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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 2013 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 2013 marking session; the example responses will also serve as anchors in the selection of the June 2013 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 2013 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 2013 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 2013.

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

When I say “capitalism,” I mean a full, pure, uncontrolled, unregulated laissez-faire capitalism—with a separation of state and economics, in the same way and for the same reasons as the separation of state and church. A pure system of capitalism has never yet existed, not even in America; various degrees of government control had been undercutting and distorting it from the start. Capitalism is not the system of the past; it is the system of the future—if mankind is to have a future.

—Ayn Rand

Source II

John Borrows, an Anishinabe-Ojibway from Ontario, who teaches law at the University of Victoria, isn’t opposed to private property ownership per se, but says it should not be allowed on traditional reserve lands.

“We need to keep the reservations intact, so that you’ve always got this nest, in a sense, where you have a collective sense, a home to culture. Where there’s common stewardship towards a place.”

Borrows advocates a system where reserves are expanded, with new land on adjacent or nearby properties, purchased or annexed by governments, where First Nations can pursue commercial development. Only on these new areas should private ownership be allowed.

—from the Edmonton Journal
DO SOMETHING, YOU BUNCH OF MANIACS!

WELL! IT'S EASY TO JUST CRITICIZE, YOUNG LADY...

AND I SUPPOSE YOU'VE GOT AN ALTERNATIVE ALL WORKED OUT, HAVE YOU?

HYSTERICAL ECO-FANATICS! ALWAYS TELLING PEOPLE HOW TO LIVE...

GET YOURSELF A PROPER JOB!

$$ECONOMIC GROWTH$$
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
The first source given is a quote from Ayn Rand where the idea of capitalism is embraced. Rand believes in "uncontrolled, unregulated laissez-faire capitalism," for there has never been a "pure system of capitalism." If a country uses capitalism, there is always some form of government regulation and control, no country so far has used a fully capitalistic economic system. Rand believes that capitalism "is the system of the future." This source supports neoclassical liberalism; to go return to the ideas of individualism and a free market. Those who also support this idea would believe that politics and economics should be separate within a state, and that the economy grows more efficiently when the individuals have the power to run the economy based on the decisions they make on what they may buy or sell.

The second source provided is a quote from the Edmonton Journal. In this quote a First Nations man, John Borrows, expresses his view on the reserves. He believes that there should not be private property on the "traditional reserve lands". He believes the reserve land is "where you have a collective sense, a home to culture." Instead he believes in having land within a reserve that is meant for First Nations to "pursue commercial development." For many the reserve is their home, where they can live out life and keeping traditional beliefs and values such as taking care of the collective, spirituality and stewardship towards the land. They wouldn't feel it's right if individuals can own their own property, and do what they may want with it, for it goes against their traditional beliefs and values. In their society, everything is shared; knowledge, wisdom, food, and other goods. This source supports the idea of classical liberalism to an extent to where it won't conflict with their traditional beliefs based of the principles of modern liberalism.
First Nations can support these classical liberal principles if given a designated property of land to pursue in economic development, for it will not go against their value of stewardship towards their traditional reserve land.

The third source is a cartoon in which it shows a boat about to go down a steep waterfall. This boat has "$ECONOMIC GROWTH" written on the side. Inside this boat, there are three men at the front of the boat looking calm, and there is a woman at the back of the boat panicking. The woman is depicted to be telling the men to "do something." While the men respond with comments on how she shouldn't criticize them for she doesn't even know what to do. The river the boat is traveling in is used to represent the business cycle, the waterfall is used to represent a recession/depression. The boat represents the economy of a country, the men in the boat represent the government and the woman represents citizens. This cartoon is showing how the classical liberal principle of capitalism and a free market can result in instability of the economy. With capitalism comes the business cycle, where due to the laws of supply and demand, there can be fluctuations in the economy. Countries that use capitalism believe that the government should not be involved with the economy. This source criticizes the efficiency of classical liberalism, and would most likely support modern liberalism. The cartoonist would feel that the government is needed to control the economy to prevent or reduce the harm of an economic crisis.

