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Introduction

The written responses in this document are examples of Social Studies 30–1 diploma examination writing that received scores of Satisfactory (S), Proficient (Pf), and Excellent (E). These example responses are taken from the January 2016 Social Studies 30–1 Diploma Examination. Along with the commentaries that accompany them, they should help you and your students to understand the standards for Social Studies 30–1 diploma examination writing in relation to the scoring criteria.

The purpose of the example responses is to illustrate the standards that governed the January 2016 marking session; the example responses will also serve as anchors in the selection of the June 2016 marking session example responses. The example responses and the commentaries were also used to train markers to apply the scoring criteria consistently and to justify their decisions about scores in terms of an individual student’s work and the criteria.

These example responses represent a small sample of how students successfully approached the assignments.

Selection and Use of Example Papers

The teachers on the Standards Confirmation Committee for the January 2016 marking session selected the examples of student papers included here. They also wrote the commentaries that discuss the students’ writing in terms of the scoring criteria.

During their preparation for the marking session, group leaders (teachers specially selected to assist Assessment Sector staff during the marking session) reviewed and validated the standards represented by these example papers. Group leaders then used these example papers for training the teachers who marked the written-response sections of the January 2016 Social Studies 30–1 Diploma Examination.

Cautions

1. The commentaries are brief.

   The commentaries were written for groups of markers to discuss and then to apply during the marking session. Although brief, they provide a model for relating specific examples of student writing to the details in a specific scoring criterion.
2. **Neither the scoring guide nor the assignments are meant to limit students to a single organizational or rhetorical approach in completing any diploma examination assignment.**

   Students must be free to select and organize their materials in a manner that they feel will enable them to best present their ideas. In fact, part of what is being assessed is the final effectiveness of the content, as well as the organizational and rhetorical choices that students make.

   The examples of student writing in this document illustrate just a few of the many organizational and rhetorical strategies used successfully by students in January 2016.

   We strongly recommend that you caution your students that there is no preferred approach to an assignment except the one that best accomplishes the individual student’s goal of effectively communicating his or her own ideas about the topic.

   We advise you not to draw any conclusions about common patterns of approach taken by students.

3. **The example papers presented in this document must not be used as models for instructional purposes.**

   Because these example papers are illustrations only, and because they are example responses to a set topic, students must be cautioned not to memorize the content of any of these assignments and not to use them either when completing classroom assignments or when writing future diploma examinations. Examination markers and staff at Alberta Education take any hint of plagiarism or cheating extremely seriously. The consequences for students are grave.

   The approaches taken by students at the standard of excellence are what other students should consider emulating, not their words or ideas. In fact, it is hoped that the variety of approaches presented here will inspire students to take risks—to experiment with diction, syntax, and organization as a way to develop an individual style and to engage the reader in ideas that the student has considered.

4. **It is essential that you consider each of the examples of student writing within the constraints of the examination situation.**

   Under examination conditions, students produce first-draft writing. Given more time and access to appropriate resources, students would be expected to produce papers of considerably improved quality, particularly in the dimension of Communication.
Examine all three sources on pages 2 and 3 and complete the assignment on page 5.

Assignment I – Sources

Source I

We must all be responsible citizens; however, some must be more responsible than others because of their privileged position in society. The wealthy and the corporate elite need to take on the greatest role in serving the common good. They have a collective obligation toward helping those less fortunate than themselves.

Source II

Governments are necessary and desirable when limited in scope and modest in aim. But civil society thrives when governments respect the foundational elements of such: the rule of law, the protection of property, and the ability to provide for one’s family and give to one’s friends. Left alone, most people, families and friendships will bloom quite well with those minimums.

—Mark Milke

Note: The two individuals are looking out a window from a tall office tower.
ASSIGNMENT I: Value: 20% of the total examination mark
Source Interpretation Suggested time: 60 to 75 minutes

Examine all three sources on pages 2 and 3 and complete the following assignment.

Assignment

Examine each source.

Write a response in paragraph form in which you must:

• interpret each source to demonstrate your understanding of how each source links to liberalism
  AND

• explain one or more of the relationships that exist among all three sources

Reminders for Writing

• Organize your response
• Proofread your response
Examples of Students’ Writing with Rationales

Social Studies 30–1, January 2016
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Satisfactory (S)

Right vs Left Economic Systems

The perspective of source one leans more towards the left side of the economic spectrum. The author shows this specifically by saying the wealthy “have a collective obligation toward helping those less fortunate than themselves.” This specific quote is very left wing in itself but also in some ways can be critical of a free market economy. In a free market economy the wealthy will look out for only one person, themselves and this is the exact opposite of what the source is trying to say. The source believes that it is the "wealthy and the corporate elites" duty or job to "take on the greatest role in serving the common good" The use of the words "common good" specifically shows that the source is collective and supports collective principles such as collective interest, and cooperation. The source believes that the wealthy need to be more responsible because of their wealth but as we can see in more western economies it is not like this the majority of the time. The author of source one believes that in the interest of the collective the wealthy should have an obligation to helping those less fortunate and therefore is critical of the modern economy of the western world and the idea of everyone for themselves.

The perspective of source two is very right wing on the economic perspective. They disagree with government involvement in the economy and believe that when governments "respect the foundational elements of such: the rule of law, the protection of property, and the ability to provide for one's family and give to one's friends" That the economy and life will thrive. They support the principles of individualism such as private property, the rule of law, and self interest. This is shown by the listing of the fundamental "foundational elements. " The
source believes that only when the government is "limited in scope and modest in aim" is when a civil society will thrive. The source is saying that only when the government is limited in its influence and not assertive with their goals within the economy that the economy will then succeed. The source proceeds to say "Left alone, most people, families and friendships will bloom quite well with those minimums." here the source is saying that without the government involvement other than the protection of these basic individual rights citizens of the nation will prosper. The source believes in very little government involvement and is obviously supportive of a capitalist system where emphasis on individualist principles is the only way for the economy to thrive.

