

Question: Based on the following documents, analyze the responses to the spread of Buddhism in China. What additional kind of document(s) would you need to evaluate the extent of Buddhism’s appeal in China?

Historical Background: Buddhism, founded in India in the sixth century B.C.E., was brought to China by the first century C.E., gradually winning converts following the collapse of the Han dynasty in 220 C.E. Buddhist influence continued to expand for several centuries. Between 220 C.E. and 570 C.E. China experienced a period of political instability and disunity. After 570 C.E., the imperial structure was restored.

Point #	Official Description <i>Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
Historical Background		<p><b>The Problem</b> “On the whole, most students did not realize that the historical background section had any relevance to the task at hand, and therefore their essays showed no sense of chronologically specific attitudes. When Readers saw a chronologically argued essay, they could anticipate that it would have the potential to be quite good. More generally, students ignored the dates of the documents almost completely.”<sup>2</sup></p>

<sup>2</sup> 2004 Student Performance Q&A. [http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/repository/ap04\\_qa\\_world\\_hist\\_38556.pdf](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/repository/ap04_qa_world_hist_38556.pdf)

Point #	Official Description <i>Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
1 Thesis	<p>Has an acceptable thesis.</p> <p><i>The thesis should reflect a sophisticated understanding of the complexities within the question.</i></p> <p><i>Thesis should be located at the beginning of the essay (1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).</i></p> <p><b>The Thesis Should:</b><sup>3</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address all parts of the question</li> <li>2. Take a position on the question</li> <li>3. Set out categories for discussion</li> </ol>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b> “There were many responses to the introduction of Buddhism into China.” <i>This thesis is too vague. “Many” is a virtually meaningless qualifier that doesn’t “take a position.”</i><sup>4</sup></p> <p>“Buddhism had a large impact on China.” <i>Off topic. The question asks the reader to focus on the <u>type</u> of responses to Buddhism, NOT the <u>amount</u> of impact Buddhism had in China. This is an example of why it is so important to read the question carefully. Not only would this ‘thesis’ not earn the Thesis point on the DBQ Rubric, it might distract the author from earning other points (#3 Evidence, #5 Content Analysis/Grouping). Make sure to answer precisely what the question asks.</i></p> <p><i>Too many students’ theses can basically be summed up as “‘A’ had a huge effect on ‘B’.” Readers are not easily impressed with qualifiers like “large, huge, big, lots, many” etc. Be more specific! Use <u>quantitative</u> descriptors. If there were 3 effects, <u>name</u> the 3, rather than “many.” If you can’t name 3, then don’t say there were “many” at all. This not only forces students into better thesis statements, it helps organize the rest of the essay, categorizing later evidence paragraphs as well.</i></p> <p><b>Minimally Acceptable</b> “Chinese reacted to Buddhism in both positive and negative ways.” <i>Bare minimum of acceptability. There are at least 2 categories, but good historical analysis should be more descriptive than just ‘good’ and ‘bad.’ (Can you think of anything that hasn’t had both good and bad aspects to it?)</i></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b> “Chinese peasants responded positively toward Buddha’s message, but aristocrats and those with a vested interest in the status quo rejected Buddhism.” <i>This thesis shows the student understands the socio-economic differences within Chinese society (peasants vs. upper class).</i></p> <p><b>Excellent</b> “Although Chinese peasants initially welcomed Buddhism, as it gave them shelter during politically uncertain times, as imperial security improved government authorities increasingly saw Buddhism as a threat to their political power and moved to discredit it. <i>Excellent! This is essentially a ‘Change over Time’ thesis (first ‘A’, then ‘B’) that also incorporates the socio-economic awareness of the previous example. This thesis would likely be eligible for the “Expanded Core” (Extra Credit) as a “clear, analytical, and comprehensive thesis.”</i></p>

<sup>3</sup> This advice is from the Social Studies Vertical Teams guide book p. 140 and is directed generically at all thesis statements, not specifically this question.

<sup>4</sup> I have a rule in my classroom, “Any thesis that contains the words ‘very,’ ‘many,’ ‘things,’ ‘lots,’ or ‘stuff,’ or ‘ways’ is automatically vetoed.” Possibly the hardest skill to learn is the ability to form a sophisticated, complex thesis. One strategy I’ve learned (from Geri McCarthy of Barrington, RI) is to require students to begin their thesis with “While”, “Although”, or “Despite/In spite of.” These words strongly encourage students to formulate a mature thesis that helps structure the rest of their essay. Once students can consistently write a competent thesis sentence, then I concentrate on having them develop an essay preview/outline of later paragraphs. The result should be a thesis paragraph that is several sentences long (the paragraph should NOT just be a single sentence).

