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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 2014 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 2014 marking session; the example responses will also serve as anchors in the selection of the June 2014 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 2014 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 2014 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 2014.

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

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

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

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

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

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

   Under examination conditions, students produce first-draft writing. Given more time and access to appropriate resources, students would be expected to produce papers of considerably improved quality, particularly in the dimension of Communication.
Assignment I – Sources

Source I

The view has been gaining widespread acceptance that corporate officials … have a “social responsibility” that goes beyond serving the interest of their stockholders… . This view shows a fundamental misconception of the character and nature of a free economy. In such an economy, there is one and only one social responsibility of business – to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition, without deception or fraud.

—Milton Friedman, 1962

Source II

Our natural environment is the source of our wealth and our health. Canada’s forests, water, soil and energy resources fuel our economy. However, if we treat our environment like a business in liquidation, those resources and our economy will suffer. The lack of federal regulation, monitoring, and action has made Canada one of the world’s biggest and most tragic offenders against the environment. We rank amongst the world’s worst for wasteful use of natural resources. Our soil, air and waters are dumping grounds for toxic chemicals. Through inadequate environmental protection we risk leaving our children the deplorable legacy of a debilitated and degraded environment. How can we be so thoughtless?

—from the Green Party of Canada


Reasons for latest price hike:

1) It’s Wednesday
2) There’s this island I want to buy
3) Horoscope suggested
4) Change
5) Double dare

HOW ABOUT 'BECAUSE WE CAN...!'
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
- 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 2014
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Satisfactory (S)

The first source believes in capitalism having no government restrictions, a truly free market economy. This source has his ideals embedded in the pursuit of self interest and wishes that governments would not be involved at all in the market economy, but still believes that there are some "rules" that should be followed. Such rules would be that corporations are not allowed to monopolize products or services as it imposes on a "free and open competition". The market should follow the idea of dollar voting, and that the consumer should be the one who decides how the market is run. He also believes that the control and use of resources can be used as the company sees fit, to gain profit and status in the economy. The source has its roots in liberalism, as it believes in the pursuit of self interest and that humans have a right to engage in "open and free competition". Source two believes that a free economy is fine but governments must be allowed to put restrictions on how a company gets its resources, produces the product/service, and how it distributes it. Their link to liberalism is a restricted one because they just want some control over the economy but not total control. They want to ensure that companies are not abusing their powers and exploiting the earth, and possibly workers rights as well. The economy needs regulation or else the future generation of businesses and even the lives of people could be severely affected. To ensure this doesn't happen, the government needs to monitor the actions of companies and make sure they dispose of harmful chemicals properly. Source three is criticizing the idea of big companies that are allowed to do whatever they want just because they have a lot of power and money in the economy. The source wants government regulations in place to ensure that companies can't do this. The source believes that a uncontrolled economy is wrong and is the reason such
abuse and exploitation happens in the economy. the source does think that free markets are okay as long as there is open and free competition. All three sources conflict on the idea on whether governments should have regulations and/or restrictions on the economy. Source two would agree with source three because they both think that companies will harm the well being of people just to gain profit. they would both disagree with source one though because source one thinks that any regulation is wrong and that the free market should be exactly what it is, and the only rules that should be in place are the ones society feels should be there. It brings up a conflict between them that is saying
EXAMPLE RESPONSE—*Satisfactory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source I</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s interpretation that Source I believes in capitalism demonstrates a generalized understanding of links to liberalism. While the writer acknowledges that some “rules” (p. 1) need to be followed within a market economy, it is addressed in a straightforward and adequate manner.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source II</td>
<td>The writer adequately recognises that the Green Party believes too much freedom in an economy leads to exploitation of the environment and government must impose restrictions on industry to protect resources for future generations. A straightforward understanding of links to liberalism is demonstrated in the discussion of government restrictions in a free economy. The need for government monitoring of companies for the good of society reveals a conventional understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Source III</td>
<td>The writer adequately acknowledges the cartoonist’s belief in the importance of government regulations within an “uncontrolled economy” (p. 1). While the writer recognises the benefits and limitations of the free market system, it is presented in a conventional and generalized manner.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>The writer’s explanation of the role of government in the economy is adequate. The discussion of how the sources relate to government regulation is straightforward. The writer’s explanation lacks depth and development.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>The vocabulary is conventional and generalized. The sentence structure is controlled and straightforward, but lacks complexity. Despite formatting issues, the writing is adequately organized.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type 1 Writing Assignment