All three sources reflect a perspective on classical liberalism and capitalism. The first and second source reflect a positive view on classical liberalism. The first source
advocates for the use of pure capitalism, for those who support this view feel that the government should not play a role in the economy at all, and individuals should have the purse in their economic freedom without any sort of regulation. Source two also supports the use of capitalism. This source advocates in having First Nations people pursuing in economic development without it going against their values of the collective. Unlike the first two sources, the third source rejects classical liberalism, and supports modern liberalism. The source expresses the need of government regulation to create a stable economy.
### EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Satisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source I</strong></td>
<td>The writer identifies that the source supports neo-classical liberalism, involving a return to the liberal principles of individualism and a free market. In a straightforward manner, the writer demonstrates that Source I advocates a separation of “politics and economics” (p. 1). This interpretation reflects an adequate understanding of the basic principles of capitalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer demonstrates a generalized understanding of the traditional values that Source II advocates. The recognition that Borrows accepts “the idea of classical liberalism to an extent” (p. 1) reveals an adequate understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>While the discussion of Source III appears lengthy, much of it is a description of details in the source. The writer’s interpretation that the business cycle and key players in a capitalist economy are depicted by the cartoonist in Source III is adequate. A straightforward understanding of capitalism’s foundational principles and potential effects is demonstrated. The writer’s recognition that the cartoonist likely supports modern liberalism and criticizes classical liberalism is conventional.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The writer identifies a relationship among the sources with each source relating to classical liberalism and/or capitalism. The explanation of each source’s perspective on capitalism and/or classical liberalism is straightforward.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>The vocabulary used by the writer is conventional. The use of social studies terminology is generally appropriate. The sentence structure is controlled: for example, “This source supports the idea of classical liberalism to an extent where it won’t conflict with their traditional beliefs based on the principles of modern liberalism.” (p. 2) The writing is adequately organized. Considering the proportion of error in terms of complexity and length of the response, the writing demonstrates basic control of mechanics and grammar and is adequately organized.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first source is a quote stated by Ayn Rand that regards the misuse of the capitalist economy in society. The source is in clear support of the laissez-faire capitalist ideas that were associated with classical liberalist ideals, where everyone is for themselves and must serve their own self-interest. The idea of capitalism was originated by Adam Smith, where the values of self-interest and freedom in the economy were to serve the benefits for the people. Smith stressed the inadequacy of political intervention within his system. The speaker believes that society hasn't even considered the classical liberalist approach to capitalism. Nobody has really practiced the true ideals behind this system. For the most part, every country that is convinced they have used the system has distorted and repressed the economic freedom with some form of government involvement. A committed capitalist economy revolves around the belief that opportunity is available to anyone who serves their own self-interest. For example, business owners would have freedom within the market to buy and sell, which vastly creates wealth for the owners, competition between corporations, and thus, competing prices for the consumers. In general, the source's speaker supports a classical liberalist approach, where minimal government involvement is the key. He strongly suggests that society has not experienced the complete benefits of capitalism and its contributions to society.

Source two is an excerpt from an article in the *Edmonton Journal* revolving around John Borrows, an Anishinabe-Ojibway Canadian citizen, and his reasoning for a collectivist approach to land ownership for the First Nations. The source provides basis for Borrows advocacy of sustaining a traditional First Nation collectivist society. His position offers direct support for a more socialist approach to First Nations land ownership. Past traditions for First Nations proved to offer sufficient self-governing within tribes. The people worked collectively, in the interest of
everyone. Borrows wishes to revisit a time where First Nations had control of their own land and politics so that there can be a center for the cultural values that the First Nations held so close.

With a system like this, the First Nations can own expanded land where they can further pursue their own interests like commercial development within their boundaries. In other words, instead of having private ownership of land infringing on traditional reserved land, the First Nations should have full right to collectively expand and control their land and values. Then they can allow whatever political and economic system applies to their needs most viably. The source isn't exactly in direct contradiction of liberalist ideals. It just explains how the First Nations society should have the capability to act in their own interests separately from the rest of society.

The people can use some of their new land rights to own private property, but a reserve with collectivist values must be maintained in moderation.