Point #	Official Description <i>Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
2 Doc Meaning	<p>Addresses all of the documents and demonstrates understanding of all of all but one.<sup>5</sup></p> <p><i>The spirit, intention, and content of each document should be correctly interpreted.</i></p>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b> “The Anonymous Chinese Scholar (Doc #3) is clearly attacking Buddhism. The questions are hostile and meant to drive people away from Buddhism.” <i>Doc 3 is the most frequently misinterpreted document. While the <u>questions</u> are accusatory in tone and content, the author’s <u>answers</u> are actually a sort of guide to ‘how to successfully defend Buddhism against hostile questions.’ We may or may not agree with the author’s answers, but the point is that the AUTHOR thought those answers were an effective answer to Buddhism’s critics.</i></p> <p><i>Note: MANY students’ essays <u>misinterpreted</u> Doc #3 and still <u>successfully</u> earned this point. Perfection is NOT the goal. Readers understand that students have only 10 minutes to read the doc’s and 40 minutes to write the essay.</i></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b> <i>There are a myriad of acceptable interpretations of doc’s. Suffice to say that readers will know a correct interpretation of a doc’s meaning when they see it.</i></p> <p><b>Excellent</b> <i>Essay shows careful and insightful <u>analysis</u> of the documents.</i></p>

<sup>5</sup> Note: This Rubric category has changed since this DBQ was administered. I have “retrofitted” it to reflect the current Rubric. Teachers should be careful to note that the while students can misinterpret the meaning of one document, they must at least *attempt* to interpret ALL documents. This Rubric Category requires two students to demonstrate two skills: 1) Acknowledge the existence of ALL relevant documents in their essay; and 2) Correctly interpret all or all but one of those documents. Students who correctly interpret all but one document but ignore the remaining document will not earn credit for this “Meaning” Rubric Category.

## Document Summaries

**Doc. 1. Four Noble Truths, 5th century B.C.E.**<sup>6</sup> The Four Truths are sorrow, craving, stopping sorrow, the way of stopping sorrow.

POV: 1st sermon of the Buddha, which was used to teach people why there is suffering and what to do about it.

Analysis: Basic doctrine of Buddhism. There is equality of suffering and the ability to stop suffering. There are no duties to society, there is no hierarchy.

NB: this doc. does not relate directly to responses to the spread of Buddhism in China

**Doc. 2. Zhi Dun, Chinese scholar, ca. 350 CE [period of unrest, invasion by central Asian steppe nomads]** In an era of “sensual pleasures,” a Buddhist who observes the way will reach Nirvana.

POV: Zhi is scholar who clearly admires Buddhism; who sees its value in correct observances in face of uncontrolled passion (sensual pleasures). He would pass his opinions on to the Chinese aristocracy at the time.

Analysis: In times of upheaval, Buddhism presents a comforting worldview for Chinese scholars and aristocrats.

**Doc. 3. Anon. Chinese Scholar, ca. 500 C.E., “The Disposition of Error” [end of period of unrest]** In Confucian dialogue format, the scholar presents the arguments of the non-“Chinese-ness” of Buddha and the non-usefulness of Buddhist monks since they do not have wives and children. This scholar, however, feels that Confucius didn't have to explain everything, and “wives, children, and property are luxuries of the world” and replaced by goodness and wisdom.

POV: the scholar knows both Confucian and Buddhist philosophies, and doesn't agree that Buddhism is in conflict with Confucianism or that it is destabilizing. Tone of document is conciliatory. Students *may* question the “anonymity” in a variety of ways.

Analysis: There is a sense of accommodation, blending, or coexistence of the two philosophies. Doc. be used to show existence of conflict, or used to extract Confucian criticisms of Buddhism at the time.

**Doc. 4 Han Yu, Imperial Tang advisor, 819 C.E., “Memorial on Buddhism”** Buddhism is .a cult of barbarian peoples”; the relic of his finger is “foul”; the Buddhist crowd might “mutilate their flesh” in offerings to Buddha. The Emperor should not participate in the procession; Buddhism should not be allowed to .delude the masses.”

