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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 2015 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 2015 marking session; the example responses will also serve as anchors in the selection of the June 2015 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 2015 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 2015 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 2015.

   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.
Assignment I – Sources

Source I

The vast majority of citizens are ill-equipped to make informed decisions that can affect the stability and security of their country. There would be fewer errors in judgment that impact society as a whole if important decisions were made entirely by political leaders equipped with the natural abilities and charisma to effectively manage a country.

Source II

SOVIET ELECTIONS  CANADIAN ELECTIONS
Most majority governments are elected with less than half the votes. Tinkering won’t solve this flaw. …

One possible answer, used widely in European democracies, would be to restructure the way MPs are elected. Instead of a winner-take-all system based on ridings, we could have an alternative system where every vote counts. Instead of your votes being “squandered” because someone from another party wins, your vote would help elect representatives of a party or platform you agreed with …

Changing our electoral system will not satisfy the agenda and aspiration of every voter, but it will make our democracy more vigorous, by giving citizens greater influence…

—Satya Das
ASSIGNMENT I: Source Interpretation

Value: 20% of the total examination mark
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
Assignment 1

The first source given rejects the idea of liberalism. How it does this is by claiming that in a liberalistic society where everyone has the opportunity to vote, the country will fall apart. It says that common people lack the know how to make decisions in a clear concussive manner, that would benefit the entire country. What this source would most likely support as the alternative is an authoritarian approach to government. It shows this by saying that if important decisions were made entirely by political leaders in power with the knowledge to make such decisions, that this is the only stable way that the betterment of all people can be achieved. This stance would be shared by the views of Thomas Hobbes, who also believed that better judgment would be made if the government called all the shots for you. This source is rejecting liberalism on the grounds that it believes that everyone does not have the capability to decide clearly on issues, and that burden should be placed into the hands of those in power.

The second source rejects and is critical of liberalism. It shows that the liberal electoral process in Canada does not hold liberal values at all. The source is a comic that shows the electoral process of a liberal democracy to be no better then soviet Russia’s elections, which you only have the one option. The source shows the parallel that having a winner take all system, such as that in Canada, has the same flaws that a authoritarian government such as soviet Russia, where the peoples will is not being represented. This source points out the major flaw in the so called “liberal” way of electing governments, where people feel as though the vote they cast is utterly pointless, and does not effect the outcome of the election in anyway. This source rejects liberalism, and criticizes the electoral process claiming that the votes of the people do not matter.
The final source, a quote by Satya Das, accepts liberalism, but is critical of its current form. She does this by claiming that in order for liberalism to flourish, the winner take all electoral process must be changed. She shows that in the current way our government is elected, majority governments are elected, when less than half the votes are won by them, meaning the country is being run by a party that the majority of Canadians did not want, because all the party has to do is beat the party with the second most votes. What she offers as an alternative to this situation is the idea of proportional representation, where every vote counts, because the seats you win is proportional to the votes you receive. This source accepts what liberalism could be, but is critical of it in its current form, by saying that proportional representation is what must occur for liberalism to reign its values true.

All three sources are linked together. They are linked through the question of what electoral system is best for a society. The first source takes an authoritarian approach, where the citizens, buy and large, are not equipped with the decisive power to make just decisions, and that decision making should be placed into the hands of those with power. The second source shows the flaws of a winner take all electoral system, showing that just as in the USSR, it nullifies the power any vote has, and is saying that this style of election is skewed because it does not reflect the will of the people. And the final source, like the second, shows that winner take all systems are a skewed version of elections, and favors the idea of proportional representation much like countries in Europe, where you control as much as the government as your votes have allowed you too. Each source given, shows a stance on what electoral process is just, and what one isn’t.
# Social Studies 30–1 January 2015
## Assignment I
### 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 interpretation that a country is best served by an authoritarian government and that not everyone is capable of making political decisions is straightforward. When compared to the Proficient response, a much more generalized understanding of links to liberalism is demonstrated.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source II</td>
<td>The writer demonstrates a generalized interpretation that the illustrator rejects and is critical of liberalism, without getting the “sarcastic” intent that the Proficient response identified. Many of the same references of the interpretation of the source are made at both the Proficient and Satisfactory responses, but the level of development and understanding of the links to liberalism demonstrates measurable differences. In this case the writer’s interpretation is adequate and straightforward.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source III</td>
<td>The writer adequately acknowledges the criticisms associated with the winner-take-all system. Although the writer recognizes majority governments do not accurately reflect the political views of the majority of Canadians, and that proportional representation is the solution as stated by Das, it is interpreted in a conventional manner.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>The overarching theme that all three sources question which electoral system is best, is straightforward and adequately developed by summarizing each source’s view on that theme. This approach tends to reflect a general understanding of the relationship that is clear but not capably developed.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>The vocabulary is conventional and generalized, for example: “flaws” (p. 1), “utterly pointless” (p. 1), and “flourish.” (p. 2) The sentence structure is controlled and straightforward, for example: “The second source rejects and is critical of liberalism” (p. 1) and “All three sources are linked together.” (p. 2)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment #1