The third and final source is an editorial cartoon that explicitly displays the illegitimacy of an individualist, capitalist economy. The cartoon illustrates a boat representing economic growth and the near death crash that is in plain site if it continues down the waterfall. The illustrator may very well be explaining how capitalist approaches to the economy may have its benefits of economic growth, but without any sort of government moderation, the economy is bound to hit a heavy recession. The government officials driving the boat are not actively trying to steer away from economic recession. Instead, they are ignoring the the woman at the back who is urging them to act quickly. If the government officials continue to ignore the problem ahead, they will sacrifice the economic growth. Capitalist economies have proven to have rapid inflation and recessions. There really is no moderation without government intervention. In response to the lady who says, “And I suppose you've got an alternative all worked out, have you?”, a new economic system that advocates a balance on the economic spectrum is a viable solution.
Keynesian economics was an introduced method that aimed to maintain a balance between inflation and recession using the boom-bust cycle. This system would increase government spending during recessions, and raise taxes during inflation. Basically, the source addresses the need for any sort of mixed economy, also known as a modern liberalist ideology. With a fairly free market, along with government intervention, the economy can regulate itself by creating more equality and freedom for the people, while affirming a constant avoidance of recessions. Canada endorses an economic system such as this.

All three sources regard the interests of society from slightly different economic perspectives. The first source explains the position from a capitalist point of view. The second regards a collectivist perspective, and the final source explains the flaws of capitalism and the solutions required. Within the first source, the belief of capitalism is strongly advised due to its support of freedom and its benefits to any individuals’ wealth. On the other hand, the second source describes a slightly opposite approach, where the ideas of capitalism and individualism are respected, but the allowance for a traditional collectivist political and economic system should be available for the First Nations. The third source and the second source are able to relate in terms of equality and a need for government. However, the Borrows interpretation of government has to do with a collectivist self-governing tradition within the First Nation's reservations. On the other hand, the third source expresses the need for government in order to avoid economic problems that could potentially cause massive unemployment and a lowered gross domestic product. Ayn Rand's explanation does contradict the illustrator's editorial cartoon because Rand is trying to persuade people that capitalism is the answer to the future success of America, while the cartoon depicts the unfortunate downfalls of the system, and how it should be moderated to serve the better of everyone economically.
### 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 acknowledges that the basic tenets of capitalism have been misused in the past. This awareness is logically explained in the assertion that the capitalism that nations thought they were practising was actually “distorted” (p. 1) by “some form of government involvement” (p. 1). The writer specifically links the capitalist nature of Source I to liberal principles such as self-interest, freedom and the market system.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer demonstrates a sound understanding of the collective nature of Aboriginal land ownership prior to treaty settlements, as it provided a “center for the cultural values that the First Nations held so close” (p. 2). With such a system in place, the writer adeptly notes that First Nations peoples would be able to expand commercial developments on new lands provided by the government. However, a lack of precision is shown when the writer fails to address from where these new lands would come, and how the land would be obtained by First Nations’ peoples.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s interpretation of Source III as reflecting a modern liberal ideology that consists of a mixture of “fairly free market” (p. 3) principles, coupled with “governement intervention” (p. 3), is specific. Despite not expressly mentioning the benefits of economic growth, the writer accurately notes the value of Keynesian economics in mitigating the inherent pitfalls of unregulated capitalism, such as “rapid inflation and recessions” (p. 2).</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Notwithstanding the general nature of the writer’s labelling of the relationship among the sources as based upon “slightly different economic perspectives” (p. 3), the depth of discussion of those perspectives is capable and purposeful.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Vocabulary is appropriate and specific: for example, “viable” and “infringing” (p. 2). The writer demonstrates controlled and effective sentence structure: for example, “Source two is an excerpt from an article in the Edmonton Journal revolving around John Borrows, an Anishanabe-Ojibway Canadian citizen, and his reasoning for a collectivist approach to land ownership for the First Nations.” (p. 1) While there are minor errors in spelling, given the length and complexity of the response, the writer demonstrates capable control of mechanics and grammar.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collectivism vs. Individualism