POV: leading Confucian scholar who sees Buddhism as evil, anti-Confucian, and illegal (“does not conform to our laws”). As a Confucian scholar, his position and livelihood is vested in Confucianism remaining dominant, especially with the civil service examination system, which provides access to government jobs.

Analysis: Buddhism is foreign and therefore “evil”. It is also potentially destabilizing (the crowd, the masses will be uncontrollable).

**Doc. 5 Zong Mi, Buddhist scholar, Tang dynasty , 9th c. C.E., “On the Nature of Man”** All teachings (Buddhism, Daoism, Confucianism) should be accepted and acceptable.

POV: As Buddhism is under attack at the court (see doc. 4) this scholar is trying to make the case-perhaps to the Emperor--that Buddhism is not a threat to traditional Chinese social and political structures. This has a slightly defense tone to it.

Analysis: He argues for the equality of beliefs and the social/political usefulness of all of the philosophies. Zong must emphasize that Buddhism poses no threat to the social order in order to counter Confucian arguments that Buddhism is destabilizing. (argument similar to Doc. 3)

**Doc. 6, Tang Emperor Wu, 845 C.E., “Edict on Buddhism”** Imperial edict abolishing Buddhism, because it is foreign; monks and nuns are useless parasites; because it is evil and destabilizes the family and the society.

POV: This is an official Imperial edict. The emperor has been persuaded that Buddhism is a threat to the Chinese economy, laws, family, social structure and to his own status as well (the monasteries are grander than the palace!).

Analysis: The emperor has been persuaded that Buddhism is antithetical to Confucianism, which is native Chinese (and therefore good). He uses the historical and the xenophobic argument.

---

<sup>6</sup> There was a typo on the students' exam: “Buddha (563 C.E. - 483 C.E.), India, fifth century B.C.E.” Students were NOT penalized for chronologically misplacing Doc #1.

Point #	Official Description <i>Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
<p>3 Evidence</p>	<p>Supports thesis with appropriate evidence from all or all but one document. <b>2 pts</b></p> <p>(Supports thesis with appropriate evidence from all but two documents.) (1 pt)</p> <p><i>The minimum requirement for how many documents are to be used to support the thesis is determined by the reader, NOT the student.<sup>7</sup></i></p> <p><i>The most common mistake students make is to merely <u>quote</u>, <u>summarize</u>, <u>paraphrase</u>, or <u>attribute</u> something to a document, rather than truly <u>support</u> the thesis with evidence from the document.</i></p>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b> “Zhi Dun says in Doc #2, ‘blah blah blah.’” <i>The DBQ instructions say <u>explicitly</u> that a good answer “Does not simply summarize the documents individually.” This example merely summarizes. Your job is to interpret the information in the doc’s to make an argument or draw a conclusion. Students who quote documents beyond a few words usually deceive themselves into thinking that quoting the document helps their score. Keep in mind, the reader knows the documents better than you do. If you want to earn credit for the Evidence point, just write “(Doc #)” after you use some evidence from that document that supports your thesis.</i></p> <p>Only using evidence from 3 documents during the essay. <i>Students must correctly support the thesis with 4 of the 6 doc’s for 1 point, at least 5 of the 6 doc’s for 2 points.</i></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b> “The Anonymous Chinese Scholar’s (Doc #3) defense of Buddhism reflects the growing criticism of Buddhism as political order and stability was reestablished in China. As Tang officials reasserted their power, there was more pressure placed on Buddhists to show evidence why Buddhism was compatible with more traditional Confucianism.” <i>Note how the evidence interpreted from the document relates back to the thesis (from p. 1). It isn’t just “hanging out there” unrelated to anything else in the essay.</i></p> <p><b>Excellent</b> <i>An essay that uses documents persuasively as evidence. Also, an essay that brings in relevant “outside” historical content (information not contained in the documents themselves).</i></p> <p>The financial pressure implied in the second question of the Disposition of Error (Doc #3) is echoed in Emperor Wu’s Edict (Doc #6). <i>This statement appropriately uses truths from 2 documents to support the thesis [that Buddhism was under political pressure from Confucianists.] This statement could also count toward the Content Analysis (Point #5) as it highlights a specific characteristic that is shared by more than one document.</i></p>