The first source is a quote by Milton Friedman in which he talks of what the average person believes corporate official’s responsibilities are versus what the official’s actual responsibilities. Friedman feels that most people don’t understand that the only responsibility of business is to continue increasing profits while staying within the rules. Friedman believes strongly in the principles of liberalism and is likely a classical liberal in ideology. This is shown through his belief in a free economy as well as in open and free competition. He also believes strongly in self interest over public interest as he says that there is no real social responsibility other than continuing to make money for yourself and your stock holders. He believes that most people have been lied to and made to think there is need for morals and thinking of more than just your company when doing business. His response to this misconception is that there is only one responsibility and that is to continuing to increase profits. A philosopher who would agree with Friedman is James Hayek. Hayek believed that the economy must be free and able to keep pushing and growing leading to a natural competition amongst businesses and keeping the economy going.

In the second source is a statement from the Green Party of Canada. In this statement the party is talking about how Canada’s environment is the biggest part of our economy, and we are treating it like a business in liquidation. The party believes that our economy will be unable to sustain itself if we continue to exploit the environment this way. They feel that we are destroying our environment through excessive waste and inadequate protection, and that this will leave future generations with our legacy of a ruined environment. The party is very much against the principles of liberalism, as it believes we need to look out for the collective rather than the individual, as they desire to leave behind a better and functional environment for the future Canadians. They also strongly advocate for the environment which is never talked about in the
main issues dealing with liberalism. They feel that we have a social responsibility to help out
with the future by helping solve the problems new rather than allowing it to become the next
person's problem and selfishly not doing anything to help. A group who would support the
statement is the Green Peace protesters who believe that we need to better maintain our
environment rather than exploiting and destroying it for profits.

The third source is a cartoon of two old white men in suits, where one has the words big oil on
his back, discussing reasons for price hikes. Behind them is a board of obviously sarcastic
reasons such as "it's Wednesday" and "double dare". One of the men is also suggesting the
reason "because we can". The cartoon seems to be critical of the freedom for rich businessman to
be able to use whatever reason they want in order to increase their profits. Due to this the author
is also likely against the self interest principle of liberalism, as he dislikes these men only
looking out for their own money. The artist is likely against the concept of self interest found in
liberalism as he feels these men working in their self interest to be overly selfish which will
likely affect the average person in a negative way. The artist would most likely wish to see large
companies taking on a social responsibility in order to help those with less than them rather than
only thinking of profits. A group who would likely support this is the everyday people whose
lives are directly affected by the decisions of large oil companies, and who would benefit from
the breaks and help these companies could supply.

All three sources are dealing with the same principle of liberalism: self interest. Two of
the sources seem to feel that we should not be so focused on our own self interest and do more to
look out for the good of others as well. One of the sources believes that our only responsibility is
to ourselves and to playing within the rules of business. The second and third sources agree most
closely about the affects that large corporations can have on the rest of society and both feel that
Type 1 Writing Assignment

they should do more to look out for the average person, rather than attempting to increase their profits even more. The first and third source are also related by agreeing that corporate officials are responsible to only to business and that that is often the only responsibility that they take on. However the first source feels that this is the way business should be done and the third source believes that this is the way corporations work but it is a problem for most people if officials continue to act this way. The first and second source’s relationship is found in there opposing views of social responsibility. While they both acknowledge as social responsibility is present they are very different in their opinions on what it is. The first source believes that corporations are only responsible to continue being profitable, while the second source believes that corporations should be looking out for the future and doing their part to help make it better.
# EXAMPLE RESPONSE — Proficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source I</strong></td>
<td>The writer logically interprets Source I as reflecting a classical liberal ideology that places self-interest and profit above public interest. The writer specifically acknowledges the contradiction between the expected and “actual” (p. 1) social responsibility of business. Principles of a free market economy, as discussed by the writer, reflect a sound understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer demonstrates a sound understanding of Source II’s collectivist perspective. The interpretation that the Green Party believes in the social responsibility of the current generation to future generations is adept. The writer logically explains that destroying the environment for profit is both selfish and unsustainable, as argued by the Green Party and its supporters.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The interpretation that the cartoonist is critical of economic freedom and self-interest, as demonstrated by the “overly selfish” (p. 2) actions of the businessmen in Source III, demonstrates a sound understanding of links to liberalism. The writer’s assertion that the cartoonist would likely support corporate social responsibility directed at the less fortunate is adept.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The writer purposefully establishes two distinct relationships among the three sources, that of self-interest and responsibility. The explanation of how each source addresses both relationships is capable. For example, the writer capably discusses distinctions among the sources regarding the complexity of social responsibility.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></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>
Examples of Students’ Writing with Teachers’ Commentaries

