

---

# AP<sup>®</sup> Seminar

# Performance Task 1

## Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

### **Inside:**

#### **Individual Research Report**

- Scoring Guideline**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

**Individual Research Report (IRR)****30 points****General Scoring Notes**

- When applying the rubric for each individual row, you should award the score for that row based solely upon the criteria indicated for that row, according to the preponderance of evidence.
- You should start by reading the title and then moving to evaluate the bibliography/works cited, but read the whole report before assigning a score for any row.
- Reward the student for skills they have demonstrated. Demonstrating means that there is evidence that you can point to in the report.

**0 (Zero) Scores**

- A score of 0 is assigned to a single row of the rubric when the response displays a below-minimum level of quality as identified in that row of the rubric. For rows 1 to 4, if there is no evidence of any research (i.e., it is all opinion and there is nothing in the bibliography, no citation or attributed phrases in the response) then a score of 0 should be assigned.
- Scores of 0 are assigned to all rows of the rubric when the response is off-topic; a repetition of a prompt; entirely crossed-out; a drawing or other markings; or a response in a language other than English.

**NR (No Response)**

A score of NR is assigned to responses that are blank.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p><b>Row 1</b></p> <p><b>Understand and Analyze Context</b></p> <p><b>(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)</b></p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for two points.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>The report identifies an overly broad or simplistic area of investigation and/or shows little evidence of research. A simplistic connection or no connection is made to the overall problem or issue.</p>	<p><b>4 points</b></p> <p>The report identifies an adequately focused area of investigation in the research and shows some variety in source selection. It makes some reference to the overall problem or issue.</p>	<p><b>6 points</b></p> <p>The report situates the student’s investigation of the complexities of a problem or issue in research that draws upon a wide variety of appropriate sources. It makes clear the significance to a larger context.</p>
<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>				
<p><b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide no evidence of research (i.e., there is a complete absence of bibliography, internal citations, and attributive tags that point to a research source. If one of these is present, cannot score 0).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address a very general topic of investigation (e.g. “pollution”)</li> <li>Draw mainly from one or two sources or poor-quality sources.</li> <li>Provide unsubstantiated assertions about the significance of the investigation (e.g. “<i>this is important</i>”).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify too many aspects of the topic to address complexity (e.g. “air, water, and land pollution”).</li> <li>May be overly reliant on journalistic sources or lack any academic/scholarly sources.</li> <li>May provide generalized statements about the significance of the investigation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly state an area of investigation that is narrow enough to address the complexity of the problem or issue (e.g. “water pollution in India”). The context established is sustained throughout.</li> <li>Include research that draws on some academic/scholarly sources.</li> <li>Provide specific and relevant details to convey why the problem or issue matters/is important.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research context is located often in the titles of the reports and first paragraphs, but the whole report needs to sustain the focus throughout.</li> <li>Review Bibliography or Works Cited (but also check that context is established by sources actually used, especially academic sources).</li> </ul>				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p><b>Row 2</b></p> <p><b>Understand and Analyze Argument</b></p> <p><b>(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)</b></p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for two points.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>The report restates or misstates information from sources. It doesn't address reasoning in the sources or it does so in a very simplistic way.</p>	<p><b>4 points</b></p> <p>The report summarizes information and in places offers effective explanation of the reasoning within the sources' argument (but does so inconsistently).</p>	<p><b>6 points</b></p> <p>The report demonstrates an understanding of the reasoning and validity of the sources' arguments.* This can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use of the reasoning and conclusions.</p>
<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>				
<p><b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide no evidence of research.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make no distinction between paraphrased material and response's commentary; demonstrate no instances of effective explanation.</li> <li>Do not anchor ideas to sources.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are dominated by summary of source material rather than explanation of sources' arguments; provide some instances of effective explanation of authors' reasoning.</li> <li>Occasionally lack clarity about what is commentary and what is from the source material.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide commentary that explains authors' reasoning, claims or conclusions (<b>direct explanation</b>).</li> <li>Make effective use of authors' reasoning, claims or conclusions (showing understanding of the sources) (<b>purposeful use</b>).</li> <li>Attribute clearly source material (i.e., readers always able to tell what comes from what source)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Validity is defined as "the extent to which an argument or claim is logical."</li> <li>Reference to arguments from the sources used often appears at the end of paragraphs and / or immediately following an in-text citation as part of the commentary on a source.</li> <li>Clear attribution, (i.e. readers are always able to tell what comes from what source and what kind of source it is) must be present in order for the report to demonstrate "purposeful use."</li> </ul>				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<b>Row 3</b>  <b>Evaluate Sources and Evidence</b>  <b>(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)</b>	<b>0 points</b> Does not meet the criteria for two points.	<b>2 points</b> The report identifies evidence from chosen sources. It makes very simplistic, illogical, or no reference to the credibility of sources and evidence, and their relevance to the inquiry.	<b>4 points</b> The report in places offers some effective explanation of the chosen sources and evidence in terms of their credibility and relevance to the inquiry (but does so inconsistently).	<b>6 points</b> The report demonstrates evaluation of credibility of the sources and selection of relevant evidence from the sources. Both can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use.
	<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>			
	<b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide no evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide evidence that is either poorly selected or poorly explained (in terms of relevance and credibility).</li> <li>Provide evidence that is irrelevant or only obliquely relevant.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include descriptions but the attributions are insufficient to establish credibility.</li> <li>Pay attention to the evidence, but not the source (may treat all evidence as equal when it is not).</li> <li>Draw upon research that may be clearly outdated without a rationale for using that older evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide descriptions in the attributions that effectively establish credibility of the source and relevance of evidence (<b>direct explanation</b>).</li> <li>Make effective use of well-chosen, relevant evidence from credible academic sources (<b>purposeful use</b>).</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Notes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Row 1, the judgement is whether the bibliography allows for complex context; Row 3 judges whether the incremental examples of evidence presented are well-selected and well-used.</li> <li>Purposeful use, in this case, refers to the deployment of relevant evidence from a credible source. Clear attribution, (i.e. readers are always able to tell what comes from what source and what kind of source it is) must be present in order for the report to demonstrate “purposeful use.”</li> </ul>				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p><b>Row 4</b></p> <p><b>Understand and Analyze Perspective</b></p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for two points.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>The report identifies few and/or oversimplified perspectives from sources.**</p>	<p><b>4 points</b></p> <p>The report identifies multiple perspectives from sources, making some general connections among those perspectives.**</p>	<p><b>6 points</b></p> <p>The report discusses a range of perspectives and draws explicit and relevant connections among those perspectives.**</p>