The first source is a quote displaying the need for a return to a classical liberal ideology within the economic system of America. The source states that "uncontrolled, unregulated laissez-faire capitalism" is the best economic system and must be implemented in order for the nation to succeed. The source would hold the perspective that Adam Smith's ideas and principles on the free market economy should be embraced to the full extent and would agree with the efforts Ronald Reagan implemented through Reaganomics and his attempt to have less government control in the American market. The source with value strong individualism within the economy and no collectivist thinking. The American economy would be run by self-interest, individualism and laissez-faire economics with no government intervention within the economy, each person would be working toward his or her own self-interest. Furthermore, the source states that "a pure system of capitalism has never yet existed" implying that the future of America should not only involve a return to the capitalist ideas of Smith but should also involve an extension of these, turning the economy into a completely capitalist system with absolutely no intervention or regulation to control monopolies or the effects of corporations, but rather pure individualism where each person receives whatever they can work hard enough to gain. It is also revealed in the source that capitalism and the free-market economy should not be viewed as simply an event that has past but rather a system that should be reused and reinstated in order to secure the future of America. The source holds the perspective that the best way to manage the American economy is through pure capitalism and, not only a return to the principles of classical liberalism, but an even more extreme form of these ideas. Unlike the modern liberal ideology, the future
of America should not be "undercut" or "distorted" by government regulation but rather
the economy should be left alone completely in order to grow and succeed.

The second source shows a perspective on private land ownership held by John
Borrows, a First Nation's man from Ontario. The source displays the perspective that
private land ownership should "not be allowed on traditional reserve lands." Rather,
Borrows believes that the land should be owned collectively in order for it to be cared for
and enjoyed. Borrows believes that if land is not owned privately, it has more likelihood
of being looked after and the people sharing the land will be more stalwartly towards it.
Although Borrows is not opposed completely to the individual ownership of land, he
holds the belief that it should only be privately owned for commercial development, not
for homes. The collective mindset that results from collectivist thinking is a more
important issue to him than private ownership and capitalist perspectives. Borrows
believes that the life on the reserve is more valuable when shared collectively as the
people gain a collective sense of home and a culture that is their own. Both him and many
other First Nations people would reject the ideas of private land ownership and strong
individualism. Rather, they would prefer to live in a nation where collectivism was
encouraged and all members of society worked together to gained a collective sense of
nation, the same way the Aboriginal people have since before the Europeans came to
North America. The source relays the perspective that through collectivism nations will
be stronger and more united, and collectivism should be seen as more important than the
individual self-interest.

The final source is a cartoon depicting a boat named "$\$ economic growth$"
floating down a river toward a waterfall. In the back of the boat a girl is yelling for the
men in the front to do something as they seem unconcerned and unwilling to steer the boat to safety. The source displays the problems with a classical liberal economic system with little or no government involvement within the economy. Like the inevitable doom the boat faces when not steered and headed toward the waterfall, economic systems face certain problems when uncontrolled by the government. Similar to the men standing in the boat, the government's unwillingness to help will result in negative circumstances for both themselves and the other people within the nation, or in the boat. Rather than leaving economic growth to be controlled by the people, the source shows that a modern liberal ideology would be more efficient in controlling the economy and preventing a market crash. By leaving the people alone to do what they want, as is done in a capitalist system, the market fluctuations are sure to be extreme and will inevitably cause hardships for the people. Instead, the source suggests that if the government intervened and helped the economy, extreme recessions and depressions would have a lower likelihood of taking place and the nation as a whole would benefit. The source would agree that a less extreme version of Adam Smith's capitalist economy would be more beneficial to a nation and the principles of government intervention and market control involved in Keynes economic theory would lower or even eliminate the risk of market crashes. The source shows that in order for an economic system to be secure, it cannot rely solely on individualism but rather must balance self-interest with the need for collective thinking to provide security and stability to the economy.