Social Studies 30–1, January 2014
Assignment I Responses
Example Scored Excellent (E)

Assignment #1

The first source criticizes the view that corporate officials should have an obligation to “social responsibility”. It goes on to say that, in a free economy, corporate officials need only serve one duty, and that is to use their resources and partake in actions meant purely to increase profit. Of course, it must be done in a way so that it engages in open and free competition. This, then, means that it must exist without deception or fraud. It is clear that the speaker in the source, Milton Friedman, is in support of capitalism. Capitalism is a right-wing ideology on the economic spectrum. The ideology of capitalism supports a free market economy and laissez-faire economics. This means that it believes that the government should not provide regulation or intervention in the economy, as it will sort itself out on its own. Many individuals with capitalist ideologies would believe that government intervention infringes on their personal freedoms. The source would be in support of classical liberalism, as it would agree with the old ideals of pursuing one’s freedom and having individual rights. What the source critiques, specifically, is a combination of collectivism, socialism, and modern liberalism. Modern liberalism, while similar to classical liberalism, allows for more government intervention with the economy, which a far-right capitalist would be in strong disapproval of. The “social responsibility” suggests that the corporate officials are expected to serve more than just themselves and their business. While this supports collectivism, the source is in support of individualism. Collectivism is the belief that people are stronger together and must work with one another to lead to a prosperous society. Socialism, in that same regard, supports government regulation in the economy and less value of individualism over collectivism.
Individualism, however, believes that people are at their best when they are able to pursue their own beliefs and goals without being hindered by the plights of others. The source, then, is clearly individualist as it believes the corporate officials need only work towards profit. Adam Smith, a well-known supporter of capitalism, would agree with Milton Friedman because he would also be in support of individuals striving towards their own goals without the intervention of others. The individualist beliefs and disdain towards left-wing economic ideologies place the source clearly at the far right of the economic spectrum.

In the second source, a quote from the Green Party, it is stated that Canada's environment is the main source of its wealth and prosperity. It possesses the belief that there is a lack of federal regulation in the Canadian economy; and that, because of this, Canada has become one of the worst offenders for causing harm to the environment. The source has an environmental stance on economics, as it does not believe that profit trumps over protecting the environment. However, because the source believes that the reason for the environmental issues comes from a lack of federal regulation, it is also in support of collectivism. However, collectivism and environmentalism often go hand in hand, as individuals concerned with the environment fear for the future individuals who will have to face it when they are gone. This does not reflect an individualist's perspective, as an individualist would be more concerned with their own lives than with the concerns of the future after their time. When the source mentions that it would be cruel to leave our children behind in a destroyed environment, this expresses its collectivist ideology as it is concerned for the whole of society. In relation to liberalism, the source is in more close correlation to modern liberalism than classical liberalism. Its desire for young people
to be able to grow up in a stable environment shows the value placed on the rights of the individual, in that they should be free to live in a good world. As well, the belief in the need for more federal regulation corresponds to modern liberalism, which shares the same ideology. A strong supporter of capitalism would unquestionably disagree with the source, as they would claim that government intervention would restrict their freedom. To them, it would be unfair for federal regulation to infringe on their ability to be free to make profits in whatever way they desired. Of course, the source would firmly disagree with this, finding the beliefs of the capitalist selfish. The ideology presented in the source is slightly left to the middle of the economic spectrum, as its want for government regulation and collectivist ideology relates it to socialism.

