



POWERPREP[®] Online Practice Test 1

Scored Sample Essays with Rater Commentary for the
Analytical Writing Task

Topic – Practice Test 1

“A nation should require all of its students to study the same national curriculum until they enter college.”

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the recommendation and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, describe specific circumstances in which adopting the recommendation would or would not be advantageous and explain how these examples shape your position.

Note: All responses are reproduced exactly as written, including errors, misspellings, etc., if any.

Score 6

Essay Response

Nations should not require that all students study the same national curriculum. If every child were presented with the same material, it would assume that all children learn the same and that all teachers are capable of teaching the same material in the same way. In addition to neglecting differences in learning and teaching styles, it would also stifle creativity and create a generation of drones. The uniformity would also lend itself to governmental meddling in curriculum that could result in the destruction of democracy. If every teacher is forced to teach a certain text, the government need only change that text to misinform an entire generation. Lastly, a standardized curriculum would also adversely affect students who come from lower income families or families who have little education as they might not have as many resources for learning outside of school.

Children all learn in very different ways. If the curriculum is standardized completely, it leaves little room for exploratory learning. One child may learn how to spell from reading, another may learn from phonics. If the curriculum is standardized, suppose one aspect is dropped, that may exclude certain children from learning adequately. This is not to say of course that there shouldn't be requirements, but they should be general requirements, not something so specific as a curriculum. Especially at the high school level this would be detrimental to the variety of subjects that a student can learn. Standards and the “No Child Left Behind” act in America are already forcing the reduction in programs such as art and music that have a less defineable curriculum. Additionally, education systems are rarely funded well enough to achieve the general goal of educating children. If a national curriculum were implemented, would it come with a significant increase in financial support? History suggests that it would not.

Teachers also have different methods of teaching; if say, the English curriculum of all high schools were standardized, then a book that one teacher teaches excellently and therefore inspires students to read more and learn on their own might be eliminated, and although that teacher ought to be capable enough to teach the curriculum books, his or her students will still be missing out on what might have been a great learning experience. It also limits how much of the teacher's unique knowledge he or she can bring to the classroom. It is these inspirational books or experiences that allow teachers to reach students; if they are put in a mold, the quality of teaching and learning will go down.

Learning should be enjoyable and children and adolescents should be taught not only the curriculum in school, but that the body of knowledge that exists in the world today is enormous and that you can learn your whole life. Having a national curriculum implies that there is a set group of things worth learning for every person. Maybe this is true, but for students, it sets up a world where there is a finite amount of knowledge to be acquired for the purpose of regurgitating it on a test. Teaching a standard curriculum doesn't encourage inquiries; it doesn't make students ask questions like, "Why?" and "How?" School's real purpose is teaching people to learn, not just teaching them a set group of facts. By teaching them to learn, students can continue doing so, they can extend skills from one area of knowledge to another. This type of learning fosters creativity that can be used not only in math or science or English, but in art or music or creative writing. Teaching a brain to go beyond being a file cabinet for facts is the best way to teach creativity. Creativity is too often assumed to be something only for the arts. It is creativity that results in innovation and it is innovation that has resulted in the greatest achievements of humanity in the sciences and humanities alike.

Finally, the education system of a country is designed to put all children on a level playing field. Though this is only an ideal, it is a noble ideal. If the school curriculum becomes standardized, children who have highly educated parents, or more money to buy books outside of school, or more resources for tutors or private schools will immediately gain a foothold. Poorer students from uneducated families in the current American school system are already at a disadvantage, but at least now there is hope through variety that something can reach out to them and inspire them. There is hope that they can find a class that interests them. If the curriculum becomes rigid and standardized, it is these disadvantaged students who fall through the cracks.

There are many reasons not to standardize the curriculum. The uniqueness of students and teachers is the most obvious, but students from less educated backgrounds will suffer the most. The creativity of a nation as a whole would fall with a standardized curriculum. Most importantly though is the question of who and what? Who chooses the curriculum? What is important enough that it must be taught? These questions assume that there is some infallible committee that can foresee all and know what knowledge will be important in everyone's lives. There is no person, no group, no committee capable of deciding what knowledge is necessary. Curriculum should have standards, not be standardized and education should be as much about knowledge as it about learning to learn.

