

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, FREESTONE
Secondary 4 Express
Humanities (Social Studies)

Social Studies Skills LORMS General Summary

A. Basic Inference

E.g.: What is the message of the source?

L1	1	Answer based on provenance, description, or misinterpretation
L2	2 - 3	Answer based on context, or unsupported valid inference
L3	4 - 5	Supported valid inference, or inference based on valid outcome

B. Advanced Inference

E.g.: Why did the author publish this source?

L1	1	Answer based on provenance, description, or misinterpretation
L2	2	Answer based on context, or unsupported valid inference
L3	3 - 4	Supported valid inference, or inference based on valid outcome
L4	5 - 6	Purpose, with audience and outcome (5As)

C. Comparison

E.g.: How similar/different are the two sources?

L1	1	Similarity <u>OR</u> difference based on provenance, or source type
L2	2	Similarity <u>OR</u> difference based on topic, false matching, or invalid basis of comparison
L3	3	Similarity <u>OR</u> difference based on unsupported content comparison
	4	Similarity <u>AND</u> difference based on unsupported content comparison
L4	5	Similarity <u>OR</u> difference based on supported content comparison
	6	Similarity <u>AND</u> difference based on supported content comparison
L5	7	Similarity <u>OR</u> difference based on supported purpose, POV, or tone

D. Reliability

E.g.: How reliable is the source?

L1	1	Answer based on provenance, or description of source or issue
L2	2	Reliable <u>OR</u> unreliable based on content or typicality, or unsupported valid inference
L3	3 - 4	Reliable <u>OR</u> unreliable based on source content
L4	5	Reliable <u>AND</u> unreliable based on source content
L5	6	Reliable <u>OR</u> unreliable based on cross-reference
	7	Reliable <u>AND</u> unreliable based on cross-reference
L6	7	Reliable <u>OR</u> unreliable based on explained provenance

E. Utility

E.g.: How useful is the source as evidence of the issue?

L1	1	Answer based on provenance, or description of source or issue
L2	2	Useful <u>OR</u> not useful based on content or typicality, or unsupported valid inference
L3	3 - 4	Useful <u>OR</u> not useful based on source content
L4	5	Useful <u>AND</u> not useful based on source content
L5	6	Useful <u>OR</u> not useful based on cross-reference
	7	Useful <u>AND</u> not useful based on cross-reference
L6	7	Useful <u>OR</u> not useful based on evaluated provenance

F. Surprise

E.g.: Are you surprised by Source A?

L1	1	Answer based on provenance, or description of source or issue and fails to address element of surprise or expectancy
L2	2	Identification of surprising <u>OR</u> unsurprising factor with no valid explanation
L3	3	Surprised <u>OR</u> unsurprising based on contextual knowledge (or in the case of two sources, cross-reference between given sources)
L4	4	Surprised <u>OR</u> unsurprising based on cross-reference
	5 - 6	Surprised <u>AND</u> unsurprising based on cross-reference
L5	7	Surprised <u>OR</u> unsurprising based on evaluated provenance

G. Hybrid

E.g.: Does Source A prove that the problems shown in Source B are baseless?

L1	1	Answer based on description of source or issue without explanation
L2	2	Answer based on provenance, explanation of source-in-question without reference to reference source, or false matching
L3	3	Prove <u>OR</u> does not prove based on unsupported content analysis, with a valid basis of comparison
L4	4 - 5	Prove <u>OR</u> does not prove based on supported content analysis
L5	6	Prove <u>AND</u> does not prove based on supported content analysis
L6	7	Prove <u>OR</u> does not prove based on evaluated provenance

H. Assertion

E.g.: Using the sources in the case study, explain how far you would agree with this statement.

L1	1 - 2	Identification of sources, with no valid source use or specific knowledge presented
L2	Agree <u>OR</u> disagree, supported by valid source use	
	2	1 source asserting agree <u>OR</u> disagree without explanation (balanced)
	3	1 source asserting agree <u>OR</u> disagree with explanation (balanced)
	4	2 sources asserting agree <u>OR</u> disagree with explanation (unbalanced)
L3	Agree <u>AND</u> disagree, supported by valid source use	
	5 - 6	2 sources asserting agree <u>AND</u> disagree with explanation (balanced)
	6	3 sources asserting agree <u>AND</u> disagree with explanation (unbalanced)
	7	≥4 sources asserting agree <u>AND</u> disagree with explanation (unbalanced)
	8	≥4 sources asserting agree <u>AND</u> disagree with explanation (balanced)
*	9 - 10	<p>Bonus marks, 1 mark awarded for each occurrence of method for a maximum of 2 marks</p> <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contextual knowledge applied to source, which supports source stance and explanation• Analysis of reliability, utility or sufficiency of at least one source• Giving a balanced conclusion or resolution to conclude final stance at the end of response
**	1 - 2	Any source analysis of which candidates' explanation does not contain a <u>stance</u> , <u>evidence from source</u> , <u>outcome</u> , and/or <u>impact</u> .

I. Opinion SRQ

E.g.: In your opinion, how can we XXX? Explain your answer using **two** recommendations/reasons.

L1	1	Describes the topic without addressing question
L2	2	Identification of one recommendation/reason
	3	Identification of two recommendations/reasons
	3	Description of one recommendation/reason
	4	Description of two recommendations/reasons
L3	5 - 6	Identification and explanation of one recommendation/reason
	6 - 7	Identification and explanation of two recommendations/reasons

J. Evaluative SRQ

E.g.: How far do you agree that XXX is more important/brings about more XXX than XXX?

L1	1 - 2	Describes the topic without addressing question
L2	3	Description of one factor
	4	Description of two factors
L3	5 - 6	Explanation of one factor
	6 - 7	Explanation of two factors
L4	8	L3 + Evaluation and explanation of the relative importance of each factor (Balanced conclusion)