2016학년도 수시모집 논술전형 논술고사 출제 영역 및 채점기준
- 경제통상대학 국제학부 -

시험유형	영어강의 듣기(30분) + 영어에세이 작성(70분)

1. 출제의도 및 문제해설

[제시문 1]

1. Students will consider the best response to climate change's negative impact on developing countries.
2. Students will consider whether the current generation of residents in developed countries should be responsible for greenhouse gasses produced by prior generations.
3. Students will learn how to better analyze the ongoing debate over aid to developing countries.
4. Students will address an issue that will be the subject of the UN's Paris Climate Conference, in November-December 2015.

[제시문 2]

1. Students will examine the changes in the South Korean economy since the end of the Korean War.(Economics & Korean History)
2. Students will examine factors involved in economic development and will assess issues facing the Korean economy today.(Economics)
3. Students will employ their understanding of world history to identify flaws in reasons attributed to Korea's economic growth.(World History and Social Studies)

2. 종합평가 기준

문항	문항정보 필수항목						
	문항별						
	교과목명	평가영역	평가내용	적용교육과정	성취기준	난이도	배점
1	영어	듣기영역	세부내용파악	09개정교육과정	영어Ⅱ - 듣기영역 - ② 세부내용을 파악 한다 - ②-1. 다양한 주제에 관한 말이나 대화를 듣고 세부 정보를 파악한다. - 영고28121-1. 다양한 주제에 관해 설명하는 말이나 대화를 듣고 세부 내용을 파악할 수 있다.	중상	100
		쓰기영역	의견이나 감정 표현		영어 Ⅱ - 쓰기영역 - ③ 의견이나 감정을 쓴다 - ③-1. 일반적 주제에 관해 자신의 의견이나 감정을 쓴다. -영고28431-1. 일반적인 주제에 관해 자신의 의견을 표현하는 글을 쓸 수 있다.	중상	

제시문별 세부 채점기준

rubric of 1st question

100-90

Substantively, the answer shows full comprehension of the question and all or almost all of the lecture. The answer references and uses facts/arguments from the lecture. But, the answer adds to the lecture's basic point that the negative impact of climate change mostly falls on less developed countries (LDCs) and industrialization mostly benefited developed countries (DCs), thus justifying DC àLDC compensation.

Additional points, not covered in the lecture, include the following: 1) The pros and cons of different types of payments. Payments which help LDCs reduce pollutants is a 'global good,' benefiting DCs as well as LDCs. Payments which help LDCs deal with the specific effects of climate change (e.g., flooding) might be more acceptable to DCs than general payments for the negative effects of climate change. 2) Should all LDCs be treated the same? What about China and India? 3) What are specific policy solutions for helping LDCs deal with the costs related to climate change? Should there be an international organization to manage DCs' payments? How will we ensure that the payments are used for this purpose and not for other purposes? Students may have additional, original points. 4) Even if DCs countries only recently became aware of climate change and its negative effects, they largely continue 'business as usual.' 5) Beyond the LDCs' right to compensation, there is a moral argument for helping suffering people.

Stylistically, the argument is clear, logical, practical, and well supported with specifics. The argument shows thought and organization before writing, rather than just free-range thinking. Fewer, detailed, organized arguments are better than several broad, conclusory statements. The English is average to good, relative to our students. But the highest score does not require perfect or even the best English. Substance is most important.

89-80

Substantively, the answer shows a complete or majority comprehension of the question, but it is not clear that the student fully understood the lecture or the student has not sufficiently fully integrated the lecture into her arguments. The student takes and defends a position, but does not cover enough of the points listed in the 100-90 category or fails to add her own original ideas. The argument is not especially clear, specific, logical, practical, but is still a good essay.

Stylistically, a greater effort is required to understand the writing, but the answer is still well organized, reveals thought before writing, and is clear. Their English is average or somewhat below average compared to our department's students.

These students will not be the best, but you see potential for them to become very good students in the department.

79-70

Substantively, the answer shows some comprehension of the question and understanding of the lecture. However, the answer may not reference or barely reference the lecture or it may simply repeat the lecture, showing little or no originality. This student is someone who would likely get a C in your classes.

Stylistically, the student is struggling to communicate and you struggle to understand/follow the argument. These answers may be unclear, go off topic, and show little effort to organize the answer before beginning to write. The English is below average, though mostly understandable.

69-60

Substantively, the answer shows little comprehension of the question and does not reference the lecture at all. The answer is too short, disorganized, or empty. The student may mention some interesting things, but she is off topic – does not answer the question. Even if English or other writing skills are good, the essay is so lacking in content that you see no potential. The student would likely receive a D in your class.

Stylistically, the student's writing skills are neither up to our standards, nor indicate an ability to sufficiently improve without great and unlikely effort. Their English is well below that of our department's students.

59-0

No response or so little it cannot be evaluated. You lack a basis to make a judgment, or it is clear that the student would not be able to complete our program.

rubric of 2nd question

The highest score does not require perfect or even the best English. If a student surprises us with a fresh or interesting perspective then we should overlook grammatical or mechanical English errors.

100-90 Shows full comprehension of the two questions and all or most of the lecture. The answers to both questions are clear and logical. It is organized, has excellent to very good English (relative to students in our department), and shows the qualities valued in our department. They are comprehensive and specific in their writing. Their essays are easy to read and display the ability to articulate original thoughts without simple regurgitation of lecture wording.

Question 1: The student presents and discusses all six factors presented in the lecture: 1. Education, 2. Government Economic Planning, 3.Foreign Aid, 4. The Labor Force, 5.The Chaebol-Industrialization Organization and 6.The World Economic Climate. Extra consideration should be given if they also give other legitimate economic, political, business, and/or social reasons for Korea's rise(40 pts)

Question 2: discusses flaws in two of the six factors given to explain Korea's economic rise with specificity. Refer to the ANSWER KEY for general argument points for each factor. Extra points should be allotted for students who add other arguments including: 1) the Government's over subsidizing certain favored companies and industries or 2)The pressures placed on less favored companies and small-to-medium-sized companies that have resulted in chaebols dominating markets and hindering greater economic growth (60 pts).

Guideline -Score 30 pts max. for each argument-

89-80 Shows full or majority comprehension of the questions,

(They leave a positive impression and you see some potential that we can work with in our dept.)

Question 1: Student presents all or almost all of the six factors presented. However, it is not clear if they understood the entire lecture. For example, there is reference to at least 4-5 factors but they do not provide comprehensive answers.

Question 2: Student 1) has less originality in coming up with arguments or 2) does not address flaws in at least two arguments. The answers are less specific, more conclusory, not as well supported, and do not flow as well. The writing is clear and most of it is understandable.

79-70 Shows some comprehension of the questions and limited understanding of the lecture.

(They do not leave any impression at all or somewhat of a negative impression. There is little to no potential.)

Question 1:There is incomplete reference to the six factors (i.e., less than 4 stated) and no specificity. You find yourself working too hard to understand their writing.

Question 2: Student 1) has less originality in coming up with arguments or 2) does not address flaws in at least two arguments. The answers are less specific, more conclusory, and do not flow as well

69-60 Shows little comprehension of the two questions and provides limited reference the lecture at all. (They leave a definite negative impression; you see no potential.)

There is nothing of interest to save their limited writing skills or their writing skills are good but They seem to lack English and/or basic conceptual ideas.

59-0 No responses or so little it cannot be evaluated. Lacking any basis to make a judgment.