Source one explains a system of government that relies on the abilities of a select, qualified few to run a society. They believe that citizens should not have a voice in the government simply because they too frequently make judgment errors and do not have the ability it takes to make informed decision to keep the country stable. They also go on to say that the country as a whole would be better off if important decisions were always made by the political leaders that possess the natural ability to effectively manage a country. We could argue that the author believes in a more authoritarian way of government, where power is given to an elite few who believe they are the only ones who can efficiently run the country. The author would be strongly opposed to a democracy, as a democracy gives its citizens a voice in how the country should be run and relies on the citizens to become successful. A man who would embrace this source is Edmund Burke, a classical conservatist, who believes that people are not all equal and only a select few have the ability to make intelligent decisions. Burke was also very traditional in his thinking and wanted society to return to the old way of government. The source shows a very reactionary, right side approach as we see a traditional way of decision making, and possibly a return to an authoritarian state. A philosopher like John Locke would completely oppose this position as he feels citizens are intelligent and rational, and they are the source of power. He also strongly believed that the government should be accountable to its citizens and any actions taken by the government should be justified by popular consent, an obvious rejection to the source.

In source two we see two illustrations that provide similar stances on the voting systems in their country. On one side is the soviet election and the television reads, “Vote Anosov! Your Only Choice”. From this we can infer that there is a sarcastic tone as there is clear controlled participation and the citizens of the Soviet Union would not even need to vote, as they know who
will win. The other illustration shows a television from Canada which reads, “Miller Wins with 20% of votes counted”. Although this is within Canada, which is a liberal democracy, there is a sarcastic tone when the people say “why vote when we know who will win”. This touches on the issue of voter apathy in Canada as only 20% of people voted. A democracy requires its citizens to participate in order to be successful, and when citizens choose not to vote, they leave it to the rest of the population to decide for them. Another issue brought up is the tyranny of the majority, as our voting systems often leaves people feeling like their vote doesn’t matter if they choosing the opposing candidate. This is much like an authoritarian way of voting as the people feel they don’t have a say in who runs their country. The illustration leads us to believe that the authoritarian way of voting does not differ from a democracy by a very large margin.

Source three addresses the problems within Canada’s voting systems and the need for change. They explain the dissatisfaction among citizens when the majority governments are elected with less than half of the votes. This means that the voices of those citizens who voted for the opposing candidates were not heard. As a result, voter apathy is much more likely to occur as people start to feel as if their vote doesn’t matter. This brings into question the fundamental flaw of Canadian democracy. The source provides a solution to this by suggesting that countries should use a system such as the one in Europe where every vote counts, as opposed to a winner-takes-all system. This will ensure that citizens are represented in a way that is meaningful and constructive for them. It will eliminate the problem of voter apathy by providing a sense of aspiration among voters, and provide them with a greater influence. A man like J.S Mill would agree to a system like this as he believed oppression of the minority was wrong, and wanted them to have an equal say in the government.
Assignment #1

Each source provides a perspective on the degree of control citizens have in their governments. Source one opposes source two and three, as they explain that the governments shouldn’t even give citizens the option of participating in the government. They believe that involving the citizens will only lead to an unsuccessful government as regular citizens do not possess the intelligence needed to create a stable society. Source two and three address the issues of the Canadian voting system and why it is becoming less and less efficient. Source three provides a clear solution to the issue presented in source two by explaining that citizens will start participating more as long as they are given an equal say in the government. Source two brings up a similarity between the communist government in the Soviet and the Canadian democracy as citizens in both countries feel they have the same amount of say in their governments. Both citizens question why they even need to vote as they do not have a say in the government regardless. All three sources question the effectiveness of democracy. In order for a true democracy to occur, people need to be provided the ability to have a fair, equal voice in the government, free of oppression of the minority. When citizens and government officials work together to develop a country that meets the needs of all, the success and effectiveness of a true democracy thrives.
### EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Proficient

<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 logically interprets the author’s position that citizens should not have a voice in government and should adopt a more authoritarian style of government. The writer adeptly makes reference to philosophers who would likely embrace and reject the source, thereby demonstrating a sound understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer demonstrates their sound understanding of the cartoonist’s intent in using sarcasm in the comparison of elections in the Soviet Union and Canada. The writer’s perception that the two systems do not differ greatly in the role the citizens play in choosing their governments is adept. The writer also understands the challenges to the voting system and how it relates to the viability of liberalism in Canada.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The assertion that there are inherent flaws within the winner-take-all system is logical. The writer’s adept recognition that voter apathy is a result of this system is an extension of the argument presented by Das and enhances the overall interpretation of the source.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The overarching theme regarding the degree of control citizens have in government, is capably developed by discussing how each source relates to this theme and comparing the points of view to each other. Although it is not required, the writer discusses a second relationship further demonstrating a capable understanding of the relationship that exists among the sources.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>The use of vocabulary, for example: “popular consent” (p. 1) and “sarcastic tone” (p. 2) is appropriate.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence structure is controlled and effective. For example: “In order for a true democracy to occur, people need to be provided the ability to have a fair, equal voice in the government, free of oppression of the minority.” (p. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Students’ Writing with Teachers’ Commentaries

