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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 2012 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 2012 marking session; the example responses will also serve as anchors in the selection of the June 2012 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 2012 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 2012 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 2012.

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.
Source I

This photograph was taken on the Brandon University campus in Manitoba, 1970.

Left banner reads:
TELEGRAMS PROTESTING THE WAR MEASURES ACT. TO: P.M. Trudeau + Premier Schreyer. SIGN HERE.

Right banner reads:
We do “NOT” support FLQ. We do oppose the suspension of “YOUR” CIVIL Liberties.

Source I Brandon University Photograph collection, October Crisis protest (BUPC5.1), S.J. McKee Archives, Brandon University
Source II
The state determines all that is morally, socially, and materially valuable. Therefore, it has the right and obligation to monopolize all power and authority, controlling all aspects of society. The state functions as the protector of citizens, providing them with identities, welfare, and security in return for loyalty and obedience. No rights or freedoms should exist apart from service to the state. Individuals and groups constitute one unified, integral whole working towards common goals. Thus, any notion that liberalism functions for the greater good is naive.

Source III
Canadians have proved themselves willing to put in place important measures to address extraordinary threats. The Anti-Terrorism Act was carefully crafted by parliamentarians to provide such measures in a way that was consistent with our Charter of Rights and Freedoms and with our core values. Given the nature of the measures adopted by the Government, we are committed to their legislative review at the end of this year\(^1\) to ensure that the balance struck was appropriate. We also need to ensure that there are effective mechanisms for oversight and review so that, in protecting an open society, we do not inadvertently erode the very liberties and values we are determined to uphold.

\(^{1}\text{2004} \quad — \text{from Government of Canada Privy Council Office} \)
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 Teachers’ Commentaries

Social Studies 30–1, January 2012
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Satisfactory (S)

The source is a picture of two men that have signs protesting against The War Measures Act and the FLQ. This source is clearly in favor of liberalism and its principles. One sign states “We do oppose the suspension of YOUR CIVIL rights” which shows that their society’s rights are being terminated and not valued as they should be when a country claims to follow in liberalism’s footsteps. Although it can be justified, that when in times of need, a liberalistic country has been known to push aside liberal practice in order to better the people or the nation as a whole, the message in the source states that the people are not happy with the extreme measures taken. The people in the source are standing up for their rights in a civilized way and want to bring their society back in line with liberalism and its true meaning, to value the individual.

This source believes that because a state protects the people, and provides them with identities, welfare, and security that in return the people should have no rights or freedoms. It feels that individuals should provide service to the state and all work towards one common goal. It does not believe in liberalism and its view of rights and freedoms for every individual. This perspective is completely totalitarian in its views and goes against any liberal practices to better its nation. This can relate to how Hitler decided to impose rule over Germany by seizing complete control over the nation, and forced individuals into one group that worked towards the common goal; to make Germany the strongest nation in the world. This source believes in control over the individual, and that any positive ideas of liberalism are considered
unsophisticated. It does not believe in valuing the individual by respecting their rights and freedoms.

The source clearly states how it takes extreme measures to protecting the individual, especially in times of harm. This goes along well with the definition behind liberalism because it values the individual, and not the collective good. The source is determined to make sure that when dealing with harmful situations that the measures taken do not go against Canada’s Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Also, it is determined to maintain the set liberties and principles, so as to not go against them when struck with high threats. This goes hand in hand with liberalism because it values maintaining the people’s rights and freedoms in any given problem or situation.

Sources one and two relate in that they both go against the principles of liberalism. The higher power in each source disregards the true meaning of liberalism in order to better its country as a whole, ignoring the individual’s rights and freedoms. Also, source one and three relate because they both understand the meaning of liberalism and want to maintain its definition in society. Although in source one, their rights are being pushed aside the people are still fighting for what is right in a liberalistic view. Source two differs from both source one and three because it is completely against any form of liberalism in society and believes in complete control over its people. Instead of providing its individuals with rights and freedoms it takes them away from them, and places people in groups, forgetting the meaning of the individual.
### 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 adequate, straightforward, and conventional, demonstrating a generalized understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>The writer interprets Source I in a straightforward and conventional manner by identifying the violation of rights in a liberal society and the protestors’ response to the measures taken. The writer generally recognizes that the protestors in Source I are attempting to preserve liberties through civil action.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source II</td>
<td>The writer demonstrates an adequate interpretation of Source II by paraphrasing the author’s message. A straightforward understanding of the author’s acceptance of totalitarian views and rejection of liberalism is presented throughout.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source III</td>
<td>A conventional interpretation of the position presented in relation to the balancing of collective and individual rights during times of crisis is evident. The last sentence in the writer’s interpretation of Source III reflects a general understanding of the principles of liberalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relationships | The relationships among the sources are adequately explained as the writer identifies how the three sources relate to each other. A straightforward relationship to liberalism is presented but not extensively developed. | S |