Source three is critical of the capitalist system. One can assume that since they are critical of the free market economic system they would support either left wing or centre economic systems such as a command economy or a mixed market system. The comic is of a father and son in a fancy office looking out at other office buildings. It is reasonable to say that the father is in higher management because he tells the son "Someday, Son, All of this won't be enough for you either..." The source is emphasizing on how a capitalist economy promotes greed and materialistic values. It does this through the use of the words "won't be enough" The father is telling the son basically when you inherit this company you will also want more than this company will give you. It is commenting on how in a free market system the rich will get richer and the poor will get poorer. The man is obviously quite wealthy and yet he does not think it is enough. This source is showing one of the main flaws in capitalism which is greed and the constant want for more.
All three of the sources have one thing in common. They all are talking about a right-wing or capitalist economy. Source one is subtly critical of a right-wing economy. It speaks about how the wealthy have a "collective obligation toward helping those less fortunate than themselves." The source is promoting collectivist ideals and actually is encouraging the opposite of what happens in a free market economy. Source two is supportive of a capitalist economy with little to no government involvement. The source believes that "left alone, most people, families and friendships will bloom quite well with those minimums." The minimums the source is talking about are individualist principles such as the rules of law and the protection of private property. The source is supportive of capitalism and has an extreme right-wing economic perspective. Finally, source three is very critical of a capitalist economic system. The comic in source three is putting emphasis on the idea that capitalism promotes greed. The father in the picture is of higher management or the owner of a company and tells his son "Someday, Son, All of this won't be enough for you either..." This quote is commenting on how even though this man is obviously wealthy due to the competitive nature of a capitalist or right-wing economic system he still does not feel like he has enough. All three sources show either the negatives of a free market economy or the positives of a free market economy.
### Example Response—Satisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source I</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s discussion of the source supporting ideas connected to collectivism is adequately explained. The writer’s interpretation that citizens who live in countries with “western economies” (p. 1) typically put their own self-interest first, is straightforward and demonstrates a conventional understanding of how free market ideas support classical liberal values. The subsequent understanding that the source proposes the wealthy should feel obligated to help the disadvantaged, reveals a generalized understanding of modern liberalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s interpretation that limited government involvement supports individualist principles found within a capitalist system is conventional. This demonstrates a generalized understanding of capitalism and classical liberalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The writer displays an adequate understanding of a free market economy based on his conclusion that “the rich will get richer and the poor will get poorer.” (p. 2) The writer uses a brief description of the cartoon followed by a straightforward paraphrasing of the character’s comments to support his generalized understanding that greed is being presented as a flaw of capitalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The writer identifies a common theme connected to capitalist economies. The explanation of the relationship is done without inter-relating the sources revealing an adequate and straightforward understanding of how each source is connected to capitalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vocabulary is conventional and generalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sentence structure is controlled and straightforward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The writing demonstrates basic control of mechanics and grammar and is adequately organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vocabulary is conventional and generalized, for example, “obligation” (p. 1) and “higher management.” (p. 2)

The sentence structure is controlled and straightforward, for example, “The source believes in very little government involvement and is obviously supportive of a capitalist system where emphasis on individualist principles is the only way for the economy to thrive.” (p. 2)

The writing demonstrates basic control of mechanics and grammar and is adequately organized.
Examples of Students’ Writing with Rationales

Social Studies 30–1, January 2016
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Proficient (Pf)

Source one is an excerpt which explains that all citizens have a duty to be responsible, but the privileged and elite few in society should take up the mantle of heightened responsibility, as they should have a responsibility to take care of those less fortunate than them. The author of this source is clearly one with a Modern Liberal viewpoint, as the author turns away from individualism in favor of the good of the collective, which is very compatible with the principles of Modern Liberalism. The author’s statement of “collective obligation” maintains that when one of us, whether it be rich or poor falls on hard times, the effects of this is felt by all of us, so it is in our best interest to help each other out in order for society to move forward. The author of this source would be very supportive of progressive taxation, in which higher earners would be placed in higher tax brackets, so that the rich are taxed more while the lower and middle classes are taxed slightly less so that they can still live comfortably. The idea of the Welfare State would also be very compatible with the author’s perspective, as the Welfare State would provide a social safety net to all members of society, so that they have a solid foundation to start again from should they fall on harder times. The Welfare State in itself is very well suited in serving the common good, as with the wealthy and corporate elite paying their fair share of taxes, lower and middle income class earners benefit from this by having that safety net in place should they ever need it. The author of this source shows that in a Modern Liberal society, when people of all socioeconomic classes work together, they will all benefit.

Source two is an excerpt by Mark Mike, who states that government takes up a necessary and desirable role in society, provided that they keep intervention in peoples lives at a minimum. The authors perspective is a promotion of Classical Liberal principles, supporting the idea that people should be left relatively free to pursue their own self interests, and that in turn, these individuals will benefit society. This perspective is very in line with the thinker Adam Smith, who believed
that in an individuals pursuit to better themselves, society also benefits through their hard work and success. This idea, dubbed the "Invisible Hand" shows that when individuals are free from restrictions of government, individuals have much more power to pursue these interests and in tum benefit society as a whole. The authors statement of "civil society thrives when governments respect the foundational elements of such: the rule of law, the protection of property, and ability to provide for ones family and give to one's friends." Shows that the author believes that government should exist to maintain rights and freedoms, and pass judgement on those who infringe on these freedoms, but then further states "Left alone, most people, families, and friendships will bloom quite well with those minimums." Stating that the extent of government control should only be limited in scope in order for society to thrive. This further strengthens the authors right wing perspective, as the maximization of rights and freedoms and smaller role of government is very in line with Classical Liberal principles.

Source three is a political cartoon which depicts a large man in a suit standing in a lavish office staring at the skyline of a city with his son, and states "Someday son, all of this won't be enough for you either..." The illustrator of this cartoon is mocking the idea of how individuals of extremely high economic standing believe that even what extreme amounts they have is not enough for them and that these individuals will always continue to desire more for themselves. The illustrator of this cartoon is questioning the viability of Liberalism, in how the rich get richer while continuing to desire more, while those under them have to work hard to even maintain a decent standard of living. The outlines the very issue with Liberalism, more specifically Classical Liberalism, because in pursuit of ones own self interest, there is the potential to harm others also trying to pursue their own interests. Limited government intervention as well as profit motive sets the stage for greed and exploitation to take over, which allows the rich to get richer.
all the while desiring more for themselves, while the lower class are struggling to maintain
themselves while being screwed over in every possible way. The Classical Liberal way of
thinking in the illustrator's perspective is incredibly flawed, and serves only to protect the rich in
place of protecting everybody. The author of this cartoon would most likely support a more left
wing perspective, in this case Socialism, which advocates minimizing the socioeconomic gap, so
that more people can live comfortably, without the idea of greed and corruption to overtake the
good of the collective.