<p><b>(0, 2, 4, or 6 points)</b></p>	<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>			
	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide no evidence of research (only opinion).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Might include a minimal range of perspectives but they are not connected (they are isolated from each other).</li> <li>Juxtapose perspectives but connections are not clear (they must be inferred).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include multiple perspectives and include some instances of general connections.</li> <li>Include multiple perspectives that are connected, but do not explain the relationships among them by clarifying or elaborating on the points on which they are connected.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Go beyond mere identification of multiple perspectives by using details from different sources' arguments to explain specific relationships or connections among perspectives (i.e., placing them in dialogue).</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>**A perspective is a “point of view conveyed through an argument.” (This means the source’s argument).</li> <li>Throughout the report pay attention to organization of paragraphs (and possibly headings) as it’s a common way to group perspectives.</li> <li>Readers should pay attention to transitions as effective transitions may signal connections among perspectives.</li> </ul>			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria											
<p>Row 5</p> <p>Apply Conventions</p> <p>(0–3 points)</p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p><b>1 point</b></p> <p>The report includes many errors in attribution and citation OR the bibliography is inconsistent in style and format and/or incomplete.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>The report attributes or cites sources used but not always accurately. The bibliography references sources using a consistent style.</p>	<p><b>3 points</b></p> <p>The report attributes and accurately cites the sources used. The bibliography accurately references sources using a consistent style.</p>								
<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="317 477 684 524" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 0 points:</th> <th data-bbox="684 477 1079 524" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 1 point (many errors):</th> <th data-bbox="1079 477 1509 524" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 2 points (some errors):</th> <th data-bbox="1509 477 1950 524" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 3 points (few significant flaws):</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="317 524 684 1179"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide no evidence of research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="684 524 1079 1179"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa).</li> <li>• Demonstrate no organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical)</li> <li>• Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited).</li> <li>• Include poor or no attributive phrasing with paraphrased material (e.g., “Studies show...”; “Research says...” with no additional in-text citation).</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1079 524 1509 1179"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide some uniformity in citation style.</li> <li>• Provide, perhaps with a few lapses, an organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical)</li> <li>• Include unclear references or errors in citations, (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url).</li> <li>• Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references.</li> <li>• Provide some successful attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1509 524 1950 1179"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contain few flaws.</li> <li>• Provide clear organization principle in bibliography/works cited.</li> <li>• Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references.</li> <li>• Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring note:</b> The response cannot score 3 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 1 point (many errors):	Typical responses that earn 2 points (some errors):	Typical responses that earn 3 points (few significant flaws):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide no evidence of research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa).</li> <li>• Demonstrate no organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical)</li> <li>• Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited).</li> <li>• Include poor or no attributive phrasing with paraphrased material (e.g., “Studies show...”; “Research says...” with no additional in-text citation).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide some uniformity in citation style.</li> <li>• Provide, perhaps with a few lapses, an organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical)</li> <li>• Include unclear references or errors in citations, (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url).</li> <li>• Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references.</li> <li>• Provide some successful attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contain few flaws.</li> <li>• Provide clear organization principle in bibliography/works cited.</li> <li>• Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references.</li> <li>• Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring note:</b> The response cannot score 3 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p>
Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 1 point (many errors):	Typical responses that earn 2 points (some errors):	Typical responses that earn 3 points (few significant flaws):									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide no evidence of research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa).</li> <li>• Demonstrate no organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical)</li> <li>• Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited).</li> <li>• Include poor or no attributive phrasing with paraphrased material (e.g., “Studies show...”; “Research says...” with no additional in-text citation).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide some uniformity in citation style.</li> <li>• Provide, perhaps with a few lapses, an organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical)</li> <li>• Include unclear references or errors in citations, (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url).</li> <li>• Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references.</li> <li>• Provide some successful attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contain few flaws.</li> <li>• Provide clear organization principle in bibliography/works cited.</li> <li>• Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references.</li> <li>• Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring note:</b> The response cannot score 3 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p>									
<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In AP Seminar, there is no requirement for using a particular style sheet; however, responses must use a style that is consistent and complete.</li> <li>• Check the bibliography for consistency in style (and if there are fundamental elements missing).</li> <li>• Check for clarity/accuracy in internal citations.</li> <li>• Check to make sure all internal citations match up to the bibliography. In order for links to work in print, there must be a clear organizational principle arranging the elements on the bib/works cited.</li> </ul>												