The third source portrays two business men holding conference with one another. By the words “big oil” written on the back of one of the men’s suits, it can be inferred that the source relates to oil companies. Furthermore, the blackboard displays the words “Reasons for latest price hike”, with various reasons below. With reason two stating “There’s this island I want to buy”, one can infer that it is implying the selfishness of corporate officials, specifically in the oil industry. The dialogue spoken by one of the men suggests that they will raise the prices “because we can”. This shows that the source is critiquing the nature of those in charge of oil prices for doing so for selfish or seemingly meaningless purposes. Because of this, it is likely that the source is not in favor of extreme capitalism. Similarly, it is not in support of classical liberalism, which advocated for the individual’s pursuit of personal goals. It is more likely that the source supports the idea of government regulation, oil prices being only an example of the
issues that arise if the government does not intervene enough. A holder of the ideology represented in the source would believe that corporate officials being free to raise and lower prices to extremes is unfair to the consumer. This supports collectivism, as it values the effects of a business’ choices on the whole of the group rather than the individual’s profit. It also supports socialism, as the need for federal regulation is expressed. However, a supporter of Adam Smith and the priorities of capitalism would argue that these corporate officials are merely doing their job right, as they are making their profit, seeing as this is one of the main goals of capitalism. They would not agree with the idea of regulation, as it would restrict their economic freedom. The source itself is not necessarily against capitalism completely, but recognizes that it must be regulated in order to prevent injustices from occurring.

The three sources express ideologies concerning the amount of government regulation required in an economy for it to prosper. The first source does not believe that it is necessary, as it is in favor of individualism and the freedom of the corporate official to do what he needs to gain a profit. The second source, however, disagrees with the first source. It argues against the selfishness of capitalism, stating that because of this Canada’s environment has suffered greatly. The third source would agree with the second. It expresses a similar distaste for capitalist corporations to run their companies as they please without concern for the consumer, so long as they are gaining the money that they desire. The man in the source that states that they are essentially able to raise the prices for no reason at all expresses the source’s need for government regulation to stop such activities. The first source conflicts with the following two, which express different reasons for needing regulation. Regulation is needed to protect the
environment from careless practices carried out only for profit, as well as to protect consumers from being duped by higher ups who cheat the system for their own gain. Together they express the idea that capitalism itself is not evil, but the ways in which man can use it have the potential to make it so; thus, there must be regulation by the federal government in order to prevent injustices from continuing to occur.
### EXAMPLE RESPONSE—Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source I</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s discussion of the importance of social responsibility within a free market economy is insightful and precise. The writer’s interpretation of Source I makes reference to both left- and right-wing economic perspectives. The discussion of the differences between modern and classical liberalism is perceptive.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interpretation of the source is sophisticated, insightful and precise, demonstrating a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source II</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s discussion of relevant links to liberalism, including environmentalism, collectivism, and modern liberalism, is sophisticated and precise. The writer specifically qualifies how these ideologies are clearly demonstrated in the discussion of the source. The writer further demonstrates a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism by including capitalist and individualist critiques of the ideas in Source II.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation of Source III</strong></td>
<td>The writer recognizes that the cartoonist is specifically and purposefully criticizing the lack of fairness in the selfish pursuit of personal goals in an extreme capitalist or classical liberal economic system. The writer’s discussion of the cartoonist’s support of government regulation and collectivist values, but without complete opposition to capitalism, demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of Source III’s link to liberalism.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>The overarching relationship of government regulation is perceptively explained through a discussion of the concept of individualism within a classical liberal economic system. The idea that regulations are required to protect both the consumer and the environment is perceptive.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The explanation of relationship(s) is perceptive and thorough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>The vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen, for example: “disdain” (p. 2), “correlation”(p. 2), “infringe”(p. 3) and “injustices” (p. 5). The writing demonstrates skillful control of mechanics and grammar and is judiciously organized.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSIGNMENT II: Value: 30% of the total examination mark
Position Paper Suggested time: 90 to 105 minutes

Analyze the following source and complete the assignment.

Source
The government must take decisive action to protect citizens during times of crisis. During periods of stability, however, citizens must have freedom from unnecessary government control.

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 source suggests that during times of stability, meaning that society is doing well in aspects like the economy, health and safety, the government should have the least amount of control over the people to ensure that their individual rights and freedoms are being met. By this, the source implies that the government's role in society is to make sure that the economy is running relatively smoothly and that the citizens are free to pursue their self interest without harming or directly interfering with other's. However, the source also suggests that when society is going through times of crisis like terrorist attacks, severe economic depression, natural disasters or disease, the government should be allowed to intervene. By intervening, the government might have to take some illiberal actions like decreasing some of society's rights and freedoms to solve the problem as was seen in 2011 with the PATRIOT Act in the United States. The source advocates for modern liberal principles like, self interest and individual rights and freedoms as well as economic freedom because it says that citizens "must have freedom from unnecessary government control." People like Locke would have agreed with the source because of the focus it has on rights and freedoms and would be rejected by more Left orientated people like Karl Marx or Robert Owen who believed in high levels of government intervention at all times. The modern liberal ideology reflected by the source should be embraced because it ensures individuals to be free and live to their fullest and protects them in times of crisis. The source can be related to the Emergencies Act in Canada and the PATRIOT ACT in the US.