All three sources address the issue of "To what extent should government be involved in
bridging the gap between all classes of society". Source one is a perspective in that in order for
society to prosper, wealthy and corporate elite should take up the mantle in assisting the lower
classes in the name of "common good". Source two differs in perspective in that it believes that
the government should only enforce the minimums, and that with less intervention, society
would be better off than with it intervening. Source three shows the issue with limited
government intervention in that limited intervention sets the stage for greed and exploitation by
higher income classes. Source one and three are similar in that they both believe that high
income earners should not focus on themselves but instead shift their focus to helping society as
a whole as they have the capability to do so. Both sources believe that high income earners, due
to their impressive amount of wealth, could easily have a huge impact on those which live under
them, and hope to see that instead of chasing more materialistic desires, the top 1% would take a
slight hit in order to get society back in shape. Together, all three sources present differing
perspectives on how society would be if government decided to take a more active or passive
role in bridging the gap between all socioeconomic classes. While source one and three believe
that it is beneficial for this gap to be minimized, source two presents the perspective that society is benefitted when individuals are left to do as they please.
# EXAMPLE RESPONSE— Proficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source I</td>
<td>The writer’s interpretation is specific as they identify that the source reflects a modern liberal viewpoint and that the author of the source would support progressive taxation and the social safety net provided by a welfare state. In addition, the writer’s explanation of the concept of “collective obligation” (p. 1) is adept and demonstrates a sound understanding of the links to liberalism.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source II</td>
<td>The writer’s interpretation is specific and logical in its explanation of how the source reflects the ideas of classical liberalism, Adam Smith and the invisible hand.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source III</td>
<td>The writer’s explanation that the cartoon is mocking classical liberal economics and “questioning the viability of Liberalism” (p. 2) because profit motive, greed and exploitation are factors that can undermine the well-being of the collective, is specific and adept and demonstrates a sound understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>While at first it might seem that the discussion of the relationships is above mid-basket Proficient, upon closer examination it is clear that the explanation of the two identified relationships is capable and purposeful. In particular, the discussion of how Source II fits into those two relationships is not as well developed as the discussion of how Sources I and III illustrate those relationships.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Communication                                                                 | Vocabulary such as “progressive taxation” (p. 1), “safety net” (p. 1), “Invisible Hand” (p. 2), “lavish” (p. 2) and “mocking” (p. 2) is appropriate and specific.

The sentence structure is controlled and effective, for example, “Source one is an excerpt which explains that all citizens have a duty to be responsible, but the privileged and elite few in society should take up the mantle of heightened responsibility, as they should have a responsibility to take care of those less fortunate than them.” (p. 1)

The writing demonstrates capable control of mechanics and the grammar and is purposefully organized. |
|---|---|
In a liberal, capitalist society, it is inevitable that some will be more privileged than others, possessing more wealth, and likely more power as a result. Source I claims that these people have a special responsibility or duty that others do not possess as a result. It claims that the "wealthy" and "corporate elite" are required to serve the "common good", and to help those less fortunate. Liberal societies that follow a capitalist system often naturally create a class divide, separating the "wealthy" and the "corporate elite" from the lower class which is described as the "less fortunate". Often, money is tied very closely to power in liberal societies, as the wealthy command respect from the lower class, spread influence, and can afford political campaigns or lobby groups. This upper class is then presented with the issue of whether they will selfishly hold their money and use their power for their own benefit, or use their money and power to benefit those less fortunate. The speaker in the Source I would encourage them to do the latter, as it is believed that they have a special responsibility to use their wealth power wisely that others do not have. This question is closely linked to the question of where society would fall on the economic spectrum. The speaker would likely believe that society should shift further to the left, as the source suggests a belief in equality, and that the privileged should help the underprivileged. This is a common belief of the followers of modern liberalism, though classical liberal principles would disagree. Classical liberalism suggests that the upper class has no obligation to aid the lower class, as they earned their money through their hard work, and thus it belongs to them. The source refers to their position as a "privileged" one, possibly drawing attention to the fact that many members of the upper class inherit their wealth and do not truly deserve it. Allowing this to happen continues to strengthen the class divide.
even further, creating even more inequality. The source claims that it is natural for some citizens in society to possess privileges others don't, and it is their duty to use their wealth and power to aid the less fortunate.

A constant question facing liberal societies is the level of control the government should possess, in economic and political forms. In order for a society to remain "liberal", the people must have numerous freedoms that allow them to shape their lives as they desire, suggesting the government should have little control and the government should keep the economy on the right end of the spectrum. Alternatively, it can be argued that, in order for people to truly be free, they must be protected, as society in a natural state creates inequality. This argument may be strengthened by the class divisions present in virtually every early human society, which restricted the freedoms of those on the lower levels. As such, arguments can be made that liberal societies must have strong government control and shift towards the left. Source II suggests that a balance must be struck between these two systems. The source claims that governments are "necessary and desirable", but must be "limited in scope and modest in aim". This implies that government is important and required in a society, but it must limit its control. The speaker claims that the government must uphold the law for the citizens and itself, protect peoples' property (also possibly from itself). However, citizens must be largely left to their own devices, retaining the ability to "provide for one's family and give to one's friends". The speaker believes that under these conditions, citizens will be able to thrive. The power of the free market and limited government control was demonstrated historically during the Cold War, as the capitalist
American economy thrived and the communist Soviet economy failed, unable to understand what to produce and who should produce it. However, despite the strength provided by minimal government intervention, it is important that the government protects the market, to prevent cheating or stealing. The source understands the economic strength and stability provided by the free markets of capitalist societies, as well as the need for some levels of government control. As such, the source suggests that a small level of limited government control is necessary to maintain a liberal society.

As suggested in Source I, in a liberal, capitalist society, some people are born with privileges others are not. It is natural for people to grow used to the conditions they born in, and it is also natural to always desire more. The Source III would suggest that this is very true for people born into privileged positions, that they quickly becomes accustomed to their conditions, and begin to desire even more, despite everything they already have. The man in the cartoon speaks to the young boy (likely his son), telling him that someday he will grow unsatisfied with his life and desire more. The family already appears to have a significant amount of wealth, and as such, likely much power as well. However, the upper class is constantly unsatisfied, and always seeks more than it has. The power inherent to the upper class often allows them to take more if they desire, due to the nature of money breeding more money, and the degree of their political power. It is possible that this will come at the expense of members of the lower class, furthering the class divide. It is suggested in the cartoon that the members of the upper class are not truly happy, as they are constantly unsatisfied with what they
possess. It is also suggested that they are cruel and selfish, always desiring to take more. As such, the cartoonist appears to possess beliefs that a liberal society would regard as left wing, as the cartoon shows the problems, unhappiness and lack of fulfillment created by a society with a rigid class structure. It also appears to show parallels to the writings of Karl Marx, as it the cartoon suggests that the upper class will cling to their power, and always desire more. In order to fix this issue, intervention must occur. Though Marx suggested violent revolution, in a democratic, liberal society, the government would have the power to intervene and force the upper class to give up their wealth and power, as the lower class has the potential to outvote them. The source suggests that the upper class is selfish, and will always cling to its power and hunger for more, as well as that they are not truly happy, suggesting a left-wing perspective on economics.