The three sources provided display differing perspectives on the amount of collectivism and individualism that should be present within an economic system. While the first source embraces full individualism and a pure classical liberal ideology, the
second source shows how a more collectivist way of thinking can benefit the people within a nation through a collective sense of acceptance and oneness. Furthermore, source three contradicts the first source as it shows what can happen as a result of the individualism presented in the quote. The cartoon suggests that by accepting the perspective of source one, a nation is dooming their economy to failure without collectivist thinking through government intervention. Finally source two and three can be connected through the perspective that collectivism is a valuable concept to be grasped within a nation as it provides a general sense of oneness, as seen through source two, as well as stability within the economic system, as source three suggests. The three sources taken together show different views on collectivism versus individualism and show varying perspectives on which should be embraced in order to benefit the country most economically.
## 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 individualism, self-interest, and laissez-faire economics is precise and shows a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism. The writer’s ability to interpret the ideas expressed in Source I as both a more extreme form and an extension of those put forth by Adam Smith is insightful.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s sophisticated discussion of the longstanding value and protection of collectivism in First Nations’ culture being emphasized above the need to acquire new land for privatization demonstrates a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The connections the writer makes between Source III and the ideas of Smith and Keynes are sophisticated. The writer’s interpretation that Source III implies that there must be a balance between allowing individual self-interest and moderate government intervention in an economy is perceptive.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The succinct manner in which the writer explains the overarching relationship is perceptive. Although not necessarily thorough, the discussion of the causal relationship between the ideology supported in Source I, the predicted outcomes depicted in Source III, and the identification of differing benefits of collectivism in Source II and Source III is perceptive.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>The vocabulary, as it applies to aspects of capitalism and collectivism, is precise and deliberately chosen. The sentence structure is controlled and sophisticated: for example, “Like the inevitable doom the boat faces when not steered and headed toward the waterfall, economic systems face certain problems when uncontrolled by the government.” (p. 3) Sentence length varies, and the writing demonstrates skillful control of mechanics and grammar.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSIGNMENT II:

Position Paper

Value: 30% of the total examination mark

Suggested time: 90 to 105 minutes

Analyze the following source and complete the assignment.

Source

In democracies, the need to protect civil liberties undermines the stability of the state. Rule by a strong leader best serves the common good.

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
The Assessment Sector diligently attempts to secure student permission to post all of the Example of Student’s Writing.

In the case of the Satisfactory Assignment II Response for January 2013, however, permission to use the student’s response was not granted.
First world countries, in many ways, are defined by the civil liberties that are allowed to their citizens. Those who live in these countries are given the right to vote and have a say in their government, the right to private property, the right to have security, the right of free speech. These are just a few of the rights that are granted. In democratic societies, many of these rights were hard fought for, and cherished by the citizens who enjoy them. The source states that democratic societies are unstable because of these civil liberties, that personal needs do not serve the collective, and it would be more stable if one strong leader were to rule the society instead of a democracy. Thomas Hobbes, a philosopher, would have agreed with the source, as he thought that people were incapable of governing themselves, and that a central power, a "leviathan" was needed to rule over people. The perspective in the source demonstrates a rejection of the principles of liberalism, and should not be embraced because, as history has proved over and over, when one strong leader takes control of a state, the effects on the population can be devastating and the absence of civil liberties does not assist in the "stability" of the state. When civil liberties are taken away, a state does not become more stable. To the contrary: the absence of civil liberties can make a state more unstable, and ultimately lead to the state's downfall.

Democratic systems have been at work in society for thousands of years, with one example being ancient Greece, which functioned as a direct democracy. In Canada, democracy was seen before settlers even arrived in Canada, in the Iroquois confederacy. Today, Canada's parliamentary system is a representative democracy, and it does its best to protect the civil
liberties of its people. The government does this through several methods. Canada's government is referred to as "responsible government" because there are many "checks" in place to attempt to avoid corruption, and to ensure the protection of civil liberties. Canada's system is Bi-cameral, which means that there is a separation of powers between the judicial branch, and the executive and legislative branches. Another way the government tries to keep accountable is through the vote of non-confidence: if the party in power presents a bill and is defeated in parliament, there will be a re-election because the vote of non-confidence has demonstrated that the party's aims are no longer constant with what the voters wish.

Governments must also be re-elected at least every four years. All these systems are put in place to keep the government accountable and in line with what the majority of citizens wish. In a democratic system, the right to vote and have a say in government is a very important principle of liberalism that was hard fought for. Because Canadian citizens are able to enjoy so many civil liberties, Canada is a relatively stable state. There have been instances when civil liberties have led to instability, such as the October crisis. This is an extreme example, where a separatist group in Quebec (the FLQ) resorted to terrorism to accomplish their aims. Their actions resulted in the implementation of the war measures act, which temporarily took away civil liberties in an attempt to stop the terrorism. However, this was an extreme case, and the problem was swiftly corrected. On the whole, Canada and other countries are more stable for the civil liberties granted to its people, and more instable when citizens are denied them. For example, the events of the American Revolution. Before citizens had the right to vote and have a say in government, they chafed under the rule of a single power, leading to instability across the state. The American colonies were under the power of the British monarchy, a power they
found oppressive because although they contributed to the state they were not allowed to reap
the profits of their work and they did not really have a say in how they were governed. A war
ensued, as the Americans fought for the basic civil right to govern themselves. In this instance,
rule by a strong central power did not ensure stability of the state, and did not serve the
common good of the people.