Reader Commentary

This outstanding response develops an articulate and insightful position rejecting the prompt's recommendation of a national curriculum. The writer understands a national curriculum to mean both the material that is taught and the way it is taught. The essay offers a wide-ranging discussion of the practical and theoretical implications of a national curriculum for students, for teachers, and for a nation. For example, the response argues that prescribing particular content and teaching methods might make it more difficult for teachers to tailor lessons to students with different learning styles and might also force effective teachers to adopt teaching methods that are less effective for them and their students. Although the essay clearly rejects the recommendation for a national curriculum, the writer does concede that there is a need for educational standards that are flexible enough to allow for individual, socioeconomic, and regional differences.

The response maintains a well-focused, well-organized discussion, developing each point fully and connecting ideas logically without relying on obvious transitional phrases. The writing is fluent, despite minor errors in grammar and mechanics; sentence structure is varied and diction is effective. In sum, this response meets all of the criteria for a score of 6.

Score 5

Essay Response

While it may be to the advantage of a nation that all its students learn the same basic information, this can be accomplished without going to the lengths of having a national curriculum. By requiring that all students know a certain amount in basic areas of knowledge without specifying the details, a nation can achieve the same benefits of a national curriculum without unduly denying the freedom of teachers to teach as they see fit. A system of simple national standards is good enough. To go further and create a full-fledged national curriculum would gain nothing and impair the ability of teachers.

It is important to ensure that all students learn the fundamentals of different subject areas. In order to graduate from high school, for example, all students should have a good understanding of algebra, of basic concepts in science and history, and an ability to read critically. These are skills that will benefit people in all kinds of different careers. Even if you never manipulate an equation after graduating from high school, you will have a far better understanding of the world around you if you know simple facts of math and science. Fields such as English and history are even more important, as they are absolutely necessary to maintain an informed citizenry capable of making important decisions that all citizens of a democracy are called upon to make. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to have national standards of education. Most teachers are very capable of imparting knowledge on students, and most school boards are similarly well-intentioned. Nevertheless, without national standards, some students are bound to fall through the cracks, and some school boards, under pressure from groups of parents, may eliminate certain subject matter from schools, as has happened recently with the teaching of evolution in conservative areas of the United States. In order to ensure that all students learn all that they need to know as functioning adults, some kind of national standards should be in place.

These national standards, however, need not go so far as to constitute a single national curriculum. No one knows a class of students better than its teachers, and no one else can shape a curriculum for their maximum benefit. A national curriculum would necessarily mean a one-size-fits-all approach, and what is appropriate in one classroom may not be in another. Partly this is a result of the intellectual levels of the students in question: some may be able to learn far more about a particular subject than others. But it is also a question of student goals. The desire for specialization begins before college. A student who wants to become an auto mechanic should be able to take auto shop classes, classes which would not be of interest to a future lawyer or scientist. This notion may sound unacceptably elitist in today's climate in which a college education has become almost an automatic goal of education, but it does not need to be this way. Students with limited interest in higher education should be able to opt out, to follow another curriculum that is more likely to lead to happiness later in life. As a society, we should not discourage them, but rather ensure that there are enough high-paying jobs available for skilled laborers with high school diplomas.

Everyone needs certain basic knowledge in order to function in society today. To this extent, we need national standards of instruction for students. But we do not need to cram every student into the same classes and force them to learn what we think is best for them.

Reader Commentary

This strong response presents a generally thoughtful, well-developed analysis of the issue and conveys meaning clearly. The introductory paragraph clearly disagrees with the prompt's recommendation: "By requiring that all students know a certain amount in basic areas of knowledge without specifying the details, a nation can achieve the same benefits of a national curriculum without unduly denying the freedom of teachers to teach as they see fit." The writer supports this position by first arguing for the necessity of national standards, citing the individual's need for fundamental knowledge in core areas, and by asserting that such knowledge makes for an informed, thoughtful citizenry. The discussion furthers this argument by examining some of the disadvantages of a rigid national curriculum, namely the inability of a national curriculum to accommodate students' individual needs and interests.