<sup>7</sup> This illustrates an important teaching point. The Generic Rubrics published in the Acorn book are designed to give teachers a range (such “all or all but one”) of what grading standard will be enforced at the official Reading. The precise “minimum acceptability” for each Generic Rubric category is determined by the Chief Reader at the Reading based on a sampling of student responses to that specific question. The minimum will fluctuate each year on each question within the range allowed in the Generic Rubric. (e.g. one year the minimum may be “supports thesis with evidence from all documents” while the next year the minimum may be “all but one document.”) 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 POV’s, Groupings, etc. should students aim for? College Board Consultant Bard Keeler’s advice is the “Rule of 3.” No matter what the category, give three examples. 3 POV’s, 3 Groupings, 3 pieces of evidence, 3 similarities & 3 differences (for Compare & Contrast essays) 3 Changes & 3 Continuities (for the CCOT essay) etc.

Point #	Official Description <i>Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
4 Context Analysis (POV)	<p>Analyzes Points of View (POV) in at least two or three documents.</p> <p><i>Analyze POV in 3 or more documents, (Note: ideally students should consistently analyze POV in every document.)</i></p> <p><i>Explains why this particular person might have this particular opinion OR what informs the author's and/or intended audience's POV.</i></p> <p><i>Evaluates the trustworthiness of the document.</i></p> <p><i>For additional suggestions on how to analyze documents, see the APWH Course Description ("Acorn" Book) p. 34<sup>8</sup></i></p>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b> "Zhi Dun (Doc #2) is biased because he is a scholar and confidant of aristocrats and high officials. <i>or</i> "Tang Emperor Wu (Doc #6) is biased because s/he is the Emperor." <i>These words are quoted directly from the document. Also, citing someone's occupation does not, in and of itself, constitute analysis. WHY would an emperor necessarily be biased? This shows no understanding of the subtleties of the document. Both of these examples just repeat information found in the document, rather than reflecting the student's analysis of the larger context that affects how one interprets the document.</i></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b> "Zhi Dun's argument supporting Buddhism (Doc #2) is understandable, given the politically tumultuous time in which it was written. When political leaders cannot be trusted to provide security, those without material resources are more likely to turn to spiritual teachings, especially ones that make sense of meaningless suffering."<sup>9</sup> <i>This statement would apply toward rubric categories #2 (Meaning), #3 (Evidence) &amp; #4 (Source Analysis/POV) simultaneously.</i></p> <p><i>Some good methods to analyze a source's POV are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1) WHO produced it? Discuss the author's gender, age, ethnicity, social status, religion, intellectual or political beliefs, etc.</i></li> <li><i>2) WHEN was it produced? Can it be connected with a significant historical event?</i></li> <li><i>3) Who was the intended AUDIENCE? Was the document written privately, written to be read or heard by others (who?), an official document for a ruler to read, commissioned painting, etc.</i></li> <li><i>4) WHY? What was the motivation of the writer/producer of the document, based on what you can surmise about them?</i></li> </ol> <p><i>When you put all these together, you get the POV, why THIS person would be producing THIS piece of information at THIS time. Then you can evaluate how much you "trust" the information in the document, or what you think was really going on.</i></p> <p><i>Note: It is useful to consider the tone/vocabulary of the document, just as you would in analyzing a piece of literature. It will sometimes convey the intent, the point of view of the author (anger, disdain, admiration, satire, etc.).<sup>10</sup></i></p> <p><b>Excellent</b> <i>An essay that analyzes point of view in most or all documents.</i></p>

<sup>8</sup> "Awareness of the documents' sources and their authors' points of view requires students to demonstrate the analytic skills of understanding context, point of view, and frame of reference. Students should pay attention to both internal evidence (the context and tone of each document in relation to the others) and external evidence (identification of author, purpose or intended audience, and the date when each document was written)."

<sup>9</sup> Note how in this example this student cited *the author* as the source, NOT just the document #. While this may seem an unimportant distinction, students who recognize that documents are created *by people* are more likely to consistently practice good POV analysis skills. *Documents* don't have POV, *people* do.