Social Studies 30–1, January 2015
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Excellent (E)

Assignment I

Source 1 is an excerpt or quotation from an unknown source, the source describes the idea of the elitist theory of democracy. The source presents the issue of uninformed voters and how this could undermine the liberal political ideology of democracy itself. The lines "the vast majority of citizens are ill equipped to make informed decisions that can affect the stability and security of their country" presents the problem mainly faced by modern liberal democracies, the problem that voters are not making a rational and politically informed choice. In liberal democracies like Canada and the United States, it is the responsibility of individuals to make informed political decisions to have the right to vote. Voters that are not informed and vote carelessly, undermine democracy because these voters do not contribute to the will of the people and lessen the impact of people who do vote with an informed position. The line "There would be fewer errors in judgement that impact society as a whole if important decisions were made entirely by political leaders." Describes the elitist theory of democracy. This theory suggests that a select few individuals should be the ones to determine government political and economic policy, as the majority of individuals either do not vote, or vote carelessly without an informed position. The source also hints at authoritarian forms of government, like oligarchies, single party states, or dictatorships as being more effective than liberal democracy. The source compliments these forms of governments for being able to reduce errors in government decision making and being more effective as a whole, whether or not the will of the people is represented. The source asserts that governments with power vested in solely in political leaders are more effective and are able to work towards a goal, whereas democracies are flawed, in that they are unable to act towards the will of the people, as it is undermined by those who vote carelessly.
Source 2 is a political cartoon depicting the issue faced by modern liberal democracies of voter turnout. The first image of the source titled "Soviet elections" depicts the futility of voting in authoritarian regimes with the lines on the TV stating "Vote Anosov, Your only choice. In authoritarian regimes, voting is often futile, as there is often only one political party or government that is in power. The second image titled "Canadian Elections" depicts a couple discussing the futility of voting because they already expect the victor of the elections. This can be shown with the line on the TV screen" Network Projection, Miller WINS", with the lines "with 20% of the votes counted" in a small font. The couple in this image assumes that "Miller has already won" despite the fact that only 20% of the votes have been counted. The source criticizes individuals who vote with this ideology, by showing the ignorance of these voters, in blindly assuming that they should not even vote or participate in elections because a result is expected, despite the fact that this could easily change. Voter turnout is an important issue in liberal democracies, if individuals do not vote and express their interests, the will of the people is not a reflection of the interests of society as a whole.

The two images address the idea of voter turnout in undermining democratic principles, as individuals do not see that they are able to influence the government. The source suggests that voting is a privilege that is not taken by most individuals by showing voting in authoritarian states, where the idea of choice is not a right and is merely an illusion. The source describes the pertinent issue that despite citizens given the political right to vote, many do not choose to take it, and hence undermine the will of the people by not actively contributing to it.
Source 3 is a quotation or excerpt by Satya Das examining the problems of Canadian democracy. The source addresses the potential problems that a "First past the post" democratic system like the one in place in Canada could cause in undermining the will of the people. The line "Most majority government are elected with less than half the votes. Tinkering won’t solve this problem." Suggests firstly that the flaws of the "First past the post" democratic system results in inaccuracies in which the will of the people is presented, and that secondly, the effects of the inaccuracies could result in less voters voting overall. The effects of the "First past the post" democratic system in undermining liberal democracies could result in a low voter turnout, as individuals may believe that their votes are ineffective. In the lines "Instead of a winner take all system based on ridings, we could have an alternate system where every vote counts." Das brings up the idea of proportional representation over the "First past the post" democratic system. Das asserts that this idea will more actively represent the will of the people with the lines "Where every vote counts. Instead of your votes being "squandered" because even if someone from another party wins, your vote would help elect representatives of a party or platform you agreed with". It is through these lines that Das asserts the view the proportional representation is more democratic than the first past the post democratic system, as it will more actively represent the will of the people. Instead of votes being wasted when a certain member of parliament in a riding wins an election, votes would still go towards a certain political party that individuals vote for, and the House of Commons would be filled accordingly depending on the percentage of votes gained by each party. With the lines "Changing our electoral system will not satisfy the agenda and aspirations of every voter, but it will make our democracy more vigorous, by giving
citizens greater influence" Das finally asserts that although implementing this idea will not appease every voter, this will solve the issue of citizens not voting because they believe that their view will not be represented.