The response develops its position with strong reasons and examples, though these reasons and examples are not always fully developed. For example, the response asserts that knowledge of English and history is "absolutely necessary to maintain an informed citizenry" and that "in order to achieve this, it is necessary to have national standards of education," but it never really explains how or why national standards would result in better-informed citizens than regional standards or a national curriculum would.

The response maintains a clear focus and organization with clear and logical transitions. Although the response conveys ideas clearly and demonstrates facility with standard written English, it lacks the precision of expression necessary for the highest score. In sum, this response demonstrates all of the characteristics required to earn a score of 5.

Score 4

Essay Response

As an educator, this topic is quite controversial to me. By having one set curriculum in the entire nation, students would be taught the same material. Students from the rural Texas will study the same thing as students in Brooklyn, NY and suburban Chicago. If they move from state to state, they will have covered the same material and they would be able to participate in class right away. You could also say that all students should have learned the same material, for which they should all be equal and should have the same opportunities. But it is unrealistic. I disagree with a national curriculum because all students are not the same, they have different interests, and this curriculum would not permit teachers to explore and teach to students interests.

First, a curriculum that becomes nation wide is supposed to teach all students the same material and perhaps the same way. All seventh graders will have to solve algebraic equations and then they will all be the same. But students are not the same. All children develop at different rates, they have different abilities. One cannot expect a child from Uptown Manhattan to be doing the same thing as the kids in southern Illinois. The conditions are different, they

have different funding and quality of teachers. Parents involvement in their childrens education is different and that would affect what the students learn.

Besides having different abilities, the students have different interests or necessities. In one part of the nation it may be important to learn trigonometry and calculus because it is a high tech area. They use many computers and there might be a big market for careers in that field, but in another part of the country it might be more important to learn about farming and erosion. That the interest would be different. Teachers also need the freedom to teach what the students are interested in. If the kids want to know about the Chicano Movement, they should have the opportunity to learn about it, instead of learning about African American Civil Rights Movement. City kids are interested in different things than kids rural areas, as well as kids from the East Coast and the West Coast.

For these reasons I would have to disagree with a national curriculum. Children are different and they should have the right to learn about things they are interested in. Teachers should have the freedom to teach what he/she thinks is more important or interesting to their students. Teachers should teach their students, not a curriculum.

Reader Commentary

This response presents a competent analysis of the issue and conveys meaning with acceptable clarity. The writer begins by acknowledging some of the perceived strengths of a national curriculum but then disagrees with the prompt, arguing that “all students are not the same, they have different interests, and this curriculum would not permit teachers to explore and teach to students interests.” The writer supports this position by suggesting that a standardized approach to education will fail to address the different types of students who make up a nation’s youth; for instance, students in two different geographical areas may be subject to different socioeconomic conditions as well as different cultural attitudes toward the role of education. The writer continues exploring the role of geography by pointing out that different areas naturally emphasize different aspects of curriculum based upon regional concerns and that a national curriculum would unfairly homogenize education.

The response is adequately focused and organized, and although it contains some errors, it demonstrates sufficient control of language in order to express its ideas.

Score 3

Essay Response

Until now, many countries have mandatory course for their students until they enter the college. It is beneficial to students to have same amout knowledge in their schools. Also, I agree this recommendation because these reasons.

Even if students have extraordinary abilities to study, it just will be some specific parts of academic fields. Generally, most ordiany students have abilities to follow their study through their courses. For all students, if people want to be had same knowlege and same academic background, the national curriculum is essential. Of course, some people don’t want to follow their mandatoyr courses so that someone takes privite classes in their house or takes a different class in other substituted schools. However, if students want to enter the college, they have to take a national test, for example, SAT. Like this test will require generalized knowledge until in

the high school. For preparing this test, every students have to study requisited courses of SAT. Even though some students take privite courses, they also have to prepare these classes. Because of this, national curriculum is needed. If they do not need to take a test to enter the college, they won't prepare these classes. However, until now, every college wants to accept to be experimented students so that they need standarized test for everybody. Recently, even though national curriculum is becoming a social issue to criticize its efficiency, if governments don't change their policy about thier educational programs, it has to exist in the education.

