, an AP World History Consultant from Houston, TX has analyzed the overall structure of common Compare and Contrast essays. Her notes below (with our *italicized comments*) can help virtually every aspect of students' writing.

<b>Compare &amp; Contrast Essay Organizational Structures</b>		
<b>Geographic “Lump”</b>	<b>Similarities and Differences</b>	<b>Categorical “Split”</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thesis</li> <li>• Body paragraph 1- region 1 Political Economic Social<sup>5</sup></li> <li>• Body paragraph 2—region 2 Political Economic Social</li> </ul> <p>Note: When writing body paragraph 2 you MUST make comparisons and contrasts back to information in body paragraph 1.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thesis</li> <li>• Body paragraph 1—similarities between regions Political      Economic      Social</li> <li>• Body paragraph 2—differences between regions Political      Economic      Social</li> </ul> <p>Note: There may not be similarities and differences in all three categories.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thesis <u>Paragraph</u> (chooses 3 categories: e.g. political, economic, and social)</li> <li>• Body paragraph 1 <u>Political</u> (similarities AND differences between BOTH regions)</li> <li>• Body paragraph 2 <u>Economic</u> (similarities AND differences between BOTH regions)</li> <li>• Body paragraph 3 <u>Social</u> (similarities AND differences in BOTH regions)</li> </ul>
<p><i>This is the most common (and usually least effective) structure students use. While it CAN work effectively, all too often students forget or fail to make <u>direct comparisons</u> between the regions. (Most comparisons are implied, at best.) Frequently, students are so eager to begin writing they fail to adequately develop their thesis. Also, there's nothing in the overall structure that inherently encourages analysis.</i></p>	<p><i>Students are more likely to initially feel comfortable listing similarities and differences, so this structure might be less intimidating than the Categorical Split.</i></p> <p><i>Good analysis though is more likely to come <u>if/when</u> students proceed to the next level of categorization (political, economic, social, etc).</i></p>	<p><i>Effective pre-writing is vitally important. The Categorical Split structure requires students to spend considerable time planning their thesis and organization. Because the thesis contains categories, it is usually more sophisticated and often automatically helps structure later paragraphs. It may even be good enough for “extra credit” (Expanded Core). Students are more likely to include <u>analysis</u> and numerous direct comparisons. In short, there's nothing like a strong thesis to help everything else.</i></p>

<sup>5</sup> The “political, economic, and social” categories are illustrative only. Obviously, if the question called for religious, cultural, and technological evidence then those categories would apply.