Overall, all three sources discuss the ideas of various factors influencing both the effectiveness of democracy, and how a democracy represents the will of the people. Source 1 describes uninformed voters being a factor undermining democracy, Source 2 describes the idea of low voter turnout being a factor in undermining democracy, while source 3 hints at the "First past the post" democratic system being a cause of a low voter turnout. Both source 1 and 2 address the topic of authoritarian states. Source 1 develops the idea that authoritarian regimes are more effective because they do not have to deal with the problems faced by democracies, like low citizen participation and uninformed voters who may limit the effectiveness of passing political and economic policy and implementing government policy on a society. Source 2 however uses the idea of an authoritarian government to suggest why voters should vote. In an authoritarian government, voters truly have no choice in terms of political parties. The source criticizes people who do not vote, for not taking their responsibilities as citizens to vote, and appreciating their right to be able to vote and choose a political party that fits their interests. Source 3 potentially discusses the idea of voter turnout in relation to another aspect of democracy, the "First past the post" democratic system. The source describes this system as undermining democracy itself, leading voters not to vote with the lines "Elected with half the votes". All three sources describe factors that limit the expression of the will of the people. Source 1 describes individuals being uninformed as a pertinent factor that influences the expression of the will of the people, as these people undermine
the will of the people by voting carelessly. Source 2 describes low voter turnout as a factor that influences the will of the people, as voters are not actively contributing to the will of the people by choosing not to vote. Source 3 describes the "First past the post" form of democracy as a factor limiting the will of the people, as the will of the people is not completely addressed in this type of political system.
## EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Excellent

<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 effects of uninformed voters undermining democracy is sophisticated as it does not reflect the will of the people. This discussion is insightful, as the writer explains the elitist nature of political liberal ideology. The writer perceptively describes government leaders “like oligarchies, single party states, or dictatorships as being more effective than liberal democracy.” (p. 1)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s discussion of the illustration is precise in their description of the importance of voter turnout and their influence on the government. The extension of the theme of futility is perceptively developed. The writer further demonstrates that the implications of the action or inaction of citizens inherently undermines the will of the people.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>Although the writer could have shortened this interpretation by not using so many direct quotations, the writer perceptively summarizes Das’s view of proportional representation and the benefits this approach would have in comparison to first-past-the-post.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Although not required, the writer does include two relationships that are: the factors influencing the effectiveness of democracy and how it affects the will of the people. The writer thoroughly evaluates both themes in the context of all three sources.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>The use of vocabulary, for example: “elitist” (p. 1), “futility” (p. 2), and “pertinent” (p. 4) is deliberately chosen. Although, the writing contains a few minor errors, sentence structure is controlled and sophisticated, for example: “The effects of the ‘First past the post’ democratic system in undermining liberal democracies could result in a low voter turnout, as individuals may believe that their votes are ineffective.” (p. 3)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSIGNMENT II: Written-Response Assignment II

Value: 30% of the total examination mark
Suggested time: 90 to 105 minutes

Analyze the following source and complete the assignment.

Source

Individuals are, by nature, unique and unequal. Efforts by the state to interfere with the lives of individuals will result in a restrictive and inefficient society.

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
This source states that 'Individuals are, by nature, unique and unequal. Effort by the state to interfere with the lives of individuals will result in a restrictive and inefficient society'. Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill would agree with this source because they both believed that society would proper if everyone looked out for their own interest, it would benefit the community. This source agrees with individual identity coming before a group, a benefit of that would be it creates competition and gives people more incentive to try harder in their lives when they get something out of it. Stalin or a communist leader would disagree with this source. He believed that the government should run everything and the collective good of the community was more important than individual rights. This allows for a better quality of life when the government have a role in society and a safer economic system with less chances of it falling. After analysing both sides of this source it become evident that one must disagree with the source.

When the government does not interfere within a state the the economy will begin to fall while left in the hands of individuals. This is shown through supply side economics. Supply side economics is a system in which the consumer selects what is to be produced, the government does not require a say in the matter. Competition between the individual will help to move the economy in supply side economics. The trickledown effect is a theory to show how supply side economics works. It is saying that the money of the rich will ultimately meet the poor. By the wealthy people spending money and putting it into the economy it will slowly start to benefit everyone by enhancing the economy by putting money in. The theory states that the money should just trickle down
until it hits the bottom but the theory is thawed and this does not work how it was planned.

A society can be effective with government intervention. This was shown through the Great Depression in the 1930's when America was in a recession. During this crisis the government stepped in and pulled the economy out of the slump by using demand side economics. Demand side economics is the government regulation of good and services. This is also known as Keynes economics. John Maynard Keynes believed that in order for the U.S to get out of the recessions the government needed to intervene and to do this he created two policy. The fiscal and monetary policy. According to the fiscal policy in times of recession the government should decrease taxes and increase government spending and when there was not a recession the government should increase taxes and spend less money. The monetary policy states that in times of recession there should be lower interests rates and when the economy was good there should be higher interest rates. With a demand side economy and government involvement it can help the individual person to prosper no matter what the economy is like. By the government interfering with the state to help the economy it did not restrict the individual nor prove to be unproductive.