All three sources share similarities in that they all address the issue of the level of control the government should have over the people and the position a society should fall on on the economic scale. As such, all three sources have significance in liberal societies, as this issue is one that constantly faces the people of such societies. Sources I and III also address the issue of class divide within liberal societies. These two sources appear to establish a left-leaning position, as they both express concern with the issues created by class divides that form naturally in liberal societies. Source I directly suggests that the upper class has a duty to aid the lower class to create a more equal society, while Source III implies this by depicting the selfishness of the upper class, as well as the unhappiness and lack of fulfillment that accompanies it. Neither
source directly suggests increased government control, though it is likely that this would be necessary in order to enforce the perspectives put forward in the sources. Source II differs from the other two sources in that it suggests minimal government control, establishing it as right-leaning. If the ideals of Source II were followed, class divisions would continue to exist, likely putting the speaker from Source II into conflict with the speaker and cartoonist in Sources I and III. Despite showing different ideals and beliefs, all three sources address the important issue of the level of government control and the position on the economic spectrum liberal societies should embrace.
### SCORING CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation of Source I</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of the source is sophisticated, insightful, and precise, demonstrating a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>The writer’s discussion of the propensity for capitalist societies to “create a class divide” (p. 1) is sophisticated. The writer insightfully explores the impact of inherited wealth and the likelihood of it “creating even more inequality.” (p. 2) The writer’s understanding that “money is tied very closely to power in liberal societies” (p. 1) demonstrates a perceptive link to liberalism.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation of Source II</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of the source is sophisticated, insightful, and precise, demonstrating a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>Although the first portion of the writer’s second paragraph may appear disconnected to Source II, it serves to establish a context for the writer’s interpretation of the source. The writer demonstrates an insightful and sophisticated interpretation of the role the government plays in enabling a free market to function. The writer’s discussion of the “strength and stability provided by the free markets” (p. 3) is precise.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation of Source III</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of the source is sophisticated, insightful, and precise, demonstrating a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>The writer’s contention that the economic success of the wealthy “will come at the expense of members of the lower class” (p. 3) is insightful. The writer demonstrates a precise understanding of how a liberal, democratic society could “intervene and force the upper class to give up their wealth and power.” (p. 4)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s unifying theme of “the level of control the government should have over the people” (p. 4) is perceptively and thoroughly supported for each of the sources. The writer astutely notes that “Source II differs from the other two sources” (p. 5) and “If the ideas of Source II were followed, class division would continue to exist, likely putting the speaker from Source II into conflict with the speaker and cartoonist in sources I and III.” (p. 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s accurate and effective use of the terms classical and modern liberalism exemplify precise vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The writer demonstrates controlled and sophisticated sentence structure, for example, “Alternatively, it can be argued that, in order for people to truly be free, they must be protected, as society in a natural state creates inequality.” (p. 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considering the length and complexity of the writer’s response, the limited number of errors demonstrates a skillful control of mechanics and grammar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSIGNMENT II: Value: 30% of the total examination mark
Position Paper

Suggested time: 90 to 105 minutes

Analyze the following source and complete the assignment.

Source

A strong leader supported by an expert group of advisors will guide a country to greatness. Giving uninformed citizens the responsibility of making decisions about critical issues would prove disastrous to the country.

Assignment

To what extent should we embrace the ideological perspective(s) reflected in the source?

Write an essay in which you must:

• analyze the source to demonstrate an understanding of the ideological perspective(s) reflected in the source
• establish and argue a position in response to the question presented
• support your position and arguments by using evidence from your knowledge and understanding of social studies

Reminders for Writing

• Organize your essay
• Proofread your essay
By analyzing the political past of many countries, society has created different opinions about the idea of accepting a government that will be directed by a single leader. The author of the source clearly supports the idea of acquiring a government that will give control of the nation to a single person. The source states that by doing so, the country will achieve a great level of improvement. Furthermore, the author suggests that the decisions regarding the well-being of the nation should only be made by the educated people, thus preventing the country from suffering by the incorrect decisions that the rest of the uninformed population could make. The ideas of dictatorship and restriction of democratic freedoms supported by the source should be strongly rejected as they embrace a dictatorial form of government that has not worked in the past. In addition, the source discards the term of universal suffrage which has been the base of many rights given to the citizens such as the democratic and suplemental rights. Furthermore, the author of the source embraces the Great Man Theory which puts high expectations into a single leader of one nation.

First of all, the ideology of the source embraces the idea of going back to a dictatorial government. Even though the source proposes to have certain people that will advise the leader of the nation, it still embraces the basic ideas of a dictatorship such as giving control and power of the nation to a single leader. In the past, the world has seen how the actions of different dictators can negatively change the situation of a nation. A clear example of this is the government of Hitler and his Nazi Party. When the citizens of Germany decided to vote for Hitler, they were guided by their desire of seeing their country rise again after their loss in World War I. They saw Hitler as a strong leader who wanted to achieve the restoration and improvement of Germany. Unfortunately, the
dictatorship of Hitler brought terrible consequences to different races such as the Jewish people who were used as scapegoats and suffered from the unfair actions of the Nazis towards them. Hitler was seen as a strong and wise leader who would bring peace and sustainability to Germany, but at the end giving power to a single person only brought extreme and terrible situations such as the death of more than 6,000,000 Jews who were killed during Hitler’s final solution, the Holocaust. This time in history shows that giving control of the nation to a person can extremely affect the lives of many people, embracing a dictatorship would take away the power of the people and it will be given to an individual that may not have good intentions towards the nation.

Secondly, the author of the source considers that rejecting universal suffrage should be an important solution that must be held by the government. By doing this, the government will be taking away the right of voting for people who is not considered to be educated or informed about the situations of the country. If a nation is considered to have a high amount of uneducated people then the decisions of the nation will only be taken by minority groups who are seen as being superior to the majority of the people. The idea of the author rejects the democratic rights of the people as they will no longer have the right to vote, also they will not be granted the right to have an opinion that counts in their nation which will change the country according to the ideas and needs of other people. This proves that the ideology of the author only focuses on the well being of the nation but it does not consider the rights and opinions of its citizens.