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p><b>Row 6</b></p> <p><b>Apply Conventions</b></p> <p><b>(0-3 points)</b></p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p><b>1 point</b></p> <p>The report contains many flaws in grammar that often interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is not appropriate for an academic audience.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>The report is generally clear but contains some flaws in grammar that occasionally interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is inconsistent and not always appropriate for an academic audience.</p>	<p><b>3 points</b></p> <p>The report communicates clearly to the reader (although may not be free of errors in grammar and style). The written style is consistently appropriate for an academic audience.</p>
<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>				
<p><b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b></p>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 1 point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May contain many instances where sentences are not controlled.</li> <li>• May rely almost exclusively on simplistic language (e.g., This is good. This is bad).</li> <li>• Employ an overall style that is not appropriate for an academic report; or colloquial tone.</li> <li>• Include many passages that are incoherent.</li> <li>• Provide too few sentences to evaluate or the student’s own words are indistinguishable from paraphrases of sources.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contain some lapses in sentence control (e.g., run-ons, fragments, or mixed construction when integrating quoted material).</li> <li>• Demonstrate imprecise or vague word choice insufficient to communicate complexity of ideas.</li> <li>• Sometimes lapse into colloquial language.</li> <li>• Use overly dense prose that lacks clarity and precision.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contain few flaws which do not impede clarity for understanding of complex ideas.</li> <li>• Demonstrate word choice sufficient to communicate complex ideas.</li> <li>• Use clear prose.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because this is a <b>report</b>, the prose is judged by its ability to clearly and precisely articulate complex research content.</li> <li>• Readers should focus on the sentences written by the student, not those quoted or derived from sources.</li> </ul>				



The Political Implications of the Privatization of Space

6443V02U

AP Seminar

Word Count: 1305

**Introduction**

According to NASA's Chief Historian, Steven J. Dick, space exploration is a necessity for self-preservation of society and avoidance of stagnation. The initial need for exploration of a new frontier came with uncertainty and required the creation of new international agreements. In 1967, the United Nations' Outer Space Treaty was signed by over one hundred countries, setting in place two fundamental principles for international space law: 1) general international law extends into space, and 2) celestial bodies are free for exploration and use but cannot be claimed by any nation (Lee). This treaty specifically addressed individual countries. However, as a half-century has passed, national space programs are no longer the only entities interested in space exploration. With the introduction of NewSpace, the industry composed of many new private space companies such as Elon Musk's SpaceX and Jeff Bezo's Blue Origin, the Outer Space Treaty's vague nature has made its enforcement increasingly complicated (Krause) (Dovey). However, the importance of space exploration and scientific advancement remains. If the private sector is able to aid scientific progress, it must be allowed to fulfill this purpose. Yet, with the current nature of international space law, unspecified regulations pave a path for serious international conflict rising from possible legal disputes and damages of intellectual property (Reinert). Thus, when analyzing the privatization of space from a political standpoint, the question arises: what does the current rise in private space companies in the United States suggest about a need for government regulation of space exploration?

**Promotion of Private Space Companies**

While the introduction of private companies has complicated the space industry, it has also introduced much opportunity. It is in the government's interest to work alongside private

companies for the country's scientific advancement, which yields political gain. In his research on liability laws in outer space, Alexander P. Reinhart of William and Mary Law School highlights that NASA no longer monopolizes the space industry. A second kind of space race is occurring among private companies such as SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic (Reinhart). These companies are at the forefront of space technology with SpaceX becoming the first private entity to deliver supplies to the International Space Station (Reinhart). Hence, partnership with private companies provides state-of-the-art resources and technology needed by the government. The U.S. therefore increases its capacity to advance science by utilizing private space exploration endeavors. Furthermore, this technology provides political gain. According to Harvard Law School researcher Yong Bum Lee, under the Registration Convention of the Outer Space Treaty, private companies have the ability to register their intellectual property, or 'space objects', under the country of their choosing, creating regulatory competition. Governments then have incentive to adjust their patent framework to meet private company desires (Lee). Having some authority over these corporations allows the country to obtain the wealth of knowledge their technology provides. Knowledge then increases political prestige internationally while partnership assists the private sector, creating a mutually beneficial relationship. However, it creates conflicting governmental interests, meaning a decision between political prestige or international integrity.

Along with this new technology comes unprecedented objectives in space for which the government must account. Intending to work with and support private companies, the U.S. government attempts to pass laws that specify its understanding of the Outer Space Treaty for the NewSpace industry's benefit. The American Space Commerce Free Enterprise Act was passed by the House of Representatives in 2018; it is a bill seeking to allow private companies less

regulation and limitation of freedom in space. Hao Liu, Director at the Institute of Aviation Law and Standard, and Fabio Tronchetti, Co-Director at the Institute of Space Law and Strategy, argue that this bill does not fully align with the Outer Space Treaty's basic foundation, allowing U.S. citizens unconditional usage of resources from outer space (Hao and Tronchetti). The bill instead removes the burden from the private space sector in the U.S. and is, therefore, a governmental attempt to promote private space companies. Along with this Act, the *ABA Journal* by the American Bar Association identifies an additional bill known as the American Space Renaissance Act which seeks to specify the Outer Space Treaty's interpretation in the U.S. It looks to increase the budgets of the Department of Transportation and the Commerce Department in order to grow their involvement in the protection of the commercial space industry (Krause). The government promotes private space endeavors while aiming to protect the companies responsible for them. Though intended to benefit the privatization of space, these acts have created controversy internationally, and the U.S. government must therefore ensure regulation and its own fidelity.