| Communication | Vocabulary is conventional and generalized; for example, “justified” (p. 1), “common goal” (p. 1), and “complete control” (p. 2). Sentence structure is controlled and straightforward. The writing demonstrates basic control of mechanics and grammar; for example, “The people in the source are standing up for their rights in a civilized way and want to bring their society back in line with liberalism and its true meaning, to value the individual” (p. 1). | S |
Examples of Students’ Writing with Teachers’ Commentaries

Social Studies 30–1, January 2012
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Proficient (Pf)

Liberalism is the enactment or upholding of individual and collective rights that allow the people of an association or country to function normally and happily in their chosen environment. The taking of rights can be classified as either an illiberal act or a non-liberal policy. Both conditions involve the taking of some, perhaps all, of the rights and freedoms that a living, breathing person possesses. The taking of rights or freedoms is usually opposed and openly argued by the people of the country enacting the policy. This is because rights and freedoms are what allows people to live the way they choose to live.

Source one depicts protesters of the 1970's activation of the War Measures Act in Canada after the emergence of the FLQ terrorist organization in Quebec and Ontario. Current Prime Minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, in order to slow the violent attacks by the FLQ to a point where they could be stopped, put forward the act. The protesters in the source are arguing that the War Measures Act was too extreme for the situation it was activated for and took too many civil liberties away from the people. The act took freedoms like the right to association and expression away in order to stop public displays of support for the FLQ. Curfews were also put in place and detention was allowed so that suspected supporters of the FLQ could be removed from the public so as to not cause damage. Because the War Measures Act took away these freedoms it is known as an illiberal policy put in place by the Trudeau government. Anything illiberal is defined as a liberal democracy instituting a non-liberal policy, which is what the Trudeau government did. The Canadian citizenry was angry because rights were taken away, provinces where
the FLQ were not problematic were the most outspoken as the act still applied. The 
picture shows a liberal idea protesting an illiberal policy.

Source two is an obvious supporter of collectivist, even Communist, ideals. This 
can be found in the way the source feels about rights and freedoms and how the source 
feels the state should function. The source states that the government should hold all the 
power because it is the holder of moral, social, and material value and operates as the 
protector of the people. The source states that the only rights that are implied by living in 
the country are service to the country. It criticizes liberal ideas believing them to be 
nenecessary and foolish as the people are obligated to do what the state wants them to do 
rather than what the people want to do. The source is supporting a, “My house. My 
rules.” Stance that is critical of rights and freedoms making it a non-liberal policy. It is 
non-liberal for the same reasons it is collectivist, it does not care for freedoms only 
submission from the people so as the collective country can grow.

Source three is explaining the Anti-Terrorism Act proposed by the Canadian 
government in 2004 in response to terrorist acts around the world including but not 
limited to the September eleventh attacks on the United States of America. Unlike source 
one in the 1970's when the act proposed was widely opposed, the 2004 Anti-Terrorism 
Act was scrutinized until it was found acceptable by both the government and the 
Canadian citizens using personal beliefs as well as the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 
The source actually states at the end of the excerpt that the government made sure that, 
“...we do not inadvertently erode the very liberties and values we are determined to
uphold.” The source is liberal in that it supports the continued use of rights and freedoms by the country and as such does not wish to limit them too much. It is illiberal in that it is taking rights from the people in order to gain security. It is illiberal even though the people agree with the measures taken. It is illiberal because the act does limit freedoms and Canada is a liber democracy.