The government can increase the quality of life of individuals and not restrict what they can do and can make society better. An example of this is the New Deal. President Franklin D. Roosevelt came up with this proposal to help get the U.S out of the recession. After times in America were bad Roosevelt derived the New Deal to try and
benefit the people who were struggling. Through this he created jobs like construction
workers or things that involve manual labour for the unemployed, he put money into the
economy and encouraged economic growth to help start the economy. By creating jobs
for people it increased their standard of life. Another example of the government
improving the quality of life is in Sweden. The government in Sweden plays a big role in
the society yet the people there are happy. This is because the government offers welfare
programs such as universal health care, old age pension plans and social security.
Individuals in Sweden are still capable to do things for themselves and are not restricted
and the society is not inefficient even though the government plays a role. The
government takes care of the people through the welfare programs which means the
people do not have to worry about the things like their health; whereas in America every
citizen would have to worry about their help bills. By not worrying about having to pay
bills and money it increases the quality of life. So overall, the government can interfere
and individuals will still have freedom and a better quality of life.

When looking at individuals and the role of the government in the society it can
be seen that the government does not restrict individuals and create an inefficient society,
it can increase the quality of life and keep a stable government. Not everything a
government does in a society is making it worse than it was before and takes away from
the individuals self-want and the decisions they make.
# 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 writer demonstrates a generalized understanding of the ideological perspective of the source when they state that “This source agrees with individual identity coming before a group.” (p. 1) The writer’s identification of those who would agree and disagree with the perspective of the source (i.e. Smith, Mill and Stalin) demonstrates a conventional and straightforward analysis of the source.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s position that the perspective of the source should not be embraced because government involvement in society can “increase the quality of life and keep a stable government” (p. 3) is generally supported by appropriately chosen and developed arguments. The argumentation is straightforward and conventional, demonstrating an adequate understanding of the assignment, for example: “By not worrying about having to pay bills and money it increases the quality of life. So overall, the government can interfere and individuals will still have freedom and a better quality of life.” (p. 3)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s description of “supply side economics” (p. 1) is conventional and straightforward, however, it is not relevant to the argument that “When the government does not interfere within a state the economy will begin to fall while left in the hands of individuals.” (p. 1) A generalized discussion of Keynesian economics, the New Deal and Sweden reveals an acceptable understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication

- 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.

The writing is straightforward and functionally organized. The introductory paragraph contains most of the analysis of the source. The body paragraphs, which outline the arguments and supporting evidence for the writer’s position, are connected to the source in their first sentences.

The writer often uses simple sentences that demonstrate an adequate control of syntax and mechanics, for example: “By creating jobs for people it increased their standard of life. Another example of the government improving the quality of life is Sweden.” (p. 3)
Assignment # 2

This source demonstrates the idea that individuals should be left to their own devices without any interference from the state. The author believes that government intervention in the lives of citizens is ineffective and will only prevent individuals from reaching their full potential. Adam Smith came up with the idea of capitalism, which favors an economy that is left to regulate itself with minimal interference from the government. Smith believed that individuals should be free to pursue their own greed and desire to succeed, and this in turn will benefit all of society without the help of the government. He believed in the idea of the invisible hand; that if people were free to pursue their economic freedom the economy would be able to regulate itself. Adam Smith's ideas align really well with the perspective of the author in this source because they both believe that interference from the state or government will only restrict individuals and create an inefficient society, whereas giving individuals the freedom to do as they wish will promote an efficient society. The author also promotes individualism because he believes that each individual is unique and unequal and therefore the state should not attempt to interfere in the lives of citizens to make a collectivist society, which is a more right-wing perspective. This source essentially embraces the ideas of liberalism because it supports the ideas of economic freedom, self-interest, as well as giving individuals their rights and freedoms. Although it is true that less government in the lives of individuals can foster a very efficient society at times, a society that has some government intervention is often more successful and less susceptible to the booms and bust of the business cycle providing a more stable society for citizens and in turn an overall more efficient society.