Lastly, the source presented supports the Great Man Theory which is based in the proposal of having a wise and strong leader that will impulse the nation to improve and have a higher level of stability. Even though there are people who will support the ideas...
of the author by arguing that an educated leader will take wise and correct decisions for
the nation and its citizens it is important to remember that giving a person the control of
changing the nation will not always bring a positive future for its people. The idea of a
leader being noble and just can only be considered a prediction as it can not be assured or
guaranteed by all the people of the nation. Supporting the idea of choosing a single
person to guide a whole nation can not give people the certainty of having a better future
as this decision does not ensure that the desires of the leader are completely fair and
truthful.

In conclusion, the ideology of the source which promotes the idea of having a singular
leader for a nation and the proposal of only letting informed and educated people to have
the right to make decision that influence their lives and the future of the country should
strongly be rejected as it supports the idea of having a dictatorship that does not considers
the opinions and ideas of all its citizens.
### EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Satisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Source</strong></td>
<td>The analysis of the source is conventional and straightforward. The writer recognizes a perspective by stating that “the author of the source embraces the Great Man Theory which puts high expectations into a single leader of one nation.” (p. 1) An alternative to the perspective identified in the source is discussed albeit in a generalized fashion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The position established is generally supported by appropriately chosen and developed arguments. The writer’s assertion that “the actions of different dictators can negatively change the situation of a nation” (p. 1) is straightforward and conventional. The argument that dictatorial regimes reject democratic rights is generally developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship between position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is generally developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>The writer’s use of evidence is conventional. The description of the atrocities committed by Hitler against the Jews is generalized. The writer discusses the removal of the right to vote by totalitarian governments as well as the Great Man Theory revealing an acceptable understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence is conventional and straightforward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evidence may contain minor errors and a mixture of relevant and extraneous information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A generalized and basic discussion reveals an acceptable understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Vocabulary is conventional and straightforward, for example: “dictatorial form of government” (p. 1), “scapegoats” (p. 2), and “the Holocaust.” (p. 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The writing is straightforward and functionally organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vocabulary is conventional and generalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There may be occasional lapses in control and minor errors; however, the communication remains generally clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The communication is generally clear but there are occasional lapses in control, for example: “Lastly, the source presented supports the Great man Theory which is based in the proposal of having a wise and strong leader that will impulse the nation to improve and have a higher level of stability.” (p. 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Students’ Writing with Rationales

Social Studies 30–1, January 2016
Assignment II Responses
Example Scored Proficient (Pf)

The Source presented believes that because of the inequality of people, a democracy does not work. It advocates that a select few elites should be the only ones in charge of making decisions because giving the average “uniformed citizens” the power to make political decisions “will prove disastrous.” This idea is in line with fascist beliefs that due to the inequality of people, it is the job of the elite few to make decisions for ill-equipped and uniformed. This rejection of liberal principles completely disregards the natural rights outlined by John Locke and the idea of separation of powers that Montesquieu advocated for. However, Adolf Hitler would agree with this source as he was creating Nazi Germany on the foundation of inequality. He believed that because people are unequal by nature, it is up to him to lead Germany to greatness. The idea that people are unequal and that they need to be ruled by an all-powerful government are very Hobbesian. Hobbes believed that because people are cruel, we must avoid the state of nature at all costs. His solution was to be led by a leviathan, an all-powerful leader that would make decisions for his people and crush any dissent at its roots. We should not embrace this source because it rejects the liberal principles separation of powers and the freedom of everyone to partake in a political decision making. However, we should allow government more power in times of crisis as long as it is temporary and does not directly infringe on citizens’ liberties.

Adolf Hitler’s Nazi Germany exemplifies why rejecting liberal principles is detrimental to a nation. He used the fear of communism coming to Germany to suspend the civil liberties of the German people. He did so using the enabling act. Shortly after this act passed, Hindenburg died leaving no one to check Hitler’s power. He had become a dictator with absolute power and passed laws with this power to make the Jewish people a lesser class to create a common enemy for the Germanic people to unite under. This violation a liberal principles shows why living
under a strong leader with complete political control is dangerous. The idea of these strong
leaders leading their country to greatness presented in the source is a fallacy. Hitler aggressively
invaded surrounding countries to achieve a greater Germany which led to World War II, one of
the greatest losses of life in human history. The Allied Countries eventually defeated Germany
leaving them crippled and humiliated once again. Rejecting the liberal principal of democracy
and adopting a dictatorship only leads to further violation of liberal principles. In the case of
Hitler, he suspended rights of the Jews and started systematically killing them off. Crimes
against humanity such as these are prevalent within dictatorships since nobody can check or
challenge the power of the absolute dictator. This leads to corruption and them seeking more and
more power, and they will step on as many bodies as it takes to get there. This is why we should
embrace the world views of western liberal democracies that allow for everyone’s political
voices to be heard and the separation of powers preventing atrocities (such as the killing of
millions of Jewish people in Germany) from taking place.

Another example of the failure of a country’s government holding absolute power over its
citizens is the USSR under Joseph Stalin. Despite it being on the opposite end of the political
spectrum, it used much of the same techniques to limit the power of the people and hold on to
absolute power as Nazi Germany did. The government within the USSR was a warped version of
Marxism that believed that the people cannot make their own decisions therefore they needed to
institute the Guardians of the Proletariat to make decisions for the people. This was a select few
people who were deemed fit to lead the country were the only ones given any political power.
Through the use of propaganda and indoctrination Stalin sought to create a nation of citizens
loyal to only him. The lack of free press and inability to practice the religion of your choice at
the time are not desirable over the rights to read and practice what you want that is found in
Liberal Democracies. When Stalin took power after Lenin’s death he enforced strict rules and crushed any and all descent. Anyone who had differing political opinions to the government was killed without trial in the purges or starved to death because of the collectivised farming system. So much for leading the “country to greatness”. The executions without trials and forced starvation that took place at the time go against the liberal principle freedom of opinion and speech and the right to a trial that exists in all modern democracies. Stalin’s Abuse of power led to conflict with the western world and eventual down fall of the USSR. Countries that are truly free do not fear for their lives and desperately want to leave but this is what happened in the USSR. This proves that giving complete power to one man or a select few leads to them seeking to hold this power for as long as possible. We must embrace the liberal views of the Western world or we risk mass oppression that was rampant in the USSR under Stalin.