All three sources contain either illiberal or non-liberal policies. Source one can be depicted as liberal or illiberal in that the men are protesting for the return of rights and freedoms taken away by the War Measures Act making them liberal supporters. The source is illiberal because the act took away freedoms like expression and association to gain security and it was enacted by a liberal democracy. Source two is non-liberal because it depicts a collectivist ideology that is supportive of only the rights of the state to hold supremacy over its people. This means rights and freedoms of any type that are usually held by people in liberal countries are non-existent in the source’s country. Source three is illiberal in the same way that source one is. The Anti-Terrorism Act took freedoms and rights away from the Canadian citizenry in order to gain security that was necessary at the time for the health of the society. All three sources are depicted and therefore are illiberal or non-liberal supportive meaning that in some way rights or freedoms were neglected or removed in the pursuit of a greater cause or because beliefs were in contrast with liberal ideas.
## 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’s interpretation of Source I reflects a sound understanding of the links to liberalism. The writer not only identifies the government actions as illiberal but also elaborates on the term and relates it specifically to the source. The links to the principles of liberalism are sound and adept as the writer demonstrates an understanding of exercising liberal rights in response to illiberal actions taken by the government.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of the source is logical, specific, and adept, demonstrating a sound understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer demonstrates specificity in the interpretation of the source by recognizing non-liberal aspects and its critique of liberal ideas. The interpretation is sound and adept in that the writer recognizes the role of government in a non-liberal society; for example, “My house. My rules” (p. 2). The writer capably develops links to the non-liberal, collective values of the source.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The incorrect reference to the date of the Anti-Terrorism Act does not detract from the writer’s overall interpretation of the source. The writer demonstrates a sound understanding of the importance of ensuring that public safety is not at the expense of our individual rights. The writer comments on the scrutiny surrounding the acceptability of the Anti-Terrorism Act. The writer capably recognizes the contrast found in the principles associated with liberalism and illiberalism.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The opening paragraph defines the values on which the relationships will be developed. The writer clearly identifies that the over-arching theme of the three sources relates to illiberal or non-liberal policies. Not only are the three sources purposely compared to the theme, but they are also capably compared to one another.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The explanation of relationship(s) is capable and purposeful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communication
- Vocabulary is appropriate and specific.
- Sentence structure is controlled and effective.
- The writing demonstrates capable control of mechanics and grammar and is purposefully organized.

Vocabulary is appropriate and specific as demonstrated by the proper usage and comparison between illiberal and non-liberal policies. Despite minor errors, the writer demonstrates capable control of mechanics and grammar; for example, “It criticizes liberal ideas believing them to be unnecessary and foolish as the people are obligated to do what the state wants them to do rather than what the people want to do” (p. 2).

| Pf |
Examples of Students’ Writing with Teachers’ Commentaries

Social Studies 30–1, January 2012
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Excellent (E)

Assignment I

Source I clearly displays a promotion of liberal principles. The war measures act was a legislation implemented by the Canadian government in order to protect the Canadian people during a time of war or severe threat to the nation. The war measures act often imposed on the rights and freedoms of certain groups of people and in the case of this source it was the FLQ. The FLQ was a political group in Quebec that was fighting for change within the province and thought they were not being heard. This caused them to become violent with their actions as they rioted, protested, and kidnapped two people, one a member of the Quebec government who was executed and the other a foreign politician who was later released. The War measures act which had been used very sparingly by the Canadian government was implemented resulting in many arrests to protesters and innocent Quebec people. In the source these two men have a poster stating they do not support the views or actions of the FLQ but they oppose the Canadian government’s actions that stripped these people of their freedoms. In other words they are saying that we do not necessarily support your perspective or opinion but we support your right to have this perspective or opinion which is an extremely liberal way of thinking. Liberalism promotes the right to have an opinion or perspective that is not always universal or widely accepted, it promotes the idea that we should all be free to believe what we would like and have the full support of our peers, and our government. This source is a near perfect example of the ideas that liberalism conveys as we all will think differently but in a liberal nation such as Canada it is our right and the government should not be constitutionally allowed to remove us of this right.
As the line in the last sentence of Source II displays, "any notion that liberalism functions for the greater good is naive," this source is an opposition to the principles of liberalism. The source believes that the state should hold the responsibility of determining what should be valuable to people in terms of things such as goods and religious beliefs and social behavior. This we can see is an obvious rejection of liberalism because people no longer have the freedom to express themselves or have the beliefs that they choose. This source believes that these things should be forced upon citizens by the state and it is their duty to accept this and not question this.