It is true that in the past capitalism has been very effective in providing an efficient society and booming economy. However these good times are often followed by very hard times
and it is necessary for government involvement to ensure the stability of the economy. Some economists argue that periods of inflation and recession are just natural events of the business cycle and will continue on if left alone. However the periods of recession can take a very large toll on citizens within a society and it is the responsibility of the government to ensure that citizens are not subject to harsh conditions during periods of recession. The 1920's in America were known as the 'roaring twenties' because of the booming economy. Adam Smith's ideas of capitalism were being put into action and the economy was benefitting greatly. However, in 1928, ten percent of the wealthiest citizens were taking in forty-nine percent of the country's income. This presented a problem in that only the very successful businessmen and citizens were benefitting from the capitalist economy. This problem only worsened after the stock market crash in October of 1929, that marked the beginning of the Great Depression. The depression started off as a recession when stock prices stopped rising and this caused a panic for investors who began to frantically sell their stocks, which caused banks to start calling in their loans. Since a lot of citizens had bought stocks on credit, this caused these investors to go bankrupt and left American society in a turmoil. The recession left many unemployed and struggling to find food for their families, specifically those citizens that had not been part of the ten percent taking in forty-nine percent of the income. The roaring twenties had come to an end and were instead replaced with poverty and unemployment. For four years America's economy suffered. To supporters of capitalism this period is seen as part of the natural course of the business cycle. However without government involvement in the lives of individuals, citizens were left to fend for themselves without hope of a reprieve. It was not until 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected as president, that the economy slowly began to recover.
When governments involve themselves in the lives of individuals just enough to provide a social safety net for citizens, individuals are less likely to suffer in times of recession. Government involvement in the economy will also make the booms and busts of the business cycle less prominent providing a more stable economy, and will therefore allow an economy to remain efficient for longer periods of time even if that efficiency may be less when compared to times of boom in a capitalist society. However, efficiency is only maintained in a capitalist society during times of boom and not during times of bust. Therefore efficiency in a capitalist society will be interrupted whereas efficiency in a society that has government involvement in the economy will be maintained. Leaving a society to completely fend for itself can only be efficient and successful for a short period of time. After that period of time, it is necessary for government involvement to get the economy back on its feet. During the depression, individuals began to see the negative side of a capitalist society and began to favor more socialist forms of government, and thus Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected as president in 1933. Roosevelt came up with the 'New Deal' which was a wave of programs that sought to bring relief to victims of the depression and to reform and revitalize the economy. Roosevelt's first wave of programs provided various social programs for citizens. He also made the Social Security system for old age people in order to provide them security. Next, Roosevelt redistributed wealth between consumers, workers, and businesses. Through the increased involvement of government, citizens were given security and stability, yet they still had freedom. Roosevelt implemented John Maynard Keynes' theory of 'demand-side economics' where government increases spending, and lowers taxes during bad times, and decreases spending and increases taxes during good times. By implementing his 'New Deal' Roosevelt created a more efficient society as everyone had a role regardless of their abilities. Even though it is true that all individuals all unique, that does not
necessarily mean that individuals should be left to fend for themselves. Seniors or people with disabilities should have access to programs that will help them as it is harder for them to thrive in a capitalist society. It is necessary for governments to provide social safety nets for individuals that are not able to sustain themselves just as Roosevelt did with his New Deal.

A Welfare State does not restrict the lives of individuals, in fact it does the opposite and provides citizens with more opportunities. Canada is a Welfare State and has been for many decades. Even though there is government involvement in the lives of citizens, individuals are still granted rights and freedoms that restrict too much government involvement. Since Tommy Douglas implemented Universal Health Care in Canada in the 1950's, all citizens have had access to health care even to this day. This access has allowed citizens to feel secure in the fact that they will not have to worry about paying for health care if they fall sick. Universal health care does not restrict individuals, in fact it gives all individuals the opportunity to access health care. Canada also has other social programs such as Canada Pension Plan or unemployment benefits. These programs act as a safety net for individuals that have retired or have lost their jobs. By providing these types of programs individuals are not restricted to suffering when they lose their jobs. The programs also generate efficiency in a society because they don't let any individual suffer during times of economic bust, which saves the government from having to pull out an entire country from a recession. With these social programs available it is harder for a society to fall into a depression as America did in 1929 because a Welfare State provides stability to an economy. This stability in turn provides efficiency to a society as government's will not be left with the task of fishing citizens out of trouble during times of crisis because the crises will not be as severe.
harm a society provided that the government involvement is balanced and does not overpower an individual's rights and freedoms. A country that practices welfare capitalism or has a welfare state is likely to be more stable and thus more efficient than a capitalist society. State interference within the lives of citizens at all times only saves governments the hassle of having to reform the economy during times of recession in a capitalist society thus increasing the overall efficiency of that society. The social safety net that a Welfare State provides does not restrict a society, it gives individuals within a society more opportunities to get themselves back on their feet or to live a better life even in bad times. All in all government intervention in a society has hardly ever resulted in problems, in fact it is when a society is left to its own devices when problems begin to occur.
### 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>In the first paragraph, the writer provides a sound discussion of both halves of the source, by capably noting the correlation between the ideological perspective and its right-wing adherents, values and tendencies. This adept analysis is tempered somewhat by the writer’s labelling of the perspective of the source as being one reflective of “liberalism” (p. 1) rather than “classical liberal.”</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s acknowledgement that more individualist societies can, at times, foster an “efficient economy” (p. 1), is augmented by a persuasive and purposeful discussion of the welfare state’s ability to enhance citizens’ lives by providing more opportunities. The writer clearly develops the relationship between the position taken, the argumentation, and the ideological perspective in the source, by revisiting the concepts of the unique nature of individuals, and the subsequent restrictions and efficient and/or inefficient characteristics of nations.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Evidence is specific and purposeful when the writer discusses the reasons for the stock market crash in the United States. (p. 2) The writer’s adept treatment of examples such as the booming 1920’s, the Great Depression, and efforts to mitigate its economic woes (as encapsulated in New Deal programs), reveal a solid understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writing is clear and purposefully organized, with the writer demonstrating a capable control over syntax, mechanics and grammar.</th>
<th>Pf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although the writer doesn’t overwhelm the reader with sophisticated language, the vocabulary is appropriate and specific to the assigned task, for example: “However without government involvement in the lives of individuals, citizens were left to fend for themselves without hope of a reprieve.” (p. 2)</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Students’ Writing with Teachers’ Commentaries