Opposite to the source, people in America and Canada enjoy the freedom of democracy. Because of this America is one of the most powerful economies in the world. Their Constitution is based off of the ideas of John Locke. He believed that the government should be elected and therefore it should represent the will of the people. If it does not do this, citizens have an obligation to overthrow that government. Most Americans live comfortable lives because they know that they have a right to their own practices. Giving the responsibility to American citizens to make political decisions is the foundation of USA. They were born out of the rejection of being led by a distant tyrant who did not represent what they believed in. Democracy is the only system that reflects what the people want. A strong leader with complete control will be corrupted by that power. There is no possibility of a benevolent dictator that makes the best decisions for his or her people. In both America and Canada representatives are elected to represent the will of the people which proves that the sources idea that citizens with political
power is "disastrous to the country" is wrong. Both Canadians and Americans have much high
standard of living than countries with no political choice. America and Canada both are
democracies that protect the liberties of their citizens. We should embrace these ideas that
contradict the source because without when we give away our political decision power we give
the government full control and good luck getting it back when it is gone. We should fight for
the freedom of choice because it is proven that when everyone makes the choices for the nation
all voices are heard and they reflect the will of the whole nation.

We should not reject the liberal principle of democracy because it leads to further loss of
liberties. This has been seen time and time again in oligarchies and dictatorships throughout
history. Hitler’s Nazi Germany shows this extremely well as he used his power to attempt to
destroy a race of people. He also dragged Germany into another war which led to eventual defeat
and a destroyed Germany. The failure of a lack of democracy can also be seen in Stalin’s USSR.
He used fear to keep people from disobeying him and destroyed any form of dissent. The lack of
political choice in led to the lack of any choice. We should instead adopt a political system that
represents what the people want. This is not achieved out of a dictator’s benevolence but rather
out of what the voter chooses. Both America and Canada are democracies and as a result it
citizens chose people to represent them in the decision making process. It is important that we
hold on to democracy because everyone has a right to say what the political climate of the nation
they live in should be.
### EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Proficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Source</strong></td>
<td>The analysis of the source is capable and adept. The writer identifies a variety of ideological perspectives including fascism, rejection of liberalism, and “Hobbesian.” (p. 1) The writer elaborates on these ideological perspectives by explaining how they relate to the source and includes how the ideas of historical figures such as Hitler, Locke, Montesquieu, and Hobbes would embrace these views. The writer reinforces a sound understanding of the ideological perspective throughout the response.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s position that the source should not be embraced is purposefully supported by logical arguments explaining that political systems rejecting liberalism result in a failure to achieve greatness. A sound understanding of the relationship between the position taken and argumentation is further demonstrated by the writer’s contradiction of the source’s perspective when they argue that citizens should participate in the political process.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evidence
- Evidence is specific and purposeful.
- Evidence may contain some minor errors.
- A capable and adept discussion of evidence reveals a solid understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.

The evidence chosen by the writer is specific and purposeful referencing details of Hitler’s rise to power on page 1.

The writer has selected evidence from Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, Canada, and the United States to support their arguments.

The writer has included a lengthy discussion of the evidence. While the evidence is capable and adept, it is not as sophisticated nor deliberately chosen which is expected at the Excellent standard.

### Communication
- The writing is clear and purposefully organized.
- Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is capable.
- Vocabulary is appropriate and specific.
- Minor errors in language do not impede communication.

The writing is clear and purposefully organized.

Vocabulary is appropriate and specific, for example: “natural rights” (p. 1), “leviathan” (p. 1), “detrimental” (p. 1), “fallacy” (p. 2), and “warped version.” (p. 2)

Minor errors in language do not impede communication.
Examples of Students' Writing with Rationales

Social Studies 30–1, January 2016
Assignment II Responses
Example Scored Excellent (E)

Thomas Hobbes, an infamous social and political philosopher believed that individuals (though not evil) are selfish and that their self-regard can be harmful to other members of society. Because Hobbes believed that the stability and security of society is more important than an individual’s detrimental self-interest, citizens should surrender their civil liberties to the state which would in return provide an orderly and safe society for all. As evidenced, Hobbes was an active advocate for limiting the freedoms and rights of citizens, whom he believed were not capable of benefitting society and encouraged the greater power of the state. His perspective is reflected in the source presented, which like Hobbes argues that citizens are “uniformed,” and that granting them the “responsibility of making decisions about critical issues would prove disastrous to the country.” Furthermore, the source also attests that “a strong leader supported by an expert group of advisors will guide the country to greatness.” Like Thomas Hobbes, the source presents the opinion that allowing state leaders to take charge of society will be the most effective means of achieving a prosperous society. Both Hobbes and the speaker of the source maintain a largely optimistic view on the intentions of strong leaders such as in communist and fascist societies. However, as events such as the Rwandan Genocide, Holocaust and Syrian Conflict, strong leaders do not always have the best interests of the people at heart and enabling to make decisions without accountability to the public can have disastrous consequences for the whole of society. As a result, the perspective presented in the source should be rejected completely.

Although both Hobbes and the presented source are disillusioned by the perception that strong leaders, accountable to only a select elite members of society will guide the country to greatness, the Holocaust of World War II demonstrates the disastrous consequences of stripping
away the civil liberties of citizens by strong leaders. When Hitler took over the Weimar Republic nearing World War II, one of his most significant legislations was the Enabling Act of 1933 that allowed him to reduce that civil liberties of German citizens (particularly those who identified as Jewish) and established him as an irremovable, powerful entity within the government. As a consequence of this Act (which established the strong leadership Hobbes and the source are advocating for) millions of Jewish people were unable to protect themselves against the atrocities that would befall upon them as they had their personal belongings and property seized and were confined to areas of the city known as ghettos, limiting their mobility within the country. They were not allowed to hold positions in government, own property or businesses and they were not allowed to practice their religion and uphold cultural practices in public. They were eventually forced to perform hard labour in concentration camps where they were either worked to death, starved or put to an untimely death in some other inhumane manner. Millions of Jews, homosexuals, gypsies and people with physical disabilities endured these horrendous crime against humanity because a strong leader had taken away the ability of citizens to make decisions about their country and had granted himself the ability to control the public through propaganda, force and indoctrination. Hitler used the technique of scapegoating to keep the blame for the hardships affecting Germany following World War I from the government and thus gain public favour.