### **Government Regulation**

Not only must the government oversee its relationship with private companies, but it must also maintain authority through national regulations. Under the Outer Space Treaty, the U.S. government has the responsibility to uphold international space law. Discussing intellectual property laws in outer space, Julie D. Cromer Young, J.D., professor at American University Washington College of Law, emphasized that the Outer Space Treaty sets overarching guidelines, but individual countries create their own domestic laws on space exploration (Young). Governments under the treaty have obligations to other countries, and therefore they must

regulate private companies to avoid inciting international legal issues stemming from contrasting interpretations of the Outer Space Treaty. These issues include both vague patent and liability laws. Lee expands on this idea, explaining that, because 'space objects' can be registered where conditions are most beneficial to the company, there is a great chance of problems in which a space company registers under one country, but services another where its technology infringes upon patent laws (Lee). While regulatory competition is, in some cases, positive in promoting the NewSpace industry, it can create international disputes based on domestic patent laws. Similarly with liability laws, Reinert explains that companies are likely to register in a country with the most lenient policies on intellectual property damages (Reinert). Under the Outer Space Treaty, both national and private endeavors, along with their hazards, are the responsibility of the state (Avveduto). However, the states offering lenient conditions are often less likely to pay damages, jeopardizing the compensation of victims (Reinert). Thus, government regulation of private space companies, as well as international collaboration, are critical in preventing international space law complications.

The U.S. government must also ensure it does not become fully dependent upon privatized companies for space exploration. Organizations such as NGOs, Non-Governmental Organizations, which are not directly related to space exploration, are able to pressure the government through lobbyists to pursue greater space exploration. In this way, government organizations themselves are regulated (Reibaldi and Grimard). Thus, the importance of maintaining a national space program remains. Young reinforces that national space programs are more stable and are essential in the event that private actors cease cooperation with the government, which could pose a safety threat (Young). Therefore government regulation and

agencies, as well as private companies, are necessary to fuel scientific advancement, the overall goal of space exploration.

### **Conclusion**

The U.S. government should overall regulate the privatization of space. While the Outer Space Treaty should remain a foundation for international space law because of its altruistic principles, it must be updated to fit the modern infrastructure of space exploration, accounting for private companies (Krause). This includes solidifying patent and liability laws. The implementation of global patent protection would mitigate degradation of patents from international competition for private companies (Lee). Additionally, holding private entities accountable for damages rather than their countries of origin would simplify and improve liability laws in space (Reinert). While limited by the requirement of large-scale cooperation of countries with individual, varying laws, these changes would make progress in updating the Outer Space Treaty, and could ultimately assist in solving the political issues of modern international space law brought about by the privatization of space.

## Works Cited

- Avveduto, Rosario. "Past, Present, and Future of Intellectual Property in Space: Old Answers to New Questions." *Washington International Law Journal*, vol. 29, no. 1, Dec. 2019, pp. 203–246. EBSCOhost, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=141353241&site=ehost-live](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=141353241&site=ehost-live).
- Dick, Steven J. "The Importance of Exploration." NASA. [www.nasa.gov/missions/solarsystem/Why\\_We\\_01pt1.html](http://www.nasa.gov/missions/solarsystem/Why_We_01pt1.html). Accessed 19 May 2021.
- Dovey, Ceridwen. "The Privatisation of Space: Does NewSpace Create Companies or Cults?" *Journal & Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, vol. 153, no. 1, July 2020, pp. 97–99. EBSCOhost, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=145102939&site=ehost-live](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=145102939&site=ehost-live).
- Hao, Liu, and Fabio Tronchetti. "The American Space Commerce Free Enterprise Act of 2017: The Latest Step in Regulating the Space Resources Utilization Industry or Something More?" *Space Policy*, vol. 47, Feb. 2019, pp. 1–6. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1016/j.spacepol.2018.02.004.
- Krause, Jason. "The Outer Space Treaty Turns 50. Can It Survive a New Space Race?" *ABA Journal*, Apr. 2017, p. 1. EBSCOhost, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=122282645&site=ehost-live](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=122282645&site=ehost-live).
- Lee, Yong Bum. "Public Space, Private Patents: Updating International Space Law to Protect Patents in Outer Space." *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, vol. 33, no. 1, Fall 2019, pp. 293–209. EBSCOhost, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=142243762&site=ehost-live](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=142243762&site=ehost-live).

- Reibaldi, Giuseppe, and Max Grimard. "Non-Governmental Organizations Importance and Future Role in Space Exploration." *Acta Astronautica*, vol. 114, Sept. 2015, pp. 130–137. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2015.04.023.
- Reinert, Alexander P. "Updating the Liability Regime in Outer Space: Why Spacefaring Companies Should Be Internationally Liable for Their Space Objects." *William & Mary Law Review*, vol. 62, no. 1, Oct. 2020, pp. 325–356. *EBSCOhost*, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=147242329&site=ehost-live](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=147242329&site=ehost-live).
- Young, Julie D. Cromer. "Charting the Course of Intellectual Property Laws in the Privatization of Outer Space." *Ateneo Law Journal*, vol. 64, no. 3, Feb. 2020, pp. 925–948. *EBSCOhost*, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=148294392&site=ehost-live](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=148294392&site=ehost-live).