Identities and freedom of choice are liberal principles as well and the source believes that it is the government's responsibility to determine this while the citizen must obey and be loyal to the state. As stated in this source people should have no rights and freedoms apart from their service to the state which displays the beliefs and values of a communist nation in which liberal principles are removed and people work for the good of the state. The source states that individuals must work together towards a common goal; they must put personal achievement and wealth aside and focus on collective principles which are in direct opposition with liberalism. As this source is analyzed we see that each aspect displays a new way in which it believes liberalism is ineffective and the state must be given control over our individual lives while we all work towards a collective goal.
Source III displays an interesting perspective on liberalism and liberal principles. This source is basically saying that in order to uphold the safety and the rights of many we must in turn remove some liberal principles from others because they are abusing them and using their own individual freedoms to infringe upon those of others. In response to terrorist threats the Anti-Terrorism Act was implemented to protect the safety of the entire nation and it was created while still following the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and ensuring that Canadians are not wrongly removed of their basic rights and freedoms. According to the source the Canadian government has worked extremely hard to find a balance with this act in order to satisfy the peoples need for safety as well as their rights and freedoms which displays how seriously Canada views its charter and how important these rights and freedoms are to a liberal nation. The closing sentence of this source displays a very common problem associated with liberalism and addresses in a way that many supporters of liberalism would. In short the last line talks about how when we provide people with rights and freedoms they will sometimes use them in a way that infringes upon others rights that they also should be awarded in a liberal nation. This is a very real problem and this source basically states that even in the most liberal of countries some freedoms must be restricted or they will result in the loss of important liberties that are trying to be upheld.

These three sources are all linked by one broad thing and that is to what extent a nation should uphold liberal principles for its people. Source I is definitely the most liberal due to its opposition to any law that removes rights and freedoms from citizens no matter how they are displaying these freedoms. The perspective in Source III would
be a supporter of the Act that is opposed in Source I because it protects the rights and freedoms of people from infringement. Source I and Source III can be viewed as being very similar because they both support liberal principles and they believe that individual rights and freedoms must be upheld; the main difference between the two is the manner in which these principles are upheld as Source III does believe in the restriction of some rights. Source II on the other hand would be strongly opposed by these two sources due to its near complete removal of rights and freedoms. The second source would support programs and government restrictions that remove people’s rights while the other two sources believe the government must implement constitutional laws that forbid such programs and restrictions. All three of these sources display three different perspectives on the same issue which just shows that there are many ways in which governments perceive liberalism and its effectiveness in society.
**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 demonstrates a perceptive understanding that liberalism is the right to express an opinion that may not be “universal or widely accepted” (p. 1) and should not be suppressed by the government. Although unnecessary, the description of the events leading up to the imposition of the War Measures Act provides detail that is not overwhelming and supports the link to liberalism, specifically the belief that the government should not be allowed to restrict freedom of opinion.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The interpretation of Source II as being “an obvious rejection of liberalism” (p. 2) is precise. The links to liberalism, such as freedom of expression and belief, are astutely established. The writer demonstrates a perceptive understanding of the dilemma of focusing on common goals at the expense of adhering to liberal principles.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The writer demonstrates insight by stating that there may be times when democracies must suspend some civil liberties and recognizes the complexities inherent in making these decisions. The writer perceptively demonstrates an understanding that citizens must not unjustly lose rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms during a crisis.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The writer perceptively identifies that a dominant relationship among the sources “is to what extent a nation should uphold liberal principles for its people” (p. 3). The relationship is further explored by comparing and contrasting the degree to which governments promote liberal principles.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communication

- 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.

Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen; for example, “conveys” (p. 1), “infringe” (p. 3), and “perceive” (p. 4).

Sentence structure is controlled and sophisticated; for example, “The source states that individuals must work together towards a common goal; they must put personal achievement and wealth aside and focus on collective principles which are in direct opposition with liberalism” (p. 2).
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

Society achieves its finest expression through the self-interest and freedom of individuals. When we adopt these principles, we will lessen the need for government to interfere in our lives.

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
Big Social Essay

In this source it says that a society becomes what it is through the freedoms of its people. This meaning that the government should not need to interfere with their lives because they could take care of themselves. The speaker of the source believes in a capitalist society, where everyone makes or loses money at his or her own expense, and they also state that the government will lessen their need to interfere. People act on their own self-interest and become who they are through these freedoms. Though some people have it hard and do not succeed in this type of society, becoming poor and unable to keep a house or to feed his or her family. This is where the government steps in to give them the help they need to survive. The source wants less government intervention, but the poor need to be taken care of. A society full of poor people is not a healthy one, and no one is willing to give some of their wealth to support them. Through progressive taxation by the government their basic needs are met. The rich pay more than the working class because they have enough to survive and more. In turn social programs such as health care and homeless shelters are started with the poor in mind. I agree with these ideas in the sense that having as much freedoms as possible such as freedom of speech, but when there are poor their needs will be met. An example of a happy medium between pure capitalism and socialism could be Canada. Canada is a great example for welfare capitalism. Canada has these social programs for the poor so that they aren't out in the cold at night, or extremely sick and being thrown out of a hospital
because they can't pay the medical bill. I find this type of society to be the most effective for everyone and not just the rich.