<sup>10</sup> These POV methods and comments are from Ane Lintvedt's AP World History EDG message, 4/28/2004. See also the 2004 Chief Reader's Q&A, [http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/repository/ap04\\_qa\\_world\\_hist\\_38556.pdf](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/repository/ap04_qa_world_hist_38556.pdf)

Point #	Official Description <i>Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
5 Content Analysis (Grouping)	<p>Analyzes documents by grouping them in one or 2 or 3 ways, depending on the question.</p> <p><i>In this case, students had to group documents in at least <u>two</u> ways. Note: other DBQ's may require 3 groups. The minimum requirement for how many grouping analyses is determined by the reader/teacher, NOT the student.<sup>11</sup></i></p> <p><i>Look for some characteristic that more than one document share. That characteristic should be the topic sentence of the paragraph that examines the evidence found in those documents.</i></p>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b> “Doc’s 1, 2, and 5 all support Buddhism, while Doc #4 opposes it.” <i>A single document cannot be a group. Find some characteristic that 2 or more documents share, and then group those documents under that characteristic.</i></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b> “Doc’s #1, 2, and 5 all support Buddhism, while Doc’s #4 and 6 oppose it. Doc #3 bridges the two, supporting Buddhism while implicitly acknowledging the growing opposition to Buddhism in Chinese society.” <i>Note: A single document CAN belong to more than one group. (In fact, excellent essays often display a sophisticated understanding that every document contains multiple characteristics, and may be analyzed several ways.)</i></p> <p><b>Excellent</b> An essay that analyzes the documents in additional ways—groupings, comparisons, synthesis. <i>Superb examples of content analysis could include multiple groupings, comparisons of specific characteristics of documents, or synthesizing information in the documents.</i></p> <p><b>Example(s) of common document groupings:</b><sup>12</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive responses: 1, 2, 3, 5</li> <li>• Negative responses: 4, 6</li> <li>• Responses during upheaval (pre-Tang): 1, 2, 3</li> <li>• “Traditional Confucian,” xenophobic, historical responses: 4, 6, with evidence from 3, 5</li> <li>• Universalist, individualistic, blending, inclusionary responses, 1, 2, 3, 5</li> </ul> <p><i>Special Note: Occasionally students attempt to ‘Group Analyze POV’ by saying that 3 doc’s all share a particular POV. While this statement earns credit for Content Analysis it does not “double dip” to earn POV credit as well. Both point #4 (POV) and #5 (Grouping) require analysis, but there is a subtle and important difference between the two types of analyses. POV applies to a <u>single</u> document, while Grouping applies to a specific characteristic shared by <u>multiple</u> documents.</i></p>

<sup>11</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 POV’s, Content Analyses, etc. should students aim for? College Board Consultant Bard Keeler’s advice is the “Rule of 3.” No matter what the category, give three examples. 3 POV’s, 3 Content Analyses, 3 pieces of evidence, 3 similarities & 3 differences (for Compare & Contrast essays) 3 Changes & 3 Continuities (for the CCOT essay) 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).

<sup>12</sup> These examples are from the official Scoring Guidelines at [http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/repository/ap04\\_sg\\_world\\_history\\_37002.pdf](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/repository/ap04_sg_world_history_37002.pdf)

Point #	Official Description <i>Commentary</i>	Examples and <i>Commentary</i>
6 Additional Document	<p>Identifies and explains the need for one type of appropriate additional document or source.</p> <p><i>Should do 2 things: 1) give a plausible reason <u>why</u> a particular document would help answer the question, and; 2) explicitly explain <u>how</u> that document is <u>different</u> from the other documents.</i></p> <p><i>Analysis is rewarded. One cannot simply say a document is missing. Describe what the missing document might be and <u>how</u> an historian might <u>use</u> it.<sup>12</sup></i></p>	<p><b>Unacceptable</b> “It would be good to have a document from a peasant.” <i>WHY would it be good to hear from a peasant? How do you think a peasant might have thought about these issues DIFFERENTLY from any of the given documents? What questions would an historian be able to answer with a peasant’s perspective that aren’t possible to answer now?</i></p> <p>“None of these documents represent a woman’s perspective.” <i>True, but be more explicit. How do you anticipate women felt DIFFERENTLY from men? What difference would a woman’s perspective make to an historian?</i></p> <p>“It would be nice to have a document from an emperor.” <i>There IS a document from an emperor! Believe it or not, many students actually call for a document that is already there. A good way to think of the Additional Document is to call it “the missing voice.”<sup>13</sup> Make sure the additional ‘missing voice’ document you suggest is missing!</i></p> <p><b>Acceptable</b> “It would be nice to see a document from a Buddhist peasant during the time of political instability, in order to see how their motive in choosing Buddhism over more traditional Confucianism compares with Han Yu’s (Doc #4) and Emperor Wu’s (Doc 6) motives.” <i>This takes the unacceptable answer above and simply adds a rationale for how it would aid an historian.</i></p> <p><b>Excellent</b> <i>An essay that explains why additional types of document(s) or sources are needed. The essay should identify and explain the need for more than one appropriate additional document or source.</i></p> <p><b>Common examples of Additional Documents often asked for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower class (peasants, farmers, merchants) to show contrast with the elite documents.</li> <li>• Women’s voices to contrast with the male (elite) documents.</li> <li>• Charts, graphs, or maps showing populations of Buddhist converts over time.<sup>14</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>13</sup> These commentaries on the Additional Document & “Missing Voice” are from Barth Derryberry’s AP World History EDG message, 12/02/2004. See <http://lyris.collegeboard.com/read/messages?id=273117#273117>