Communist Russia is an excellent example of how rule by a strong leader may not serve
the common good of a state, and lead to instability. Stalin was a very strong leader, but Russia
did not flourish under his rule, and the ultimate collapse of Communist Russia is a testament to
its failure. Citizens under Stalin’s Communist regime had little to no civil liberties, and lived
under a reign of oppressive terror. Stalin’s primary aims were to stabilize Russia, and he
planned to do this through his five year plans. The first five year plan was meant to increase
industrialization, which could be called successful, as industrialization was increased by about
400%. However, this success came at a very high cost. Because of the size of Russia, much food
was required to feed its population. During the first five year plan, there was not enough food
produced and millions starved. In the Ukrainian famine, the death count was devastating, and
the worst part was that many of those who died starved to death within sights of full granaries.
In this instance, the rule of a strong leader led to sacrificing millions of people to increase the
industrialization, an act that definitely did not "serve the common good" of the country. In
Stalin’s rejection of the principles of liberalism, he did not stabilize Russia but contributed to its
downfall.
The terrible effects on a people by the rejection of liberalism can be seen very clearly in Nazi Germany. Hitler, to the Germans at that time, was seen as the very definition of a strong leader, but his policies and oppressive rule did not serve the common good of the people. One characteristic of non-democratic systems is the tendency of minority groups to be persecuted or discriminated against. Hitler’s oppressive rule was characterized by his racism and discrimination against minority groups, such as the Jews, Homosexuals, Slavs, Gypsies, and others different from his view of the “perfect” race. His policy towards these groups did not promote stability in the state as the country divided itself and used the minorities as scapegoats for the problems that existed. In the Holocaust, Hitler demonstrated and ultimate rejection of liberalism, one that has had a lasting effect on the world and has, in fact, promoted instability. In no way could it be said that Hitler’s actions in taking away civil liberties served the common good of Germany. Even those who were not a part of minority groups lived an existence of fear, as the secret police, the Gestapo, worked to root out anyone who could possibly stand in Hitler’s way.

Over and over in history, the examples of states ruled by a strong power have ended in disaster. When the basic principles of liberalism are rejected and civil liberties are denied, the effects on a population are potent and long lasting and may even lead to the collapse of the state. Therefore the perspective in the source of rejection of liberalism should not be embraced, as the absence of liberalism often leads to instability in a state.
## EXAMPLE RESPONSE—*Proficient*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Analysis of Source**    | The writer capably identifies that the perspective of the source reflects a viewpoint that opposes the protection of civil liberties, which in turn may result in instability and a failure to serve the needs of the collective.  
The writer adeptly acknowledges that Thomas Hobbes would have concurred with the source’s rejection of the principles of liberalism and its call for a strong leader to rule over the people. A sound understanding of the ideological perspective is reinforced throughout the response. | Pf    |
| **Argumentation**         | The writer asserts that the denial of civil liberties by strong leaders does not ultimately assist in the stability of the state, nor does it serve the common good.  
The position established by the writer is defended by presenting capable and logical arguments that illustrate that: 1) liberal democracies such as Canada do provide stability and the common good; and 2) dictatorships, in their attempt to maintain stability and pursue the common good through the denial of civil liberties, do in fact lead to the downfall of society. | Pf    |
| **Evidence**              | The writer specifically and purposefully employs both historical examples (the American Revolution, the Stalinist Soviet Union, Nazi Germany) and a contemporary example (the Canadian political system).  
Minor errors, such as the misuse of the term “Bi-cameral” (p. 2), do not detract from the overall impression.  
The evidence selected in the Excellent example response parallels that of the Proficient example response and highlights the distinction between a capable, adept discussion of evidence and a sophisticated, deliberate discussion. The details of the examples do not demonstrate an insightful understanding when compared to the Excellent response. | 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. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is evident throughout the response: for example, “Stalin was a very strong leader, but Russia did not flourish under his rule, and the ultimate collapse of Communist Russia is a testament to its failure” (p. 3).