Soviet Russia was a purely communist society, where the government controlled everything. This included where you worked, how much you got paid, and where you could live. No property was private, but it was all publicly owned. Everyone was given certain amounts of food based on needs and size of families. Even then some didn't get near enough as much as they should have. Karl Marx, the father of communism, came up with and believed in some of these ideas. He didn't want private property for fear of inequality among the people. People worked depending on the amount of money needed so it couldn't be accumulated and they couldn't become richer than their neighbor. The leader of Soviet Russia at the time, Vladimir Lenin, tried to put all of these ideas in to the society. In Soviet Russia there was no inequality but rather a society of equally poor people. A pure communist society only resulted in poverty and riots. The people were not happy with the conditions and turned on their government. When a government has too much control the voice of the people is not heard, which does not give them what they want and need.

The Industrial Revolution happened in the late 18th and 19th century in Britain. The country was growing and developing easier and cheaper ways to produce goods through the use of machines. This would in turn give the producers a better profit. During this time Britain became a purely capitalist society, with
absolutely no intervention from the government. A capitalist society is run on the
supply and demand of the people. Owners would make their money depending on
what the people were willing to pay for, but with the new machines making all the
goods the people were losing their jobs. When they didn’t have a job they had less
money and would buy less things, which resulted in the private owners of a
company to lose some profit but still made enough to not be considered poor.
Conditions were so bad that women and children were forced to work for barely any
money in horrible conditions. The work places were unsafe for them and many
would die. This purely capitalist society resulted in absolute poverty for the working
class.

As said in the first paragraph, Canada is the happy medium between these
two types of societies. Enough freedoms are given to the people through the Charter
of Rights and Freedoms such as the freedom of speech and the ability to travel
freely. The people’s jobs depend on how much of an effort they put into their
education. If they want a good paying job to support their family they will be willing
to go to college or University to earn that job. The money they make is theirs to use,
as they need or want. This is where the socialist aspects come into play. Some of that
money, depending on how much they make, is paid to the government through
progressive taxation. This money is used for social programs for the people who do
not take or have the opportunities like others. Healthcare is available to everyone in
Canada. The most basic procedures needed for general health, such as root canals or
emergency surgeries, are covered through healthcare. Other social programs like
rehab for alcoholics, or shelters for battered and abused women and children are available because of social programs. All the people who need these programs are free to use them. The freedom of choice is granted to them like everyone else. Everyone has equal rights regardless of status.

These case studies all show different forms of societies and how they affect people. In Soviet Russia, a communist society, the people had no choice in their lives. They were told exactly what to do, which caused unrest. They didn’t get everything they need because of a selfish leader, whom they fought. This resulted in mass poverty. The Industrial Revolution showed how no government intervention didn’t help either. The people had no way of being assured they would live. When jobs were scarce they would fight to gain one and would cause more harm to others. Again this resulted in poverty. Freedoms are good. No one wants to be told how to live, but some do not have the chance to decide. They have a spout of bad luck or just can’t seem to find a well paying job. No one purposefully asks for poverty, it just happens. They need support to get them going again. Canada has the resources and ideas perfect for these situations, as do other countries. Canada isn’t the only country with poor people, but they are one of the countries that help them. It was obviously shown that pure capitalism or communism results in bad living conditions and unhappy people. With help they still aren’t the happiest person in the world, no one is, but they begin to see a ray of hope for a better future if they decide to fight for it.
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>A conventional, straightforward analysis is evident in the first paragraph. The writer demonstrates a generalized understanding of the ideological perspective of a capitalist. The writer repeats the same generalized understanding of the source throughout the response.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s position is that a happy medium between capitalism and socialism should be established. It is generally supported by stating the need for the government to provide social programs funded through progressive taxation. A conventional discussion of excessive government intervention and insufficient government involvement reveals an adequate understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, the argumentation and the ideological perspective is generally developed. The writer states that capitalism fails to provide for those in need, thus requiring a taxpayer-supported social safety net.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>The discussion of Canada’s social safety net, the failure of central planning in Soviet Russia, and the abuses of the Industrial Revolution is conventional and straightforward. Although the evidence is not specific, it is relevant and without major errors. For example, an absolute statement regarding property ownership in Soviet Russia generally serves as evidence to support the position taken (p. 2). A generalized discussion of how Canada’s system of taxation funds various social programs 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. Adequate control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is demonstrated. Vocabulary is conventional and general. Examples include “a happy medium” (p. 1) and “bad living conditions and unhappy people” (p. 4).
Liberals believe in freedom and individual rights, whereas government has different views on liberalism, some accept it, others don't. There is a constant struggle to find the exact amount of liberalism that is best for one's country. The source illustrates a capratistic government as it states, 'society achieves its finest expression through the self-interest and freedom of individuals.' Subscribing to Adam Smith's idea, the invisible hand, capitalistic states believe that the economy can run itself with little help from the government. The source articulates that 'when we adopt these capitalistic principles, we will lessen the need for government to interfere in our lives.' Capitalism is one extreme of the spectrum, the other being totalitarianism. One cannot hope to strike the right balance when only believing in all or none; the word balance itself means a harmony between two aspects. In this case, the aspects are freedom and control. In order to act in the good