However, the same national curriculum has some troubles. If one student doesn't follow the same curriculum, this student will be fale to enter the college. The mandatory curriculum does not allow individual characteristics, some students who have surprisingly abilities for other fields, for example, playing chess, singing the classic song, and operating computer systems, will not enter the college. So, we should consider this problem in the same national curriculum.

Nevertheless, the system of the education will not change to allow other possibilities, a nation has to require all of their students to study the same courses, until the college. It is related to educational systems so that it is difficult to decide whatever is right. However, while the current educaitonal system exist a nation, the country should require the same curriculum to its students.

Reader Commentary

This response demonstrates some competence in analyzing the issue and in conveying meaning, but it is obviously flawed. The writer adopts a position of agreement with the prompt, arguing that since higher education requires students to pass standardized exams, a curriculum which emphasized the same education for all students would be more conducive to passing college entrance exams and tests such as the SAT. In the course of this argument, the writer does consider that the implementation of a national curriculum would remove the opportunity for students to explore areas of study outside their core coursework but argues that this loss can be made up during the students' university coursework.

The response presents a clear position on the issue and develops that position with relevant reasons and examples, but it fails to convey ideas with acceptable clarity; it has problems in language and sentence structure that result in a lack of clarity. These frequent minor errors and occasional major errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics preclude the response from receiving an upper-half score. In order to merit a score of 4, this response would need to demonstrate better control of the conventions of standard written English.

Score 2

Essay Response

A nation should teach all it's students the same national curriculum until they enter college so that can prepare for college. Allowing everyone to learn the same curriculum will teach our society how to communicate with one another. This is a nation of equal opportunity and should be treated and taught equally. I believe that this would allows young individuals to get an better understanting of all different kinds of religions, culture,and society. All school teach the

same history, but some may focus more on what they feel is important than depending on where you are from.

Reader Commentary

After agreeing with the prompt's recommendation, this brief essay presents a series of unsupported claims about education and culture. The discussion fails to develop any of these claims with relevant reasons and/or examples or to make logical connections between them; as a result, the discussion is disorganized and unfocused. The final sentence states that all schools "teach the same history, but some may focus more on what they feel is important than depending on where you are from." As a result of the response's frequent errors in language and sentence structure, it isn't at all clear whether this statement is intended as an observation of current practices or a recommendation that history curricula should be flexible enough to account for regional interests.

Though this response does contain frequent errors and lacks sentence variety, these flaws serve more to impede clarity than to interfere significantly with meaning. The essay is scored a 2 primarily because it is "seriously limited in addressing the specific task directions and in presenting or developing a position on the issue."

Score 1

Essay Response

No i disagree with recommendation because it is not compulsory to student to study same national curriculum until they enter college.

Each and every student is own idea and family dream so, could not say like that student study the same nation curriculum until they enter college. we create a environment to all student are go and come in different country so we share over idea and comfortably leave with each other.

It is very necessary to collaborate with each other we develop our nation and different technology. We take an example of "SUNITA VILLIUM" she is an American scientist who works in "NASA" basically she is an INDIAN. But she completed study in USA.

So, it is not necessary to study in own national Curriculum. but we develop environment to student study with different country and develop nation name and over parents name.

Also develop support position it is very advantageous for student. some time what happens student is intelligent but he/she not able to study well we develop some kind of facility to student study well and he/she develop over country.

To conclude "A nation should not require all of its student to study the same national curriculum until they enter college."

Reader Commentary

Although this essay is obviously attempting to respond to the prompt's recommendation, its

severe problems in language and sentence structure and its pervasive grammar, usage, and mechanics errors make it impossible to discern whether the writer understands the recommendation made in the prompt.. In fact, the only clear phrases in the response are those that are borrowed from the prompt. These fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing warrant a score of 1.