The Ethiopian Wolf : Why It's Endangered And How We Can Help It

1

The Ethiopian Wolf : Why It's Endangered And How We Can Help It

AP Sem

2021

Word Count : 1,036

According to The American Wildlife Foundation, there's only around 400 left in Africa. The Ethiopian wolf is the only wolf species in Africa. They play a very important predator role in the ecosystem considering they are the apex predator. Because of this, they act as population control to other animals for example, rodents. The organization Victor Pest explains that, "As carriers of contagious diseases and hosts of infectious parasites, rodents also contaminate food supplies and spoil gardens throughout Third World and industrialized nations." The Ethiopian Wolf population has been dwindling for quite some time now, however, The American Wildlife Foundation has brought to life the severity of the problem and state that "Since 2008, this population has declined by 30 percent..." (2020). More of the general public needs to be educated and aware of the Ethiopian Wolf extinction rates because these wolves play a vital role within the ecosystem. These alarming rates are due to disease, specifically the canine distemper virus, habitat destruction, and conflict with farmers.

### **CDV - Canine Distemper Virus**

CDV or the canine distemper virus is one of the leading causes of the rapidly declining population rates of the Ethiopian Wolf. Marino 2017, who wrote an article that was published on the website for the CDC, The Center for Disease Control, talks about the disease and states that "Massive outbreaks of rabies and, more recently, canine distemper have repeatedly decimated populations of Ethiopian wolves (*Canis simensis*) in the Bale Mountains of Ethiopia, where more than half of a global population of  $\approx 500$  wolves live". The reason the canine distemper virus is so threatening is because the virus targets the respiratory, gastrointestinal, and nervous systems of the wolves causing them to die from the inside out. Christopher H Gorden 2015, who has an

affiliation with the Zoological Society of London, collected information from past CDV outbreaks amongst Ethiopian wolves and domesticated dogs. He found and that, “For the 2 CDV outbreaks combined, the death rates among subadult (85%) and adult (38%) wolves were significantly higher than the expected annual natural death rate of 15%”. This disease isn’t caught by the wolves by accidentally eating something they shouldn’t have. The Frankfurt Zoology Society tells us that, ‘the disease is transmitted to wild animals by domestic dogs living in the human settlements inside and around the park area’ (2015). The dogs come in contact with the Ethiopian wolves because the farmers have farm dogs which will then go after the wolves that are nearby. Although the wolves shouldn’t be that close to domestic areas, that’s mainly all they know. They were there before people were. Marino, the PTES, and FZS all thoroughly explain that the horrible disease’s spread from domesticated dogs to Ethiopian wolves dwindles their population. These diseases are bad but are not the only thing threatening the wolf’s population

### **Habitat Destruction**

Habitat destruction is one of the other leading causes to the rapidly declining Ethiopian Wolf population. Mekonnen, who has an affiliation with the Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis (CEES) and the Department of Biosciences, says ”Habitat loss and degradation by humans are the major threats to biodiversity worldwide”(2018). To be more specific the Rainforest Trust foundation elaborates in their article “Saving the Ethiopian Wolf from Extinction” that “The main threat to species in the Ethiopian highlands is habitat loss from human encroachment” (2021). The Rainforest Trust is a foundation that focuses on protecting threatened rainforests and saving endangered wildlife through community engagement and local partnership. An animal in specific that is losing its habitat is the Ethiopian Wolf who is native to the Ethiopian Highlands. The Rainforest Trust foundation has many solutions on their website on

how to help these animals and is a great start to saving these animals. Ethiopia still may need to expand and urbanize, however there are other options to urbanize and expand while conserving the natural habitat. All of the articles have stated that the more we encroach onto the natural conservative land, the more habitat loss there is for the animals like the Ethiopian Wolf, the more conflict and competition there is between farmers and the Ethiopian Wolf increases.

### **Conflict With Farmers**

Farmers don't like their crops spoiled or their livestock eaten, which is very understandable. However, the dogs that protect their farmland may hold diseases easily transmittable to the Ethiopian wolf like the canine distemper virus as stated before. Evenmore, The New Humanitarian is independent journalism on humanitarian crises around the world. One of their journalists states that "farmers were using poison to reduce the chances of their domestic livestock being killed and eaten by wild predators" (2002). Most poisons are directed towards other carnivorous animals such as hyenas and lions. The New Humanitarian believes that the longer farmers poison other animals for the sake of their livestock, the more devastating populations would be for all animals including the Ethiopian Wolves. There are other options to keep other wildlife out of their farm, for example secure fences. Sefi Mekonen, who has an affiliation with the Department of Biology, College of Natural and Computational Science, Debre Berhan University, Debre Berhan, Ethiopia, did a study with wildlife and human conflict. They studied the best methods to repel what they call crop raiders, or animals and destroy their crops and livestock. What they found was that "These traditional controlling techniques of the most effective methods are fencing and chasing..."(2020). Although these animals may eat

livestock, they also eat the rodents that would tear up the farmers' crops if their predators become extinct. The poisoning and conflict with farmers is shown by both Williams and (peer reviewed article author) to be one of the most harmful conflicts for the Ethiopian Wolf population.

### **Conclusion**

To sum up all that was said, many animals in west Africa are endangered and on the brink of extinction due to a loss of homeland, competition and conflict with the farmers, disease carried by domestic dogs and death from poison. It has gotten to the point where the Ethiopian Wolves are critically endangered and need our help to regain their numbers. There are many groups that you can support like the Rainforest Trust foundation that was stated before. Another one is the World Wildlife which is a group that focuses on working to help local communities conserve the natural resources they depend upon and protect and restore species and their habitats. .