Although Canada is a Modern Liberal state and has a higher level of government intervention compared with other countries like the U.S, It's citizens still enjoy of free market, capitalism and are relatively economically free. Canadians enjoy of many rights and freedoms,
they can buy and sell, they can travel, they can marry whoever they want and many other things.

In times of crisis, as seen in Alberta in summer of 2013 because of the floods, the government thanks to the Emergencies Act was able to infringe in people's rights to go wherever they please and live wherever they please in order to restore the stability in Alberta. The government was able to keep people from the damaged areas to avoid accidents, people where removed from their flooded houses which in times of stability would be illegal. The illiberal actions taken where taken to aid the people and society and healp speed up the healing process so that individuals could return to their homes and jobs as fast as possible and the economy could keep running smoothly. The Canadian government is a great example of the government taking "decisive action to protect citizens in times of crisis." Once everything was solved, people where able to go to their homes and jobs and the government took a step back on controlling individuals just like the source suggests.

Illiberal actions were also taken in the US after the 911 incident when the US was under terrorist attack. Americans were threatened and their safety in jeopardy. There was no safety stability so the government had to take illiberal actions to avoid this from happening again. The PATRIOT ACT took away some freedoms from individuals in America. They are now subject to being questioned and being inspected, they can't bring certain objects on airplanes and are subject to policemen infiging their privacy by checking their phones to make sure that there are no signs of possible threat to the nation. These illiberal actions are ensuring that individuals can live freely and safely. Americans have given up some rights and freedoms for more security. Other than making sure that everything is safe, Americans enjoy a free market and little government intervention. They are free to travel, spend and earn, study and do whatever they please as long as they don't interefce and jeopardize other people's safety and private property.
Just like the source suggests, the US government took actions in times of crisis but other than that the government stays away from people's lives to ensure freedom.

During the Great Depression in the US, American President FDRoosevelt had to take some radical actions to aid the economic situation. America at the time was a Classic Liberal State. The government did not have much influence on society. Once the Great Depression started and the capitalist and laissez-faire system was not repairing the economic situation, FDR decided to change the system. He was now to move to, what we know call a Modern Liberal State. He started intervening more in the economy by increasing the money supply. He started creating state funded jobs so that people had more money and aiding people with health care. He also aided corporations and decreased their taxes so that they could lower costs and hire more people.

Government intervention should only be accepted in times of crisis whether an economic or safety issue threatens society. As seen in Canada last summer when the floods threatened health in the area or the 911 incident in the US where national security was threatened or even FDR's actions to get out of the Great Depression. They all show that even a society with a modern liberal system has to take illiberal actions to aid society and make sure that their rights and freedoms are met.
## SCORING CRITERIA

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After largely paraphrasing at the start of the assignment, the writer recognizes that the source reflects a modern liberal perspective, where government intervention necessitates “some illiberal actions like decreasing some of society’s rights.” (p. 1) This generalized understanding, coupled with the writer’s reference to both proponents and detractors of the perspective, as simply being left- or right-wing oriented (while not incorrect), is conventional.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argumentation
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writer’s contention that the perspective “reflected by the source should be embraced because it ensures individuals to be free and live to their fullest and protects them in times of crisis” (p. 1) is supported by appropriately chosen and developed arguments showing crises, governments’ response, and the subsequent restoration of rights.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is generally developed.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence is conventional and straightforward.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer’s generalized and basic discussion of the Alberta floods (p. 2), the implementation of the PATRIOT Act (p. 2), and the actions of the Roosevelt administration during the Great Depression (p. 3) reveals an acceptable understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communication

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

The writing is straightforward and functionally organized. The writer’s control of syntax and grammar is adequate; for example: “They are free to travel, spend and earn, study and do whatever they please as long as they don’t interfere and jeopardize other people’s safety and private property.” (p. 2)

Despite lapses in control and minor errors, (the last paragraph on page 1; the first paragraph on page 2), the communication remains generally clear.