There is additional space for written work on odd-numbered pages.

[Handwritten notes:]
- [in Stalin's collectivization of farms, the subprime mortgage crisis, and Roosevelt's New Deal]
Written Work

of all, one must allow competition to prosper while maintaining fair wages and offering some aid to those who need it.

Overall, one must support freedom and counter balance it with the right amount of control for society to prosper.

Control or Freedom. During Stalin's communist rule in the U.S.S.R one witnesses control in the extreme. All operations are state run, not allowing for any true competition. This is true for most communist states where equality is favored over all else. To have any sense of competition would allow for one to better oneself and interfere with society's equality which is seen as a communist society's finest expression. This view completely contradicts that of the source which believes freedom is society's finest expression. Freedom is one thing Stalin did not follow. He even went as far as collectivizing agriculture. All farms were run by the state and taxed to by the people. Profits went to the state and workers were paid poorly for the strenuous work. Stalin had hoped that collectivizing agriculture would work as well as collectivizing industry but it was
Written Work

Wrong. The economy ranked individuals were frustrated and stressed, and no one had the ability to help themselves out. The harder one worked, did not affect their current state, whereas in a capitalist state the harder one works, the more one benefits. One’s success is directly related to one’s work ethic and knowledge of business. The citizens’ lack of freedom is partially responsible for the U.S.S.R.’s troubles for freedom is important and does contribute to society’s success as the source says, if not to the extent viewed within it.

Control’s opposite, freedom, while desirable on its own is just as dangerous. This can be seen in the disastrous subprime mortgage crisis. The American government ran a rather capitalist economy at the time, where self-interest ruled the market. However, this offers ambitious individuals the opportunity to exploit others as is their ‘freedom’ to do so. During the subprime mortgage crisis, ambitious individuals manipulated citizens into buying ‘stable’ merchandise in order to make themselves wealthy,
Written Work

sacrificing consumers as it was in their own best interest. The extent of freedom given allows a few to walk over the many, yet in the end it hurt society. The extent of this disaster affected not only the American economy but also many more countries so that it was a global tragedy. It started with too many houses, not enough money to subprime mortgage rates to debt, to even debts, which while helping boost a few created even more debts for more people, to the point where the economy crashed and affected people globally. We saw that complete control does not help society, and now that complete freedom is no better despite the belief of the source. In order for society to prosper one must have some control and some freedom. Even if a combined effort of control and freedom is denied, it overall is the better choice for all. During the Great Depression, Franklin Roosevelt strove to help his country and her people. At the time the United States was run by capitalism as such when Roosevelt created the New Deals many saw it as...
Written Work

hindering competition and therefore neglecting their rights. However, unlike many other government acts and plans this one didn’t void any individual rights. The New Deal was created to provide financial aid to those who needed help. It created labour unions and relief programs. Roosevelt’s Second New Deal even set minimum wages and maximum work hours to prevent exploitation of workers. Society was still run competitively and in self-interest but with a little government control added to protect workers and help those suffering most. Thus, in this case followed the source in its belief in the importance of freedom but with a protective government twist. The balance Roosevelt found was needed for the situation, and as the situation changes so does the balance. Yet a balance is always required.

