**Should the Fair Labor Standards Act be modified to limit the amount of hours worked per week?**

Row 1: 5/5

The response earned 5 points for its incorporation of the stimulus documents. Although the response references both "A World without Work" and "Long Working Hours and Cancer Risk," the response is more successful with its inclusion of the latter source. Its treatment of this document is more integral to the overall argument of the paper--since the source is integrated into the author's overall claims regarding the connection between long working hours and the "health risks of working overtime"--than the paper's discussion of "A World Without Work," which reads as more descriptive in nature. The purposeful integration of "Long Working Hours and Cancer Risk" establishes the relevance of introducing the health effects of working time.

Row 2: 0/5

The response earned 0 points because of its misaligned and general context. In its introduction, the response asserts a general connection between health and work (i.e., “health does not particularly coincide with work until it becomes a major problem”). It then goes on to give a specific example of doctors working long hours and then asserts its question about the Fair Labor Standards Act, without any context indicating why the act itself is in question or why the response is focusing specifically on that act. While it provides some details about the act thereafter, the response tries to convey the controversy surrounding restricting the number of hours in a very general and broad way: “While there are serious health concerns associated with overtime work, it must be addressed that there are large benefits that result from it.”

Row 3: 6/9

The response earns 6 points in this rubric row because while it does convey multiple perspectives, the comparison, as well as the evaluation, of the perspectives is limited. For example, within the economic perspective, the response recognizes both positive and negative attitudes toward working overtime, noting that some employees gain an economic advantage meanwhile others perceive the economic costs associated with it. However, the comparison between the perspectives is general: “they provide an alternative perspective, one more oriented towards the health and the productivity of workers.” The negative health effects and economic benefits are treated separately, but the response still asserts that “while…it must be noted that working overtimes does, in fact, promote economic growth, the detrimental effects on the health and productivity of workers are much more significant.” The response does not elaborate on the limitations of understanding the issue through a strictly economic perspective, but rather asserts that it should be dismissed without explanation.

Row 4: 8/12

he response earned 8 points because while the response has a discernible organization, it is often characterized by faulty logic. The response begins by establishing the existence of a problem by showing the health impacts related with working overtime, moves to a discussion of the reasons why people work overtime, and then delves into a solution. However, the reasoning within those sections is problematic, and the connections between the different sections are not explicit. For example, at the beginning of the “Health” section, the response uses the “Long Working Hours” source to demonstrate the “serious and extremely detrimental effects on the body.” It then uses the Thompson source to show the “very real consequences” of these effects; however, the Thompson source elaborates on the effect of people not working, which indicates a problem in the response’s reasoning.

Furthermore, the response is sometimes driven by evidence. For example statements like, "the Johnson Foundation, which is commissioned for the promotion of worker health, also supports this," and "additionally, it is argued that working overtime also promotes economic growth. In the Northern Ireland Business Info sponsored by the Northern Ireland Executive, an administrative branch of the legislature of the Northern Ireland Assembly, it is proposed that overtime provides..." are emblematic of the nature of the response in demonstrating that much of the response is comprised of quotes or paraphrased material from its source documents.

The response does present a multi-pronged approach for a solution that addresses the research question; however, there are few details that facilitate an assessment of the solution’s plausibility.

Row 5: 6/9

 The response earned 6 points because it incorporates evidence from a range of sources and uses information from those sources to support the thesis that the FLSA requires an amendment to cover overtime work. The Works Cited page reflects sources from The British Journal of Cancer, the International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, and the US Department of Labor.

Furthermore, when the relevance of the source is not obvious, the response either does not make a case for its relevance, or the case made is not compelling. For example, the response acknowledges that the source from the Netherlands is “produced elsewhere,” it does not assert why the geographical difference “does not affect the application of the results in the US.” The response also uses a source from Northern Ireland without making a case for its relevance at all.

Row 6: 3/5

The response earned 3 points because the response cites sources, but not always completely. Pertinent bibliographic information is missing from the entries on the Works Cited page, particularly with the entries for Robert Hart, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and Derek Thompson.

Row 7: 2/3

This response earned 2 points because while it is mostly readable, some of the prose is cumbersome. For example, the response writes, “In the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Mental Health and Work: Impact, Issues and Good Practices, through analysis from Strategies, employment, mental illness: strategies to secure and maintain employment for people with long-term mental illness by the United States National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), determined that the burden of mental health disorders on health and productivity has long been underestimated.”