Vocabulary is appropriate and specific: for example, “’leviathan’” (p. 1), “chafed under the rule” (p. 2), “oppressive rule” (p. 4), and “potent” (p. 4).
The source presented provides a perspective in favour of a more collective, authoritarian government. However, this source is not a complete rejection of the values and principles of liberalism as it still maintains democracy as the system of government used, and democracy is the system of government that was born out of liberal ideas. The source presents the idea that a strong leader can best serve the goals of the collective, which is an idea that was used by Thomas Hobbes. In Hobbes' book "Leviathan," he argued that humans were not rational and could not properly organize themselves. He then argued that citizens should trade in their civil liberties to a strong leader, in exchange for security. The source reflects this idea by arguing that the upholding of civil liberties puts the stability of the state in jeopardy. The idea of working towards the common good was also used by the philosopher Rousseau, who argued that members of society should not exist to serve their own self-interest, but rather the interests of the collective. Both these philosophers exhibited, to some degree, the rejection of liberal principles by focusing more on the collective, rather than upholding principles of individualism and civil liberties. Those that would agree with the source would agree with the writings of Hobbes and Rousseau and look at the benefits a strong leader can bring to the state. They would argue in favour of a collective point of view and believe that the presence of a strong leader would help to achieve these collective goals and provide efficiency in government. Those that disagree with the source would be more willing to uphold the principles of liberalism and would greatly value liberal principles, such as individual rights and freedoms. They would argue that the source represents a contradiction as the use of democracy represents liberal thought, but the lack of importance on civil liberties does not. They would also argue that upholding civil liberties does not undermine the stability of the state, but rather strengthens it by providing accountability. I believe that we
should not embrace the perspective presented in this source, but would argue instead that the protection of civil liberties does provide stability to the state.

One of the great early liberal philosophers was John Locke. Locke is most recognized for his work on individual rights and is most noted for saying that everyone has the right to "life, liberty and property." His ideas were used by the early settlers of America and his ideas made their way into the United States constitution. Locke's ideas are still very much in use today, as his ideas on civil liberties and the will of the people are used by modern liberal democracies, especially in Canada and the United States. These two countries have built a stable society by protecting civil liberties, rather than constantly suspending them. One way that these countries have upheld stability is by making the government accountable to the people. By allowing citizens to exercise freedoms such as freedom of dissent, freedom of speech and freedom of association, it holds the government to Locke's idea that decisions should be made based off the general will of the people. If the majority of the people in a society are in agreement, then it leads to a stable society. Very rarely here in Canada and the United States do we see violent demonstrations, leading us to believe that by giving citizens their rights and freedoms, stability will follow. The use of periodic elections in modern democracies also serves as a tool that allows the will of the people to be expressed. A government that has the threat of losing power after four or five years will be more accountable to the people and work towards being compliant with the general will of the people, so that they can be re-elected. This form of accountability again provides stability as it complies with the general will of the people. Modern democracies also provide opportunities for citizens to express dissent and allows governments to work towards incorporating all points of view into their law making. By upholding civil liberties, modern
democracies operate on the general will of the people and accountability, leading to the establishment of a stable state.

Often times, strong leaders are more closely associated with authoritarian regimes, rather than liberal democracies. The danger of electing a strong leader for rule in a democracy is that the system of government can become skewed and great tragedies can take place, like what happened in Germany in the 1930s. Before Hitler came to power in Germany, the country was in the early stages of its new democratic form of government known as the Weimar Republic. However, during the Great Depression of the 1930s, combined with the devastation still felt from World War I, the people of Germany elected a strong leader who promised security for the country. In the early part of his leadership, Hitler revived the German economy by manufacturing weapons. It looked as though things were finally going to get better in Germany, but Hitler used his power and leadership skills to lead the German people into the Holocaust. It began with the Enabling Act, which gave Hitler supreme dictatorial powers and affirmed his complete rejection of the liberal principles present in democracy. This strong leader began his mission of getting rid of all the Jewish people. Since he was such a good motivator and speaker, he made the German people feel like it was their goal to get rid of the Jews, rather than his own personal goal. This progressed into World War II, which once again ended with German society in ruins. The danger of electing a strong leader in a liberal democracy is that their ability and leadership skills may lead to the implementation of what they want to achieve, rather than the common good. Just like Hitler, other strong leaders may have personal goals that they may wish to accomplish through the state. The suspension of the civil liberties of the German people did not provide stability, but instead led to another ruin of their society. If rights and freedoms were
still allowed under Hitler, German citizens would have had the ability to express dissent towards the goals of Hitler, possibly preventing the Holocaust from occurring.