For society to prosper one must foster individual freedom while regulating it with control. The source displays one side of the spectrum, the need for freedom.
Written Work

However, the square misses the other half of the equation: control. To have one without the other is to invite disaster, as seen through the cases of Stalin and the subprime mortgage crisis. Society achieves its true finest expression through a harmonious combination of control and freedom, shown by Roosevelt and the New Deals. The struggle to find the balance is hard, yet necessary to find the best take on liberalism.
### 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 writer capably analyzes the source throughout the response. The writer starts the response by appropriately identifying the perspective of the source as capitalist (p. 17) and contrasts it with an adept acknowledgement that communists would view society’s “finest expression” as based on equality rather than competition (p. 19).</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Argumentation** | The writer’s position that a balance of freedom and control is desirable is persuasively supported by the purposefully chosen and developed argument that as a situation changes, so does the degree of balance necessary, but that this balance is always required (p. 25). 
The writer demonstrates a sound understanding of the assignment in the discussion of the subprime mortgage crisis, where it is clearly acknowledged that freedom is not an absolute good and can actually allow people to exploit one another (p. 21). | Pf |
| **Evidence** | The writer purposefully includes historical examples, such as Stalin’s collectivization program in the Soviet Union and Roosevelt’s New Deal in the United States, and a contemporary example, such as the subprime mortgage crisis. 
Although the examples used are not discussed in great depth, the writer reveals a solid understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment by consistently relating the examples used to the source and the position taken. | Pf |
### 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.

The writer’s control of syntax, mechanics and grammar is capably demonstrated throughout the response; for example, “During the subprime mortgage crisis ambitious individuals manipulated citizens into buying ‘unstable’ merchandise in order to make themselves wealthy, sacrificing consumers as it was in their own best interest” (p. 21-23).

Minor errors in language do not impede communication.
Examples of Students’ Writing with Teachers’ Commentaries

Social Studies 30–1, January 2012
Assignment II Responses
Example Scored Excellent (E)

Prior to the French Revolution and the establishment of any democracies, was a period known as the Enlightenment. It was during this “age of reason” that many new philosophers emerged, each presenting radical ideas regarding all facets of life, including politics. One such idea was liberalism; it called for the exact same values this source promotes, things like self-interest and freedom of the individual. These new ideals were shown as a saving grace, claiming that through the promotion of such beliefs, progress could be made at a much quicker rate and less government involvement would allow prosperity to spread. Adam Smith was a huge supporter of this philosophy and coined multiple terms, like the “invisible hand” which will guide the economy to a sustainable place as well as ensure all necessary production targets are met, solely on the will of the people. Adam Smith’s position goes hand-in-hand with the speaker’s bias and for much of history; similar ideas ruled democracies and even helped found them. The problem with the sources’ assertion is that not only has the philosophy of little to no government involvement proved harmful, but also, the opposite stance has benefitted democracies on multiple occasions. With no government interference the market will run wild, and the concept of the invisible hand will fail. Humans are complex creatures, with wants and longings far more expansive than the greed and desire of making one’s own way in life that the invisible hand relies on.

In the early years of the twentieth century following World War One, the economy was booming, capitalism had its finest moment in the sun and things were looking up for the United States. Adam Smith’s philosophy was not only being upheld with real world evidence, it was doing far better than even he could have predicted. Then, in an instant, it was all gone. The market that had been riding high for nearly a decade had crashed; the idea of succeeding by
working for one’s own goals worked marvellously until fear was brought into the equation. The moment things looked bleak everyone panicked and withdrew all their investments at the same time. This brought the market tumbling at an unprecedented rate and led to massive unemployment and a period preceding World War two known as the Great Depression. This depression was undoubtedly caused by the ideas enlightenment thinkers like Adam Smith and the Source’s speaker propagate. Self-reliance and no government interference did not improve society let alone help it achieve “its finest expression”, in fact it did the exact opposite and led to a crash. In the immediate years after the depression, they were desperately searching for a solution and the president at the time was just the man to find one. Holding to modern liberal ideals such as providing a social safety-net with government involvement, Franklin D. Roosevelt brought in the New Deal. This form of managing the economy took points from Keynes Demand-side economics which insisted on government spending to start up the engine of the economy.

Roosevelt did this through various social programs and "make-work projects" like huge infrastructure expansion and forest planting. Through government funded and instituted programs the United States began climbing out of the slump and fixed the mess that self-interest caused, using the very principles supporters of a free-market claim as the downfall of society.