## References

Africa's most endangered carnivore. (2021). African Wildlife Foundation.

<https://www.awf.org/wildlife-conservation/ethiopian-wolf#:~:text=Population%20decline%20of%20the%20Ethiopian,of%20rabies%20and%20canine%20distemper.>

Canine distemper kills ethiopian wolfs. (2015, December 17). Zoologische Gesellschaft Frankfurt.

<https://fzs.org/en/news/distemper/#:~:text=Dog%20disease%20threatens%20rare%20Ethiopian%20Wolves&text=The%20disease%20is%20transmitted%20to,around%20the%20park%20area.>

Gordon, C. H., Banyard, A., Hussein, A., Laurenson, M. K., Malcolm, J. R., Marino, J., Regassa, F., Stewart, A. E., Fooks, A. R., & Sillero-Zubiri, C. (2015, May). 404 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/404.html?aspxerrorpath=/eid/article/21/5/14-1920\\_article](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/404.html?aspxerrorpath=/eid/article/21/5/14-1920_article)

Marino, J., Sillero-Zubiri, C., Deressa, A., Bedin, E., Bitewa, A., Lema, F., Rskay, G., Banyard, A., & Fooks, A. R. (2017, December). 404 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal. CDC.

[https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/404.html?aspxerrorpath=/eid/article/23/12/17-0893\\_article#:~:text=Massive%20outbreaks%20of%20rabies%20and,live%20\(2%2C3\).](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/404.html?aspxerrorpath=/eid/article/23/12/17-0893_article#:~:text=Massive%20outbreaks%20of%20rabies%20and,live%20(2%2C3).)

Mekonen, S. (2020, September 14). Coexistence between human and wildlife: the nature, causes and mitigations of human wildlife conflict around Bale Mountains National Park,

Southeast Ethiopia. BMC Ecology.

<https://bmcecol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12898-020-00319-1>

Mekonnen, A., Fashing, P. J., Bekele, A., Hernandez-Aguilar, A. R., Rueness, E. K., & Stenseth, N. C. (2018, February 6). Dietary flexibility of Bale monkeys (*Chlorocebus djamdjamensis*) in southern Ethiopia: effects of habitat degradation and life in fragments.

BMC Ecology. <https://bmcecol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12898-018-0161-4>

Rainforest Trust. (2019, April 5). Saving the Ethiopian Wolf from Extinction. Rainforest Trust Saves Rainforest.

<https://www.rainforesttrust.org/projects/saving-the-ethiopian-wolf-from-extinction/#:%7E:text=The%20main%20threat%20to%20species,wolves%20for%20perceived%20livestock%20predation.>

The New Humanitarian. (2002, July 8). Rare Ethiopian wolf at risk.

<https://www.thenewhumanitarian.org/report/32867/ethiopia-rare-ethiopian-wolf-risk>

Victor Pest. (n.d.). The Economic Ill-Effects of Rodent Infestation. Victorpest.Com.

<https://www.victorpest.com/articles/economic-effects-of-rodent-infestation>

## Censorship

Censorship is the prohibition of books, films, shows, news, etc. if they are proved inappropriate, or obscure. It is crazy how much the world has changed over the last few years, and It is even crazier that part of it is because of how much censorship is being put out there. According to Wikipedia, censorship started in the 1620's when a book was first reviewed and censored. There are many ways that censorship has impacted the world, and one of those examples is culture. Everything in this world is censored somehow because everyone wants to make this world look perfect when in fact it is beyond imperfect. Culture has been one of the most impacted aspects from censorship because culture is history and it should be exposed not hidden. Censorship can negatively affect the population of a nation on a cultural level by displaying fake concepts about other countries' cultures, censoring churches/religions, and censoring art.

Displaying fake concepts about a countries' culture is something people do to portray other countries as something they are not. Gale academic states, "Islam is a peaceful religion. However, as much as power restrains freedom of thought, it may often be regarded as 'censorship', hence the work's title", this is an example of how everyone thinks of islam as a very censored and insecure land when It is actually much more than that. There are families that live there fine and they have their own world that is perfect to them. The main source that displays those fake concepts about cultures is social media because everything goes around and they block out parts of the information. The high power countries like the U.S., Russia, China, etc., are usually the ones displaying those fake concepts of other countries' cultures. It affects



everyone because lies can go around, or those small countries could have no chance of presenting how good they are.

Religions have always been something that people have fought and discussed about, and because that topic has always been common, people seem to censor parts about it. Religious Censorship has a long history and is practiced in many societies and by many religions. Censoring churches and religions is something that a lot of people do because they want other people to follow a different religion, but doing that causes chaos between the churches. Religions have censorship where they have to control and limit freedom of expression because it can be inappropriate. Censoring churches affects people in a negative way because they are not able to express their religions for the reason that anything out of hand gets censored, so they can not feel too powerful and in control. Destroying historical places is also another form of religious censorship because things like artifacts, monuments, buildings, etc., come from religions from back then in history.

Many would agree that censorship has greatly impacted art all over the world. Art is history and It is a way of expressing a culture's beliefs, traditions, and ways of life. There are many things that are considered art like for example, sculpting, painting, drawing, modeling, theatre, dancing, etc. Those are all considered art forms and they are the base of many cultures and censorship has taken over by blocking them from society. The Oaxaca's review article states, "That's why it is important to create quality work, so people embrace it before the government comes and takes it down." That is an example of how censorship is taking away the arts of history, and impacting the cultural aspects of the art. People such as the government, top leaders, ect., try to censor everything they can because it "damages" the society, but what they do not realize is that a lot of what they censor comes from other countries, and cultures.