Even in longstanding democracies entrenched in liberalism, there are situations where civil liberties have been suspended and illiberal practices have occurred. These instances, however, do not provide stability for the state, as it stirs up a level of panic among the civilian population. In 1970, the Canadian government, under Prime Minister Trudeau, put into place the War Measures Act. This was done so that the police would have an easier time finding and tracking the FLQ, who were terrorizing Quebec. The problem with this act was that it suspended individual rights and freedoms across the entire country, putting citizens at risk. In Quebec this was more serious as many people were wrongly imprisoned or questioned, without basic legal rights such as the right to an attorney and the right to remain silent. This became a very serious matter for many Canadians as they spoke out against the War Measures Act and demanded that their civil liberties be reinstated. This period of panic that followed the act created just as much, or even more instability than the acts of FLQ. This period in our history proves that more problems with stability can occur when civil liberties are not protected.
### SCORING CRITERIA | RATIONALE | SCORE
---|---|---
**Analysis of Source**
- The analysis of the source is insightful and sophisticated; a comprehensive understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.
  
The analysis of the source is insightful and sophisticated, as demonstrated by the comprehensive understanding of the theories of Hobbes and Rousseau.
  
The writer skillfully acknowledges that although the source mentions liberal democracy, the ideological perspective is authoritarian. The writer demonstrates an insightful understanding of the balance between collectivism and individualism in protecting or rejecting civil liberties.

**Argumentation**
- 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.
  
The writer’s position “that the protection of civil liberties does provide stability to the state” (p. 2) is convincingly supported by judiciously chosen and developed arguments.
  
The argumentation demonstrates an insightful understanding of the assignment through a compelling discussion of Locke’s theory of government accountability and stability, the election of a strong leader, the rejection of civil liberties, and illiberal practices in a democracy.
  
The perceptively developed relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and principles of liberalism is explicit and consistently maintained throughout the response.

**Evidence**
- 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.
  
Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen, such as civil liberties granted in democracies, the rejection of civil liberties within authoritarian regimes, and illiberal practices within a democracy.
  
The merits of liberal democracies in Canada and the United States are juxtaposed with Hitler’s Germany and the use of the War Measures Act during the October Crisis. This demonstrates an insightful understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.
  
While the writer expresses the view that there was a period of panic that followed the invoking of the War Measures Act, they do attempt to qualify this by writing that this was a serious matter for “many Canadians” (p. 4) and not all Canadians.
Assignment II Response—Excellent *(continued)*

| **Communication** | Control of syntax and mechanics is sophisticated and demonstrated by the appropriate use of transitional phrases and qualifiers: for example, “They would argue that the source represents a contradiction as the use of democracy represents liberal thought, but the lack of importance on civil liberties does not” (p. 1).
Relative to the length and complexity of the response, the absence of error is impressive. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The relative absence of error is impressive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A thorough and comprehensive discussion of evidence reveals an insightful understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Categories and Scoring Criteria for 2013 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 2013 Assignment II

ANALYSIS OF SOURCE (6 marks)
When marking Analysis of Source, markers should consider how effectively the student
• analyzes the source to demonstrate an understanding of ideological perspective(s) reflected in the source

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: DO NOT evaluate evidence in this category.

Excellent

E

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

Proficient

Pf

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

Satisfactory

S

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

Limited

L

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

Poor

P

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

Insufficient

INS

Insufficient is a special category. It is not an indicator of quality. It is assigned to responses that do not contain a discernible attempt to address the assignment or responses that are too brief to assess in one or more scoring categories.
EVIDENCE (8 marks)
When marking Evidence, markers should consider how effectively the student uses evidence that
• is relevant and accurate
• reflects depth and/or breadth

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

Excellent

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>The writing is unclear and disorganized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is lacking. Vocabulary is overgeneralized and inaccurate. Jarring errors impede communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>