The score should reflect a judgment of the essay’s quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 40 minutes to read and write; therefore, the essay is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards that are appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. Evaluate the essay as a draft, making certain to reward students for what they do well.

All essays, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional flaws in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into the holistic evaluation of an essay’s overall quality. In no case may an essay with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics be scored higher than a 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for 8 essays and, in addition, are especially sophisticated in their explanation and argument or demonstrate particularly impressive control of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 8 <strong>effectively</strong> defend, challenge, or qualify Boorstin’s distinction. The evidence used is appropriate and convincing. The prose demonstrates an ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing but is not necessarily flawless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 7 fit the description of 6 essays but provide a more complete argument or demonstrate a more mature prose style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 6 <strong>adequately</strong> defend, challenge, or qualify Boorstin’s distinction. The evidence used is appropriate. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 5 defend, challenge, or qualify Boorstin’s distinction. These essays may, however, provide uneven, inconsistent, or limited explanations or evidence. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the student’s ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 4 <strong>inadequately</strong> defend, challenge, or qualify Boorstin’s distinction. The evidence used may be insufficient. The prose generally conveys the student’s ideas but may suggest immature control of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for a score of 4 but demonstrate less success in defending, challenging, or qualifying Boorstin’s distinction. The essays may show less control of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Essays earning a score of 2 demonstrate <strong>little success</strong> in defending, challenging, or qualifying Boorstin’s distinction. These essays may misunderstand the prompt or substitute a simpler task by responding to the prompt tangentially with unrelated, inaccurate, or inappropriate evidence. The prose often demonstrates consistent weaknesses in writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3 (continued)

1 Essays earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for a score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their explanation and argument, or weak in their control of language.

0 Indicates an on-topic response that receives no credit, such as one that merely repeats the prompt.

— Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.
Daniel J. Boorstin claims that there is a great difference between disagreement and dissension: that one is good and one is bad, that one belongs to the majority while the other belongs to the minority. However, I believe that there is less distinction between the two than Boorstin would think. Dissension is merely a more severe or radical form of disagreement.

Boorstin claims that "dissension is [democracy's] cancer," but history provides us with many examples of the contrary. Southern abolitionists, suffragettes, and civil rights leaders were all in the minority at some time because they dissented. However, as their views became more popular, they entered into the majority. If their views did not change, did they go from dissension to disagreement? From cancer to life blood?

Boorstin's argument seems to rest on the idea that if someone's opinion
is in the minority, then it is dissonance
and dissonance is bad. However, dissonance
is clearly just a different form of disagreement.

Like Boorstin's distinction between "argument"
and "quarrel," it is merely two different
words meaning ultimately the same thing.
The women who fought for the right to vote in America cannot be said to have
killed democracy simply because their
views were not popular among most
men and some women too. These suffragettes
both disagreed with and dissented
from the law and opinion that
women have no should have no political
gay involvement.

Likewise, many views held by people
today can be unpopular but good or
popular but bad. If Boorstin wishes
to clearly establish one type of thinking
as disagreement and another
as dissonance, he cannot rely on
such generalizations and assumptions
as those used in this except. Dissonance
is simply a more radical kind of disagreement
and radicals are what can be the
3

Foundation of new ideas and the spark needed for change to change an entire political system.
An ideal society is one that has peace without conflict, universal goal without individual interventions, and sunny weather without intensive rains and disasters. Frequently, reality does not allow this. As a result, the current world is burdened with disputes, war, crime, and natural disasters. In The Decline of Radicalism written by Daniel J. Boorstin, dissent degrades a community while disagreement does not necessarily do so. Boorstin speaks the truth, and innumerable circumstances prove his distinction between dissent and disagreement as relevant.

Dissent is similar to a personal crusade, whereas disagreement is an opinionated idea that leads to the future. For instance, someone who resists conforming to the society's norms solely because he/she wants to feel “freedom” and superiority over others is an example of dissent. It intrudes with the group's decision and is a carcinogen to the community. On the contrary, someone who opposes the society's rule because he/she thinks it biased towards the male gender is an example of disagreement. It endeavors to improve the society by recognizing, publicizing, and rectifying the flaw.

As mentioned by Boorstin, "disagreement produces debate but dissent produces dissension." The ironically presented fact of dissent producing dissension (dissent is dissension, so
it does not necessarily produce it) is relevant: A community tends to ignore or persecute someone who disrupts the peace that was previously maintained. Why? Because such disruptions can be magnified to a grander scale, where the society as a whole experiences chaos, disorganization, and malfunctions. This fact is reflected in Boorstin’s words: “A liberal society thrives on disagreement but is killed by dissension.”

Some people may claim Boorstin’s writing as bombastic, but that can be argued upon. Examples of real-life situations illustrate and back up the generalized truths that Boorstin presents, and it becomes apparent that his distinction is accurate. When reality is applicable to theory, the theory is recognized as an universal standard. Similarly, the differentiation between dissent and disagreement should be a common definition for people and for societies.
In the excerpt The Decline of Radicalism, Boorstin discusses the distinction between dissent and disagreement. He believes that dissent overcomes disagreement which will lead to destruction. In some cases America doesn't dissent especially when it comes to other countries. It seems that they are too close in their affairs, but for the most part I agree with Boorstin.

Disagreement could be the end of a powerful nation. When people begin to isolate themselves they aren't guaranteed any help in times of trouble. As a powerful nation you still rely on allies or simply friends to survive. The country didn't build itself on its own. It needed a helping hand in order to stand up.

Disagreement is another story. People can disagree but still be on good terms with each other. It may lead to some tension, but overall it is much better than disagreement. Without disagreement there would probably be no change. If everyone wanted the same objectives for themselves than much progress or growth would happen for them or more competition.

In the end disagreement can ruin your backbone, your support. Disagreement can give you a small cut, but dissension will make you bleed. America needs to overcome dissension in order to provide for each other and to survive with one another. If they imagine a bright future...
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the exam.

ahead of them then they have to come together instead of stay apart. They have to share a backbone to be a powerful nation or to stay a powerful nation.
Question 3

Sample: 3A
Score: 8

This high-scoring essay effectively argues that dissension “is merely a more severe or radical form of disagreement” and that this form of disagreement can, and often does, lead to new forms of justice. The student’s argument is clear, and the discussion of the ways in which minorities (“abolitionists, suffragettes, and civil rights leaders”) must dissent at times to effect change in society is very appropriate and convincing. In support of the student’s argument, the essay offers the example of the suffragettes who first disagreed, then dissented, then brought about women’s rights in America. Using effective language, logical organization, and well-chosen examples, this student effectively challenges Boorstin’s distinction between dissent and disagreement.

Sample: 3B
Score: 6

This adequate essay takes an interesting slant by arguing that dissent is the result of an obsession with the ego; the student claims that egocentrics act in ways that defy society. Although this is a fresh argument, the examples, such as those about gender, remain only adequately developed and convincing. The student argues that disagreement involves engaging an opponent to produce an agreement, and does so in a reasonably credible way that sufficiently defends Boorstin’s distinction between dissent and disagreement. The language is generally appropriate.

Sample: 3C
Score: 4

This inadequate essay uses simplistic terms and examples to defend Boorstin’s distinction. The student first defines dissent and disagreement by paraphrasing the prompt and then asserts that America needs disagreement and not dissension. Although the student’s position is clear, the examples are neither full nor insightful enough to make the argument adequate. The language of the essay, which consistently repeats wording from the prompt, is also less than satisfactory.