Another example of the failure of oligarchies and dictatorships is the ongoing Syrian Conflict. Earlier in 2011, public outcry and pro-democracy demonstrations began when some young teenagers were detained and killed for drawing graffiti that did not reflect positively on the Syrian government – a dictatorial state controlled by the Assad family for many generations. To squander these cries for justice and civil liberties, the government’s forces opened fire on
peaceful demonstrations and enabled emergency measures that made it impossible to even hold protests without government permission. As rebel groups calling for an end to the Assad dynasty began to rise, the government’s use of force to compel the citizens to adhere to the status quo of government in which the President Assad had complete control of Syrian society also began to increase. The government began to cut off communication with the outside media to ensure the other countries would not catch wind of the violent occurrences taking place within the country. This only increased public backlash and outcry, ultimately erupting into the Syrian Civil War within dozens of factions fighting for various causes. Despite the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Syrians and the displacement of millions more, the Syrian government refuses to allow international bodies to aid in ending the conflict. Attempts at peace talks and peace envoys sent by the United Nations have not been met with open arms by the Syrian government. Furthermore, attempts made by countries from within the Arab Spring to negotiate peace measures and monitor the implementation of these measures have also been thwarted by the Syrian government. Also as stories about cities caught in conflict, not having access to food begin to surface, he lack of effort made by the Syrian government to end the civil conflict, or provide support to those affected by it is a clear indicator that strong leaders who are accountable to only those in their caucus, do not have the public interest at heart. Their aim is to maintain the power and control they have within the nation, even at the expense of their citizen. Furthermore, the Syrian Conflict also demonstrates how citizens, who do not have civil liberties to take make important decisions about the critical issues within their country desire to have that control and influence in their society. Syria is just one country out of dozens around the world in which the citizens are struggling to attain the power to make decisions about their government, and thus
their lives. Denying these citizens this right in order to maintain a strong leader is truly what will result in disastrous consequences for the country.

The Rwandan Genocide is another example of the calamitous instability of state that results when individuals within the country are denied the right to have input in their government by a strong leader and his "expert group of advisors," who serve only their own interests. When Rwanda gained independence from Belgium and established a Presidency, the President was a dictator who maintained the cultural and social divide created by the Belgian colonists between the two main ethnic groups: the Hutus and the Tutsis. Though some attempts at reform were made, status quo was quickly reinstated to prevent backlash from the powerful Tutsis. As a result, the Tutsi minority still held many of the high ranking positions in government and public services while the Hutu majority was still restricted from pursuing these positions and forced to work the lower paying, less prestigious positions. When a plane carrying the Rwandan president was shot down, the Hutus revolted and used mass propaganda to encourage the slaughter of the Tutsis in a violent attempt to advocate for greater equality. In the years following the Rwandan Genocide, the country continues to be plagued by the consequences of this genocide, such as high tensions between the two groups who are still forced to coexist, punishing of the war criminals who partook in this genocide as well as the high prevalence of HIV/AIDS that resulted from the rapes that also took place during this time. As this case illustrates, a strong leader (in this case the President) who grants rights and power to his select few in order to maintain his power does not have the common good, and the best interests of the people at heart. As a result, citizens will advocate for the right to make decisions about the issues affecting them, and their country which is what has terrible and long-lasting consequences for the country.
In conclusion, as demonstrated by the Holocaust, Syrian Conflict and the Rwandan Genocide, strong leaders who are not chosen by the people typically are not concerned with the good of the people. Their primary motive is to maintain and sustain their power, which requires them to deny their people the right to make decisions about government and other critical issues affecting their country and their lives. When these strong leaders abuse their powers, citizens who are informed and concerned about their country, and about their right to make decisions about their state they are motivated to pursue this right. As a result, this can often cause conflict which is truly what can prove to be disastrous for the country.
### Social Studies 30–1 January 2016
### Assignment II

**EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Excellent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Source</strong></td>
<td>The writer insightfully acknowledges that when a strong leader establishes “an orderly and safe society for all” (p. 1) it comes at the expense of “limiting the freedoms and rights of citizens.” (p. 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The analysis of the source is insightful and sophisticated; a comprehensive understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</td>
<td>The comprehensive understanding of the ideological perspective is demonstrated by the writer’s identification of Hobbes as an advocate of the perspective that strong leaders create stable and prosperous societies. The writer continues their comprehensive analysis of the source by addressing Hobbes’ theory that decisions rendered by uninformed citizens will lead to disaster.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s position that the ideological perspective reflected in the source fails to consider that “the intentions of strong leaders” (p. 1) do not lead to securing “the best interests of the people” (p. 1) is convincingly supported by judiciously chosen and developed arguments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The position established is convincingly supported by judiciously chosen and developed argument(s).</td>
<td>The writer’s argumentation that the loss of civil liberties and lack of input by citizens will reap disastrous consequences is consistent and compelling, demonstrating an insightful understanding of the assignment.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The argumentation is consistent and compelling, demonstrating an insightful understanding of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is perceptively developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen.</td>
<td>The writer’s use of evidence of the Enabling Act and its impact on the civil liberties of German citizens, particularly the Jews, is deliberately chosen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The relative absence of error is impressive.</td>
<td>Details related to the underlying causes of the Syrian Civil War are thorough and comprehensive, revealing an insightful understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A thorough and comprehensive discussion of evidence reveals an insightful understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td>The explanation that the Rwandan “President was a dictator who maintained the cultural and social divide” (p. 4) may be construed as debatable by some, but does not change the otherwise Excellent score in this category.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The writing is fluent, skillfully structured, and judiciously organized.</td>
<td>The writing is fluent and judiciously organized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is sophisticated.</td>
<td>Control of syntax, mechanics and grammar is sophisticated, for example: “Earlier in 2011, public outcry and pro-democracy demonstrations began when some young teenagers were detained and killed for drawing graffiti that did not reflect positively on the Syrian government—a dictatorial state controlled by the Assad family for many generations.” (p. 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen.</td>
<td>Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen, for example: “detrimental” (p. 1), “attests” (p. 1), “powerful entity” (p. 2), “public backlash” (p. 3), and “calamitous instability.” (p. 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The relative absence of error is impressive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Categories and Scoring Criteria for 2016 Assignment I

INTERPRETATION OF SOURCES (12 marks)

When marking Interpretation of Sources, markers should consider how effectively the student
- interprets each source to demonstrate an understanding of how each source links to liberalism

Note: Students are expected to address all three sources.

Excellent

E

Interpretation of the source is sophisticated, insightful, and precise, demonstrating a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism.

Proficient

Pf

Interpretation of the source is logical, specific, and adept, demonstrating a sound understanding of links to liberalism.

Satisfactory

S

Interpretation of the source is adequate, straightforward, and conventional, demonstrating a generalized understanding of links to liberalism.

Limited

L

Interpretation of the source is incomplete, vague, and simplistic, demonstrating a confused understanding of links to liberalism.

Poor

P

Interpretation of the source is scant, inaccurate, and irrelevant, demonstrating little or no understanding of links to liberalism.

Zero

Z

Zero is assigned to a response that fails to meet the minimum requirements of Poor.

Note: When “and” is used in the marking criteria as part of a list of descriptors, it is important to note that the writing may contain one or more of the descriptors listed. This applies to both Assignment I and Assignment II.
RELATIONSHIPS (6 marks)
When marking Relationships, markers should consider how effectively the student
• explains the relationship(s) that exist among all sources

Note: Students may explain the relationship(s) in one part of the response or the explanation of relationship(s) may be embedded.