In Canada, government intervention has been embraced on multiple occasions and for good reason; it has improved the quality of life for every citizen. One such occasion was the institution of Universal Health Care, brought forth by politician Tommy Douglas. Throughout his career as a political figure, Douglas supported the notion of interference in the economy by the government. He saw regulation as a necessary step in ensuring the safety of the economy and all of society. Through the advent of universal health care, the market was restricted. No longer could one make it rich by being the best surgeon in town, because the government now
controlled the industry. The speaker of the source would be in clear disagreement with this action as he lobbies for complete economic freedom, but to say universal health care has caused a problem would be simply not true. Equality and low prices, as well as eliminating the need to worry about something as basic as health care are just a few benefits given to all Canadian citizens through Tommy Douglas’ accomplishment. Without an increased amount of government involvement, none of these benefits would have ever arrived.

In the first decade of the 21st century, the world was at its heels again, once more this bust was caused by principles held by free market economists in agreement with the speaker. This time though, it wasn’t fear that brought the economy down, it was a bubble created by loans that should have never been made, as the debtors had no chance in ever paying them off. Hit the hardest, was the United States, a nearly complete free-market, while Canada (a mixed economy) was able to ride out the storm. The housing market in the States was the first to plunge because that is where most loans had been made, in the form of mortgages. Once time had passed and people were supposed to pay up, it became apparent that a large percentage of houses would have to be foreclosed. The banks had loaned out money they didn’t have to people who could never pay them back. Barack Obama, the president was desperate for a solution because now everything was tanking and by 2009, the entire market had entered a recession. The actions he took were not something the anonymous speaker would advocate, in fact, they were just the opposite. Instead of waiting out this very large slump, Obama took the path of interference, and injected massive stimulus packages into all sectors, bailing out multiple car manufacturers and banks. As expected, this solved a portion of the economic crisis, which would have taken many years if he was to wait it out, very quickly. Obama’s actions were declared “socialist” by his
opponents and maybe they were, but the fact remains that sticking to self-interest is a detriment to society that can only be resolved with intervention by the government.

When the philosophy that the speaker of the source first emerged, it was revolutionary, bringing up the greatest democracies the world has ever known. Through time though, it has been proven on many instances, that changes to this ideal of no government participation in the economy are not only useful, but necessary. Twice the American market has gone through huge crashes, solely because of the speaker's opinion, and twice government intervention has resolved things. Often, intervention has improved things, as outlined by Tommy Douglas' introduction of universal health care, and never has a slight guiding hand by the government done more harm than good.
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’s analysis of Adam Smith’s invisible-hand concept demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of self-interest and its connection to economic liberalism. An understanding of all aspects of the source and its relationship to an ideological perspective is comprehensively demonstrated when the writer examines both the source and the implications of unchecked liberalism throughout the response.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>The position that complete economic freedom and self-interest will fail is convincingly supported by stating that citizens will be undermined by their own fear and greed.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The consistent development of the argument that government intervention has been beneficial is compelling. The writer’s recognition of the nuances associated with government intervention in the case of Obama’s stimulus package demonstrates an insightful understanding of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The perceptively developed relationship between the position taken, the argumentation, and the ideological perspective reinforces the argument for government to remain vigilant in checking the excesses of self-interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen, as reflected in the use of theoretical, historical and contemporary examples.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The discussion of the failure of unchecked capitalism in the United States leading to the Great Depression, implementation of universal health care in Canada, and the American subprime mortgage crisis demonstrates an insightful understanding of social studies content and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communication

- 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.

The writing is fluent, skillfully structured, and judiciously organized.

Although not without error, the control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar demonstrates qualities characteristic of the standard of excellence, relative to the response’s length and complexity.

Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen; for example, “infrastructure” (p. 2), economic “bubble” (p. 3), and “stimulus packages” (p. 3).
Scoring Categories and Scoring Criteria for 2012 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, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Vocabulary is appropriate and specific. Sentence structure is controlled and effective. The writing demonstrates capable control of mechanics and grammar and is purposefully organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Vocabulary is conventional and generalized. Sentence structure is controlled and straightforward. The writing demonstrates basic control of mechanics and grammar and is adequately organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Vocabulary is imprecise, simplistic, and inappropriate. Sentence structure is awkward. The writing demonstrates a faltering control of mechanics and grammar and is ineffectively organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Zero is assigned to a response that fails to meet the minimum requirements of <strong>Poor</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scoring Categories and Scoring Criteria for 2012 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

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 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.