S
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Assignment #2

"The government must take decisive action to protect citizens during times of crisis. During periods of stability, however, citizens must have freedom from unnecessary government control."

In the source we get a statement supporting government control in times of crisis. The writer makes it clear that during times of stability the citizens must be free from unnecessary government intervention. The author of the source is a clear supporter of individual rights and freedoms, with the exception that they must be protected and sometimes limited. He also holds the same values as a famous thinker John Locke, who believed that the government is their to serve the people and should only intervene to protect the rights and freedoms of the citizens. This means that during times of crisis when the democratic system is too slow, we must trust in our government to act quickly and defuse a dangerous situation. Security is a prerequisite for freedom, so in order for us to be able to express our individualism through rights and freedoms, we must be in a safe and secure environment. To what extent should we embrace the ideological perspectives reflected in the source? We should fully support the ideas presented in the source as long as the government is acting only to protect its citizens and their liberties, the government acts to protect our rights and freedoms and not inhibit them. We should support the ideological perspectives presented in the source because during times of stability is when a democratic state reaches it's finest expression.

It is important to state that the government should only intervene to protect it's citizens and their individual rights and freedoms; the government is in place to serve the people. If this value is not emphasized the outcome can be appalling. Hitler used a clause called the Enabling Act which made the Nazi party the only party in Germany's political
system. With no one to oppose him he was able to consolidate power and stifle any dissidents. Hitler put the Enabling Act in place not in the interests of the citizens, but in order to gain power and world prestige. A democratic government should only ever intervene to protect its citizens, or their democratic beliefs. A similar law that has been used in Canada’s history is the War Times Measures Act which enables the government to temporarily act without the consent of its citizens in order to protect the citizens. This act was put in place during the peak of Quebec’s separation movement. A Canadian terrorist group called the FLQ kidnapped two government officials and held them hostage, so the government acted quickly to protect these people and defused the situation. In the end a few people had their rights and freedoms limited, but it had saved the lives of one of these officials and promoted Canada’s democratic values. We should support the ideological perspectives in the source as long as the government acts only to protect its citizens, or the values that make up the foundation for democracy.

The government should only intervene to protect our rights and freedoms, and not restrict them. This is a very fine line, in order to protect our individual rights and freedoms the government sometimes must limit them. This is acceptable because a prerequisite for freedom is security, and the citizens must be willing to give up some rights and freedoms in order to express their liberties in a safe environment. The government should never act to restrict our rights and freedoms when it is not in our best interest. Our responsibility as citizens is to hold the government tightly accountable and make sure checks and balances are in place so that the government can’t act against us. During WWII the government eliminated the rights and freedoms of one particular group: the Japanese. Although Japan was part of the Axis during World War II the Canadian
citizens that Canada's government were imprisoning were innocent, and were never given a fair trial to prove them guilty of any sort of treason. The government used scapegoating and fear to justify its actions against Canadian citizens and this is never acceptable. The values that make the foundation for democracy must always be emphasized, otherwise we become vulnerable to our own government. We should support the ideological perspectives presented in the source as long as the government acts to protect our rights and freedoms and not inhibit them.

The second half of the source lays emphasis on citizens being immune from unnecessary government intervention during times of stability. We must fully support this statement because during times of stability is when a democratic system reaches its finest expression. The source mentions "[...] citizens must have freedom from unnecessary government control.". This is important because the government must still intervene to protect our individual rights and freedoms. The supporter of democracy John Locke believed that the government is their to protect the rights and freedoms of its citizens. Another historical thinker and economic expert Adam Smith would agree with the author of the source; Adam Smith believed in a 'invisible hand' that guides the economy to prosperity without the need for a lot of government intervention. This being said, the system only works when the government provides conditions for perfect competition. The government must intervene to prevent the formation of monopolies that ruin the system. We should support the ideological perspectives presented in the source because during times of stability is when a democratic state reaches it's finest expression.