To sum up, censorship negatively affects the population of a nation through a cultural lense by displaying fake concepts about other countries' cultures, as in higher economically stable countries taking advantage of smaller countries, and censoring them for higher power. The second one, censoring churches and religions where they block churches from saying too much, or expressing their beliefs as if they were the only right on mind. The final topic is censoring art because it not only affects the people from different cultures, but it affects their background.

## Works Cited

BBC, "Cultural censorship: Five debated works"

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/2TssTR65PnSXRvP4IKPj30D/cultural-censorship-five-debated-works>

Censorship Effects on Society, Posted on November 18, 2014 by aqr5261,

<https://sites.psu.edu/worldwidewomen/censorship-effects-on-society/>

Claudia W. Ruitenberg (2008) B Is For *Burqa*, C Is For Censorship: The Miseducative Effects of Censoring Muslim Girls and Women's Sartorial Discourse, *Educational Studies*, 43:1, 17-28, DOI: 10.1080/00131940701796202

Forbes, "How Is Internet Censorship Affecting Chinese Culture?" published Jul 10, 2018.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2018/07/10/how-is-internet-censorship-affecting-chinese-culture/?sh=6eb74221fcb0>

Joowon Yuk (2019) Cultural censorship in defective democracy: the South Korean blacklist case, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 25:1, 33-47, DOI:

10.1080/10286632.2018.1557644

Kissel, Adam. "Campus Free Speech: A Cultural Approach." *AEI Paper & Studies*, American Enterprise Institute, 2020, p. 1d+. *Gale Academic OneFile*,

[link.gale.com/apps/doc/A645903950/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=f86bb14e](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A645903950/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=f86bb14e).

Accessed 7 Jan. 2021.

- Mixon, Candace. "Gender and Patriarchy in the Films of Muslim Nations: A Filmographic Study of 21st Century Features from Eight Countries." *Journal of Religion and Film*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2020, p. COV5+. *Gale Academic OneFile*, [link.gale.com/apps/doc/A642349729/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=25a63e6d](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A642349729/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=25a63e6d). Accessed 11 Jan. 2021.
- Romanowski, William D. "A tale of two movies: Protestants, Catholics, and prior censorship in post-World War II Hollywood." *Cinema Journal*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2017, p. 74+. *Gale Academic OneFile*, [link.gale.com/apps/doc/A491136660/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=120f79e8](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A491136660/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=120f79e8). Accessed 7 Jan. 2021.
- Shankland, David. "Mostyn, Trevor. Censorship in Islamic societies." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2003, p. 580+. *Gale Academic OneFile*, [link.gale.com/apps/doc/A108551427/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=2d166870](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A108551427/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=2d166870). Accessed 7 Jan. 2021.
- Whatley, Edward. "Freedom of Speech: Reflections in Art and Popular Culture." *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, vol. 57, no. 3, Spring 2018, p. 226. *Gale Academic OneFile*, [link.gale.com/apps/doc/A533698065/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=bd92033e](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A533698065/AONE?u=j165901&sid=AONE&xid=bd92033e). Accessed 7 Jan. 2021.

## Performance Task 1 Individual Research Report

**Note:** Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

### Overview

This task assessed the student’s ability to:

- Investigate a particular approach or range of perspectives on a research topic selected by a student team;
- Conduct scholarly research relevant to the topic; and
- Produce an evaluative report on the research conducted, analyzing the reasoning within the sources as well as the relevance and credibility of evidence used in those sources.

### Sample: A

**1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 6**

**2 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 6**

**3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 6**

**4 Understand and Analyze Perspective Score: 6**

**5 Apply Conventions Score: 3**

**6 Apply Conventions Score: 3**

### Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context

The report earned a score of **6** for this row because its title identifies an issue (privatization of space) and further indicates that it will focus on political implications. The introduction further refines the inquiry, establishing the role that private companies play in space exploration and advancement of science, before moving on to the question of potential government regulation of the private space sector. The bibliography anchors the discussion primarily in a variety of law reviews. The significance of the problem is established in the introduction using arguments from “NASA’s Chief Historian” and three law reviews.

### Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The report earned a score of **6** for this row because it provides commentary that explains the authors’ reasoning. For example, in the first paragraph after the introduction, after presenting evidence from Lee about registering “space objects,” the report explains that governments benefit from knowledge obtained from private companies and that this knowledge “increases political prestige internationally.” It continues to explain the pros and cons of this partnership between private corporations and government. While the analysis on occasion in the opening paragraphs repeats rather than develops, there is ample and consistent evidence as the report unfolds that the writer understands reasoning in the sources.

### Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The report earned a score of **6** for this row because it draws primarily from well-selected relevant and credible, peer-reviewed journals. It consistently uses them to compose a coherent narrative from the research studied. The source of information is always clear.

### Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The report earned a score of **6** for this row because it consistently and explicitly places sources in conversation and makes good use of topical headings to organize these conversations. For example, under the “Government Regulation” heading, the report begins with Young’s perspective that under the Outer Space treaty, governments “have obligations to other countries” to “regulate private companies to avoid inciting international legal issues.” The report then shows how Lee concurs, particularly in cases in which a company’s service “infringes upon patent laws” in another country. The section continues to develop the nuances of this topic.

