

Labels are for Life: The Impact of Labeling a Minor Psychological Disorder Annotated Rubric Score

ROW ONE: The response earned 4 points for this row because it identifies a research question of reasonable scope ("Labels for Life: The Impact of Labeling a Minor Psychological Disorder "). However, the question is only tangentially related (p. 5, par. 1) and while the source is cited, there is not effective commentary on the connection to the stimulus materials or to the theme. In [this document](#), look for the YELLOW highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW TWO: The response earned 4 points for this row because it identifies multiple perspectives in the discussion, including social perspective, legal ramifications, and various facets within these realms. The essay inconsistently evaluates both sides of the implications or limitations of the various perspectives and too few opposing viewpoints are offered. Some views are not pertinent to the central response. For example, the Myers quote about discomfort with interracial marriage lacks a connection with either perspective and no alternate perspective is offered. In [this document](#), look for the GREEN highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW THREE: The response earned 4 points for this row because it interprets and synthesizes evidence from a wide range of sources, but conclusions may not be accurately synthesized. For example, Sack's research is referenced to mention that patients are not obligated to disclose mental illness in the workplace, and the response draws the conclusion that society unjustly discriminates against people with minor psychological disorders. In [this document](#), look for the BLUE highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW FOUR: The response earned 4 points for this row because it distinguishes among various pieces of evidence in terms of their credibility, and while it does not explicitly address relevance of each source, the evidence from the source makes relevance clear. While the response gives credentials for the sources, (such as Link, Myer, and Kagan's research) it does not address the credibility of the evidence itself, or offer any indication of rationale for inclusion of the evidence as a foundation for the argument. The essay has an extensive works cited comprised of scholarly and peer reviewed journals. In [this document](#), look for the RED highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW FIVE: The response earned 4 points for this row because it is logically organized in general, and while the reasoning is not faulty, it is simplistic. The conclusions offered, such as the need for accurate diagnoses and label rejection are overly generalized or are restatements of existing findings. In [this document](#), look for the PINK highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW SIX: The response earned 4 points for this row because it links claims and evidence in a number of places, but inconsistently. It cites Kagan's claim that diagnosis has increased over the past fifty years and claims the reason the diagnosis is faulty is because it is based on patient self-description of feelings, but fails to develop this with further commentary. While the essay offers both claims and evidence to support those claims, it uses minimal commentary to link the two. In [this document](#), look for the GREY highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW SEVEN: The response earned 2 points for this row because it attributes and cites most of the sources and information with a reasonable amount of accuracy, and while there are both stylistic and mechanical errors, these are relatively minor. The bibliography appears to be consistent and complete. In [this document](#), look for the TEAL BLUE highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW EIGHT: The response earned 2 points for this row because it contains minor issues or inconsistencies in grammar and some stylistic flaws, but these minimally interfere with communication to the reader. These instances are not present throughout the response. In [this document](#), look for the OLIVE GREEN highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.