Social Studies 30–1, January 2015
Assignment II Responses
Example Scored Excellent (E)

The Dangerous of Extremism

Human nature, one of the most important questions that people can have. What is our fundamental nature as a species? It is with little surprise that this question is an important part of our day to day lives. This question can influence almost everything about society and life, it makes us ponder our individual strength or whether we need the support of others. By definition these inquiries are extremely political in their nature. We can see this clearly in governments all over the world, that specific parties take different stances on the answer. Right wing parties typically value the strength of an individual, they believe that people are able to make strong decisions and don’t need any interference from government. The position of the source is very much in line with this classical liberal method of thought. The ideology is one that believes in the strength of an individual’s uniqueness and inequality. It then goes on to assert that the only form of government that will serve the uniqueness and inequality of the individual is a government free of restriction and control of the people. However the source then begs the question, what about those who are unable to care for themselves? Are they left to fend for themselves in a society where the government only exists to provide support in the most extreme cases? Therefore the answer to the question about human nature, and what government best supports the interests of everyone would be a government that applies aspects from both sides of the political spectrum and a moderate stance on the ideological perspective of the source.

The source would suggest that all individuals by nature are unequal and unique. We can see that this aspect of human nature can be seen in almost every society around the world.
Some individuals are unequal, many get advantages over others and that creates a sense of uniqueness among people. One can be born wealthy or destitute, one can be born a different gender or different culture. All these aspects of human society are universal and virtually unchallengeable. However the source suggests that the best system to deal with the inequality of society and people is a government that stays out of the everyday life of its people. This form of government certainly has merit and aspects of it should be embraced. Embracing this perspective should, however, be done with great care. This line of thinking can easily lead to a society that establishes some of its unique and unequal members as superior to others. An us versus them mentality could easily be created. This has been seen time and time again throughout history, and the dangers of a classical liberalism system can be severe. The industrial revolution is one of the most infamous examples of laissez faire gone too far. This right wing extremism created an exploitative and dangerous society. Children were assigned to work deep underground in the extremely dangerous mining industry. They were forced, for well over twelve hours a day in many cases, to haul sled loads of coal and iron up from deep underground. Many children died or suffered severe deformities as a result. Perhaps one of the most infamous examples of cruelty and suffering during the revolution was the plight of women. Women who worked in the factories that produced the popular 'strike anywhere' matches suffered horrid and irreparable injuries and deformities. The chemicals used in the production of the matches would make their way into the food of the people working on them. The chemicals would then make their way into the bones of the face and skull, causes bit and pieces of bone to literally break off and work their way out of the body. Such a society that believes whole heartedly in a distant government that does not intervene could see horrible
injustices and cruelties being inflicted upon its people. It exploits the inequality of citizens leading to an oligarchical rule of the 'robber barons' and the uniqueness of people becomes a resource to be exploited.

The inverse of the source would suggest that all the problems of laissez faire could be reduced, or even entirely removed, by having a government that supports all aspects of life. Controlling, regulating and maintaining the lives of individuals within the nation. The origins of this system are also found in the midst of the horrors of the industrial revolution. Initially we saw the rise of socialism and later the pinnacle of government intervention in communism. Karl Marx's vision of a society run by the down trodden working class was thought to be the answer to corporate greed and domination. A system achieved through violent revolution by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie was believed to be the only way governments would abolish the oligarchy and create a society that truly cared for its citizens. Indeed a society that could eventually transcend the need for a government entirely. Marx believed his idea of a glorious revolution would take place in nations that had already industrialized and had been utilizing a laissez faire form of government. Nations such as Britain, France and Prussia were believed by Marx to be the location of his revolution. Little did he suspect that the center of his vision would be the agricultural, backward and illiterate society of Russia. Here the roots of communism took hold creating the closest example of a society created after the teachings of Karl Marx at the time. Initially this system seemed to work wonders, eliminating the oppressive ideals of the oligarchy and creating a society that cared for the people within it. However it would soon be realized that this system, much like the system of unrestricted capitalism came
at price. This vision of rule by the proletariat soon became dictatorship of the proletariat and extremism became the norm. Effectively destroying commonly held ideas of liberalism and adopting a stance of control and totalitarianism. Any leader who does not share the exact same vision as the one coming before could effectively destroy all work that had been started by that leader. This has been seen in the Soviet Union time and time again, in leaders such as Stalin, Khrushchev and many more. This suggests that the inverse of the position taken by the source, that of total government control does not function as the solution. Much like what is stated in the source itself, this system would result in a restrictive and inefficient society.