## **Performance Task 1 Individual Research Report**

### **Row 5: Apply Conventions (Attribution)**

The report earned a score of **3** for this row because the Works Cited is logically organized, and in-text citations provide for successful links to the bibliography. Essential elements for citations are present, making clear the type and origin of each source. Attribution within the text is clear. (There is some confusion of Western and Chinese naming conventions with the Hao source, but the link is clear.)

### **Row 6: Apply Conventions (Style)**

The report earned a score of **3** for this row because, with few exceptions, the writing is clear, precise, and capable of communicating complex ideas.

## Performance Task 1 Individual Research Report

### Sample: B

**1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 4**

**2 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 4**

**3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 4**

**4 Understand and Analyze Perspective Score: 4**

**5 Apply Conventions Score: 2**

**6 Apply Conventions Score: 2**

### Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context

The report earned a score of **4** for this row because it declares an adequate focus on the declining Ethiopian wolf populations. The report undertakes an examination of many aspects of the problem (canine distemper virus, habitat destruction, and conflict with farmers), without consistently delving into the complexities of any one of these. The report rests largely on information or studies derived from advocacy groups or other organizations. It offers a generalized rationale for addressing the problem (i.e., the wolf “plays a vital role within the ecosystem”).

### Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The report earned a score of **4** for this row because it summarizes sources’ arguments and offers some effective tracing of the reasoning of the sources. For example, “The reason ... is because ... causing” (p.2) Or on p. 4, “Ethiopia still may need to expand and urbanize, however there are other options to urbanize and expand while conserving the natural habitat.” Elsewhere, the commentary is more general. For example, on p. 3, “Although the wolves shouldn’t be that close to domestic areas, that’s mainly all they know. They were there before people were.” In still other places, the commentary points generally to material from sources (e.g., “The Rainforest Trust foundation has many solutions on their website” (p. 3).

### Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The report earned a score of **4** for this row because there is some evidence of evaluation of credibility and relevance. For example, the report explains that The Rainforest Trust is a “foundation that focuses on protecting threatened rainforests and saving endangered wildlife through community engagement and local partnership” (p. 3). In some instances, references to sources are merely descriptive (e.g., Frankfurt Zoological Society or Victor Pest). The report does not make a strong case for the reliance on advocacy groups or other organizations.

### Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The report earned a score of **4** because a number of perspectives from stakeholders were explicitly mentioned, including points of view of farmers, landowners, advocacy groups (and research derived from advocacy groups). Connections among these perspectives are inconsistently made. For instance, the report only generally explains the relationship among three sources: “Marino, the PTES, and FZS all thoroughly explain that the horrible disease’s spread from domesticated dogs to Ethiopian wolves dwindles their population. These diseases are bad but are not the only thing threatening the wolf’s population” (p. 3).

### Row 5: Apply Conventions (Attribution)

The report earned a score of **2** for this row because the citations are generally clear and oftentimes connect directly to the information in the paper. However, many citations are missing the publisher and title information, and the report is overly reliant on URLs. While many of the internal citations match to the bibliography, some do so unclearly. For example, “American Wildlife Foundation” is not listed in the bibliography and is a prominent source within the paper. In the second to last paragraph, the response states that “The poisoning and conflict with farmers is shown by both Williams and (peer reviewed article author) ...,” without any explanation of who Williams is or a citation in the References section.

## **Performance Task 1 Individual Research Report**

### **Row 6: Apply Conventions (Style)**

The report earned a score of **2** for this row because the prose, with some notable exceptions, is generally clear. However, the report often relies on general word choice (e.g., “Farmers don’t like crops spoiled or their livestock eaten, which is very understandable”) and imprecise language (“a lot,” “These diseases are bad but are not the only thing threatening the wolf’s population”).



## Performance Task 1 Individual Research Report

### Sample: C

**1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 2**

**2 Understand and Analyze Argument Score: 2**

**3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 2**

**4 Understand and Analyze Perspective Score: 2**

**5 Apply Conventions Score: 1**

**6 Apply Conventions Score: 1**

### Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because it identifies an overly broad topic (censorship or censorship and culture). The introduction does make gestures toward narrowing the scope of the investigation to include three subtopics (“fake concepts about a countries’ culture,” “censoring churches/religions,” and “censoring art”). However, within the report, these categories are only addressed very generally. Although there is a great deal of research reflected in the Works Cited page, the report does not successfully anchor discussion to the sources (i.e., the report is not contextualized in the research). The rationale for the investigation is oversimplified and unsupported: “Culture has been one of the most impacted aspects from censorship because culture is history and it should be exposed not hidden.”

### Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because there is no clear anchoring of arguments to sources. For example, while the two attributive tags present direct readers to “Gale academic” and the “oaxaca review article,” internal citations do not make the specific sources clear. Commentary is only obliquely related to sources.

### Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because the Works Cited provides some evidence of well-selected sources. However, the body of the report only vaguely draws from two of those sources, and the two sources used are not evaluated in terms of credibility or relevance to the subtopic under discussion.

### Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because it identifies only two points of view from sources (about censorship and Islam and about art being taken down). The report does not connect them.

### Row 5: Apply Conventions (Attribution)

The report earned a score of 1 for this row because, while the Works Cited page demonstrates some citation skills, attributive phrasing is poor, and there is no evidence of successful linking of sources in the Works Cited with the report’s discussion.

### Row 6: Apply Conventions (Style)

The report earned a score of 1 for this row because there are numerous instances where sentences are not controlled. Word choice is frequently overly broad and simplistic.