Examples in history prove the source to be a reliable guideline for any democracy that wants to ensure safety for it's citizens. We should support the source as long as the
Assignment #2

government is acting only to protect its citizens, and protect their rights and freedoms. History has shown that during times of stability democracy flourishes, and given the right conditions the citizens can live a long, wealthy life. We should all support the source in order to live in a democracy safe from threat, and as long as we keep good checks and balances on our government we can ensure that the government will work to protect the values that make the foundation for democracy.
### 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 demonstrates an understanding that the ideological perspective in the source can apply to both economic and political freedom. The analysis of the entire source is capable and adept and shows a sound understanding of the ideological perspective.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The analysis of the source is capable and adept; a sound understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s position that the restriction of rights is acceptable, provided that it is done in the best interests of society, is clearly established and is persuasively supported by purposefully chosen and developed arguments.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The position established is persuasively supported by purposefully chosen and developed argument(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The argumentation is logical and capably developed, demonstrating a sound understanding of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is clearly developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>While the writer’s discussion of the evidence does not contain a great deal of depth, the examples are purposefully chosen and developed to support specific arguments.</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence is specific and purposeful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence may contain some minor errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A capable and adept discussion of evidence reveals a solid understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The writer’s use of historical (the Enabling Act, Japanese-Canadian internment, and the October Crisis) and theoretical (the invisible hand) evidence reveals a solid understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Communication**

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

The writing is clear and purposefully organized. Vocabulary is appropriate and specific; for example: “Security is a prerequisite for freedom” (p. 1), “defuse a dangerous situation” (p. 1), and “consolidate power and stifle any dissidents” (p. 2).

Minor errors in language do not impede communication.
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Assignment II

The paradox presented by the delicate relationship between rights and security has always presented a challenge to liberal democracies. Despite the premium placed on individual sovereignty by liberal governments, sometimes that same sovereignty can be abused to the point where the security of the society is impaired. According to the source, in scenarios such as the one outlined above, a responsible liberal government must abandon its obligation to protect the rights of the rogue individual(s) and instead must suspend those rights in order to preserve the security and safety of the collective, as well as to ensure that the abuse does not escalate to the point where there is a permanent removal of civil liberties (liberalism is destroyed). However, the source goes on to state a fundamental clause involved in such suspensions; it must be temporary and the government must revert back to its previous state once the crisis has passed.

The author’s perspective aligns itself with the writings of the philosopher John Stuart Mill, who theorized that individuals should be free to pursue their own goals until such time that the pursuit violates the freedom and rights of others. Ultimately, it is wise to embrace the source to its fullest extent, provided that qualifying emergency situations are judged accurately, the emergency powers afforded to the government are not abused and the clause of temporary enactment is truly respected.

The greatest danger associated with the acceptance of this source is the potential for the illiberal consolidation of the powers of the judicial, legislative and executive branches by an irresponsible government which fails to observe the true objective of the source during the time that individual liberties are discontinued. A tragic example of the consolidation of these powers
occurred in Germany during the 1930s. It was during this time that Adolf Hitler, the leader of the National Socialist Party of Germany, passed a rights suspension bill similar to the one recommended by the source in response to a national crisis, in this case a suspected communist insurrection. Entitled the "Enabling Act (1933)", Hitler had the bill accepted through normal democratic channels. Furthermore, the legislation included a "sunset period" of four years, after which time the effects of the act were to be reversed. In other words, at its inception, the bill appeared to represent the epitome of the source's perspective. However, instead of using the bill to preserve the integrity of the democracy against the crisis, Hitler manipulated the intent of the bill and used the extreme powers it accorded to him to rearrange the German government into a dictatorship in which he wielded ultimate power. Instead of using the emergency powers to protect the German citizens, he used them to permanently strip Germans of their rights and impair their democratic power. In doing this, Hitler blatantly ignored the act's principle goal of preserving liberal rights for the future. Hitler would go on to utilize his powers to incite global conflict and order the Holocaust, the genocide of millions of people, most prominently those of Jewish faith. This demonstrates both a supreme violation of the "temporary" clause as well the abuse of the emergency powers and proves that those two conditions represent prerequisites for the measures proposed by the source to be successful and liberal.

The Canadian Government has invoked the War Measures Act, legislation clearly aligned with the source's perspective, three times in Canada's history. However, the Government failed to observe the key conditions for the Act's success during the 1941 invocation. In response to the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbour, the Canadian Government made the decision to uproot all citizens of Japanese descent along Canada's Western coast and relocate them to camps away
from the coast. All property of the incarcerated individuals was seized by the government and sold. Following the conclusion of the war, the government offered no compensation to the imprisoned Japanese-Canadians and instead violated their mobility rights by forcing them relocate east of the Rockies. In truth, no espionage had occurred— an RCMP investigation returned no evidence of any nefarious activities being conducted by any of the imprisoned individuals.