**Excellent**

E

The explanation of relationship(s) is perceptive and thorough.

**Proficient**

Pf

The explanation of relationship(s) is capable and purposeful.

**Satisfactory**

S

The explanation of relationship(s) is adequate and straightforward.

**Limited**

L

The explanation of relationship(s) is superficial, incomplete, redundant, and of questionable accuracy.

**Poor**

P

The explanation of relationship(s) is scant, illogical, and tangential.

**Zero**

Z

Zero is assigned to a response that fails to meet the minimum requirements of Poor.
COMMUNICATION (2 marks)

When marking Communication, markers should consider how effectively the student communicates, including control of
• vocabulary
• sentence structure
• mechanics, grammar, and organization

Note: Students are expected to use paragraph form for the response. Consider the proportion of error in terms of the complexity and length of the response for the assigned task.

Excellent

E

Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen. Sentence structure is controlled and sophisticated. The writing demonstrates skillful control of mechanics and grammar and is judiciously organized.

Proficient

Pf

Vocabulary is appropriate and specific. Sentence structure is controlled and effective. The writing demonstrates capable control of mechanics and grammar and is purposefully organized.

Satisfactory

S

Vocabulary is conventional and generalized. Sentence structure is controlled and straightforward. The writing demonstrates basic control of mechanics and grammar and is adequately organized.

Limited

L

Vocabulary is imprecise, simplistic, and inappropriate. Sentence structure is awkward. The writing demonstrates a faltering control of mechanics and grammar and is ineffectively organized.

Poor

P

Vocabulary is overgeneralized and inaccurate. Sentence structure is uncontrolled. The writing demonstrates a profound lack of control of mechanics and grammar and is haphazardly organized.

Zero

Z

Zero is assigned to a response that fails to meet the minimum requirements of Poor.
Scoring Categories and Scoring Criteria for 2016 Assignment II

ANALYSIS OF SOURCE (6 marks)

When marking *Analysis of Source*, markers should consider how effectively the student
• analyzes the source to demonstrate an understanding of ideological perspective(s) reflected in the source

**Note:** Students may demonstrate their understanding of an ideological perspective(s) in one part of their essay or demonstrate their understanding of an ideological perspective(s) throughout.

**Excellent**

E

The analysis of the source is insightful and sophisticated; a comprehensive understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.

**Proficient**

Pf

The analysis of the source is capable and adept; a sound understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.

**Satisfactory**

S

The analysis of the source is conventional and straightforward; a generalized understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.

**Limited**

L

The analysis of the source is incomplete and lacks depth; a confused understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.

**Poor**

P

The analysis of the source is illogical, tangential, and/or the source is simply copied; a minimal understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.

**Insufficient**

INS

Insufficient is a special category. It is *not an indicator of quality*. It is assigned to responses that do not contain a discernible attempt to address the assignment or responses that are too brief to assess in one or more scoring categories.
ARGUMENTATION (8 marks)

When marking Argumentation, markers should consider how effectively the student
• establishes a position
• develops one or more arguments based on logic and reason
• establishes a relationship between position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source.

Note: DO NOT evaluate evidence in this category.

Excellent

E

The position established is convincingly supported by judiciously chosen and developed argument(s). The argumentation is consistent and compelling, demonstrating an insightful understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is perceptively developed.

Proficient

Pf

The position established is persuasively supported by purposely chosen and developed argument(s). The argumentation is logical and capably developed, demonstrating a sound understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is clearly developed.

Satisfactory

S

The position established is generally supported by appropriately chosen and developed argument(s). The argumentation is straightforward and conventional, demonstrating an adequate understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is generally developed.

Limited

L

The position established is confusing and largely unrelated to the argument(s). The argumentation is repetitive, contradictory, simplistic, and based on uninformed belief. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is superficially developed.

Poor

P

The position established has little or no relationship to the source or argument(s). The argumentation is irrelevant and illogical. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is minimally developed.

Insufficient

INS

Insufficient is a special category. It is not an indicator of quality. It is assigned to responses that do not contain a discernible attempt to address the assignment or responses that are too brief to assess in one or more scoring categories.
EVIDENCE (8 marks)

When marking Evidence, markers should consider how effectively the student uses evidence that
• is relevant and accurate
• reflects depth and/or breadth

Note: Evidence from social studies may include a theoretical, historical, contemporary, and/or current events discussion.

Excellent

Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive. A thorough and comprehensive discussion of evidence reveals an insightful understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.

Proficient

Evidence is specific and purposeful. Evidence may contain some minor errors. A capable and adept discussion of evidence reveals a solid understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.

Satisfactory

Evidence is conventional and straightforward. The evidence may contain minor errors and a mixture of relevant and extraneous information. A generalized and basic discussion reveals an acceptable understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.

Limited

Evidence is potentially relevant but is unfocused and incompletely developed. The evidence contains inaccuracies and extraneous detail. The discussion reveals a superficial and confused understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.

Poor

Evidence is irrelevant and inaccurate. The evidence contains major and revealing errors. A minimal or scant discussion reveals a lack of understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.

Insufficient

Insufficient is a special category. It is not an indicator of quality. It is assigned to responses that do not contain a discernible attempt to address the assignment or responses that are too brief to assess in one or more scoring categories.
COMMUNICATION (8 marks)
When marking Communication, markers should consider the effectiveness of the student’s
• fluency and essay organization
• syntax, mechanics, and grammar
• use of vocabulary and social studies terminology

Note: Consider the proportion of error in relation to the complexity and length of the response to the assigned task.

Excellent
E
The writing is fluent, skillfully structured, and judiciously organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is sophisticated. Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive.

Proficient
Pf
The writing is clear and purposefully organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is capable. Vocabulary is appropriate and specific. Minor errors in language do not impede communication.

Satisfactory
S
The writing is straightforward and functionally organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is adequate. Vocabulary is conventional and generalized. There may be occasional lapses in control and minor errors; however, the communication remains generally clear.

Limited
L
The writing is awkward and lacks organization. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is inconsistent. Vocabulary is imprecise, simplistic, and inappropriate. Errors obscure the clarity of communication.

Poor
P
The writing is unclear and disorganized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is lacking. Vocabulary is overgeneralized and inaccurate. Jarring errors impede communication.

Insufficient
INS
Insufficient is a special category. It is not an indicator of quality. It is assigned to responses that do not contain a discernible attempt to address the assignment or responses that are too brief to assess in one or more scoring categories.