The answer to the exploitative system of oligarchy and classical liberalism and the corrupting and inefficient nature of communism and socialism would be a system that utilizes the best aspects of both systems. Modern liberalism and a central perspective would allow the government to impose restrictions on business that would prevent the exploitation of its people. In addition this system would be able to utilize Adam Smith’s invisible hand theory to help guide the formation of the economy to create an efficient system that benefits the consumer. Taking a moderate stance on the ideological perspective of the source would imply that the uniqueness and inequality of individuals is important, and it is important that the government also be able to intervene if the need arose. This system would protect the impoverished from being exploited by rampant capitalism and also protect the freedoms of individuals by refraining from the restriction of the invisible hand. Modern liberalism rationalizes and works to solve the problems of classical liberalism and those of communism and socialism. It promotes personal freedom, freedom to be involved in the government and
freedom from severe government control while also taking care of its people. Modern liberalism rejects the dangers of extremism and proposes moderate ways of thinking in their place. A contemporary example of such a society can easily be found in modern Scandinavia. The people of Denmark are among the happiest people in the world, as are the people of Sweden. The government of Sweden takes complete care of its citizens from birth to death. Education and healthcare are all taken care of by the government without the anti-democratic illiberal tendencies of communism. They have taken the best of limited government intervention and the best of government intervention and combined them in a way that works almost without flaw. They are some of the strongest, if not the strongest, democracies on the planet with some of the best standards of living. Sweden would argue that the perspective of the source should be embraced, but only to a moderate extent. This is not to say that problems don't exist for societies that follow these systems, but they are still by far some of the best and most effective governments in the world.

The ideological perspective of the source is one that should be embraced, but only to a moderate extent. The extremes of both the perspective of the source, as well as its inverse have been shown to be damaging and harmful to members of their societies. The rampant exploitation of classical liberalism and the controlling inefficient nature of communism have both been shown in the past to be systems of government that are extremely flawed. From the industrial revolution, to the Soviet Union these systems of government have exploited and harmed the people that live under them. Extremism is never the answer, extremism is by its nature violent no matter which side of the spectrum it falls under. The extremism of laissez
faire can be just as dangerous as the extremism of socialism. Only a society that combines the
best aspects of each side and uses a system that supports modern liberalism and moderate
views can truly reflect the complete spectrum of human nature.
Social Studies 30–1 January 2015  
Assignment II

EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Source</td>
<td>The writer insightfully recognizes the challenges associated with classical liberalism as a result of individuals being unequal and unique. A comprehensive understanding of the ideological perspective is demonstrated by the writer's discussion of the plethora of inequalities that exist within human nature and how, in essence, these inequities lend themselves to inefficiency resulting from government intervention.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>The position that classical liberal and communist principles must be taken in moderation as both “came with a price” (pp. 3-4) is convincingly supported. The writer’s position is consistently supported by the argument that modern liberalism will protect the most vulnerable in society by protecting rights and freedoms, while also safeguarding individuals from extreme government control. The writer’s assertion that in nations where there is no government intervention the situation can lead to “an oligarchical rule of the ‘robber barons’ and the uniqueness of people becomes a resource to be exploited” (p.3) is compelling. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is perceptively developed by reinforcing the drawbacks of extreme laissez faire capitalism and extreme socialism.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assignment II Response—Excellent (*continued*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>The writer’s use of evidence reflects both breadth and depth of social studies knowledge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen.</td>
<td>A thorough and comprehensive discussion of the exploitation that occurred during the Industrial Revolution, the restrictive and inefficient practices of communism and the benefits of modern liberalism in Scandinavia, reveal an insightful understanding of social studies content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The relative absence of error is impressive.</td>
<td>E</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>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>The writing is fluent and skillfully structured.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen.</td>
<td>The writer’s overall control of syntax and grammar is sophisticated, for example: “This system would protect the impoverished from being exploited by rampant capitalism and also protect the freedoms of individuals by refraining from the restrictions of the invisible hand.” (p. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The relative absence of error is impressive.</td>
<td>E</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>Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen, for example: “irreparable injuries” (p. 2), “pinnacle of government intervention” (p. 3) and “rampant exploitation.” (p. 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Scoring Categories and Scoring Criteria for 2015 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 2015 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis of the source is insightful and sophisticated; a comprehensive understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Pf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis of the source is capable and adept; a sound understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis of the source is conventional and straightforward; a generalized understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis of the source is incomplete and lacks depth; a confused understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>INS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient is a special category. <strong>It is not an indicator of quality.</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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

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

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

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

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

Insufficient is a special category. It is not an indicator of quality. It is assigned to responses that do not contain a discernable 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

E 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

Pf 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

S 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

L 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

P 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

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.
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.