<sup>14</sup> These examples are from the official Scoring Guidelines at [http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/members/exam/exam\\_questions/2090.html](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/members/exam/exam_questions/2090.html)



### Thesis Paragraph

- Background/Context
- Thesis Statement
- “Road Map” (outline of later categories of document Groupings/Analysis)
- Additional Document (Optional)

### Body Paragraph #1 (1<sup>st</sup> Group of Analyzed Doc’s)

- Topic Sentence (what characteristic do these doc’s share, and how does that support the thesis?)
- Evidence Doc #1 (what text from doc #1 supports this paragraph’s topic/thesis?)  
POV/Analysis of doc #1
- Evidence Doc #2 (what text from doc #2 supports this paragraph’s topic/thesis?)  
POV/Analysis of doc #2
- Evidence Doc #3 (what text from doc #3 supports this paragraph’s topic/thesis?)  
POV/Analysis of doc #3
- How these doc’s relate/compare to each other. (The fullest understanding of any particular document emerges only when that document is viewed within the wider context of all the documents.)
- Additional Doc (be sure to relate how/why this doc would be useful in answering question)
- Conclusion

### Additional Body Paragraphs as needed

- Check to make sure that all doc’s are included, with discussion of Evidence and POV from each doc.

### Conclusion

- Include Additional Doc (if not included previously)
- Restatement/Summarization of Thesis

Writing Tip: Avoid any sentence in your essay that begins with the word “Document.” Even worse, NEVER begin a sentence with, “Doc #\_\_\_ says ...” This is merely summarizing the document. Your teacher/ reader already knows that information better than you do. Your job is to *interpret* the information in the doc’s to *make an argument* or *draw a conclusion*, not merely prove that you can comprehend what you read.

## Document Analysis Organization Technique

When students sit for the APWH exam, they obviously don't have unlimited time and space in which to write their notes re: the documents. Below is a suggested note-taking system<sup>15</sup> that students can use to quickly summarize and organize their notes.

### Additional Document

(think of some more information that would help “flesh out” the information contained in this document.)

#### SOAPSTONE or AP PARTS

(List of significant characteristics from this document, noting of doc meaning and evidence to be referenced later.)

Source: Zhi Dun, Chinese scholar, author, and confidant of Chinese aristocrats and high officials during the period when northern China was invaded by central Asian steppe nomads, circa 350 C.E.

Whosoever in China, in this era of sensual pleasures, serves the Buddha and correctly observes the commandments, who recites the Buddhist Scriptures, and who furthermore makes a vow to be reborn without ever abandoning his sincere intention, will at the end of his life, when his soul passes away, be miraculously transported thither. He will behold the Buddha and be enlightened in his spirit, and then he will enter Nirvana.\*

\*Nirvana: the extinction of desire and individual consciousness

#### Grouping

What characteristics does this document share with other documents?

#### POV

What is the POV of this document?

If students are trained to write their comments on each document in a uniform manner they will find it much easier to organize their paragraphs. (“What’s my topic sentence for next paragraph? [Look at notes written *to the right* of each document.] Need to include the POV from a document? [Refer to your notes written *below* each document.] etc.”)

<sup>15</sup> From Bill Zeigler’s “Hot Topics in AP World History” presentation at the 2006 AP Annual Conference, July 15, 2006.