This instance of rights suspension illustrates irresponsible judgement on the part of the government as to what constitutes a crisis and therefore conclusively proves that the pre-existing condition of responsible crisis judgement is imperative to ensure the liberal application of the source's perspective.

In stark contrast to the shocking misuse of rights suspension in the aforementioned cases, the 1970 implementation of the War Measures Act represents a respect for all of the stipulations required for the author's suggested response to crisis. A national crisis emerged when the FLQ, a radical political group bent on changing the social conditions of Quebec using violence, kidnapped two political figures in order to draw attention to their cause. In response to the kidnappings and the dangerous social unrest they caused, Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau activated the War Measures Act in October 1970. This gave law enforcement agencies emergency powers which ultimately enabled the resolution of the conflict, albeit without some controversy. This swift response to the violation of Quebecois' right to safety and security effectively quashed a crisis situation which had the potential to escalate to civic revolution. Following the resolution of the crisis, the government reverted to its previous, individual-respecting form. In this case, Trudeau correctly identified an emergency situation, used the emergency powers with the ultimate goal of preserving the rights of the Quebec citizens in the long term and willingly relinquished the authoritarian power once the crisis had been diffused.
is in instances such as these where the application of the source's proposed rights suspension is justifiable and liberal.

Rights suspension acts have the potential to be very dangerous the citizens on which they are applied, as the citizens no longer protection from intrusive and irresponsible government. Failed rights suspension acts have been proven to result in a multitude of evils, including the violation of mobility rights (Japanese-Canadians), right to life (Holocaust victims) a loss of democratic power (German citizens). However, as has been demonstrated, rights suspensions can be enacted in a liberal fashion, provided the imperative clauses of governmental responsibility in using emergency powers, accurate crisis judgement and the source's overall message of protecting liberal rights for the future are religously and faithfully observed.
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### SCORING CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Source</strong></td>
<td>The writer insightfully speaks to the conundrum faced by democratic governments in their application of security measures vis-à-vis maintaining citizen rights (p. 1). This dilemma is further analyzed in the first sentence at the bottom of page 4 when the writer discusses the dangerous potential for the illiberal consolidation of the three branches of government, and its consequences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This comprehensive analysis is furthered by the writer’s acknowledgement that governments must first determine what actually constitutes a crisis, as it is “imperative to ensure the liberal application of the source’s perspective.” (p. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td>The writer’s position that the perspective in the source should be embraced “to its fullest extent” (p. 1) is convincingly supported by arguing that governments need to accurately determine what constitutes an emergency situation. Once the accompanying legislation is invoked, the emergency powers that governments are accorded are not to be abused, and should be temporary in nature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective is perceptively developed at the end of each paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Although not necessarily comprehensive, the writer’s use of evidence in their discussion of the Enabling Act (p. 2), Japanese-Canadian internment (pp. 2–3), and the October Crisis (pp. 3–4) is deliberately chosen and applied in a sophisticated manner.

The application of evidence to the assigned task reveals an insightful understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.

Communication

- 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.

Despite a few mechanical errors, the writer’s control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is sophisticated; for example: “In stark contrast to the shocking misuse of rights suspension in the aforementioned cases, the 1970 implementation of the War Measures Act represents a respect for all of the stipulations required for the author’s suggested response to the crisis.” (p. 3)

Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen; for example: “impaired” (p. 1), “prerequisites” (p. 2), “incarcerated” (p. 3), “nefarious” (p. 3), and “quashed” (p. 3).

The relative absence of error considering the length and complexity of the response to the assigned task, coupled with the overall sophistication of the writing, is impressive.
**Scoring Categories and Scoring Criteria for 2014 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the source is sophisticated, insightful, and precise, demonstrating a perceptive understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Pf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the source is logical, specific, and adept, demonstrating a sound understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>S</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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the source is incomplete, vague, and simplistic, demonstrating a confused understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the source is scant, inaccurate, and irrelevant, demonstrating little or no understanding of links to liberalism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero is assigned to a response that fails to meet the minimum requirements of Poor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

- **Zero**
  - 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 2014 Assignment II

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pf</strong></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INS</strong></td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient is a special category. <em>It is not an indicator of quality.</em> 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>
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>Excellent</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Pf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>INS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>