Grade 6 – Argumentative Writing Work Sample: Does Not Yet Meet

Task: Your class is studying about the environment and recycling. You are given four sources about community service and recycling efforts.

*Read the sources carefully to **write an argumentative essay** in which you give your opinion about whether the school should agree to clean a section of a highway or host a technology recycling day as your school's community service project. Make sure you clearly state your opinion and write several paragraphs supporting your opinion with reasons and details from the sources.*

Scores, Justification of Student Evidence, and Suggested Areas of Student Improvement

Ideas and Content: 2

The essay attempts to argue that the school should choose a technology recycling day rather than a highway cleanup, but the claim is not clearly stated, the reasoning is fragmented, and many statements are inaccurate, incomplete, or unsupported by the sources. There is some relevant information about landfills, recycling difficulty, and CRT hazards, but ideas are repeated rather than developed, and the essay lacks coherent explanations showing how the evidence connects to the claim. Misunderstandings of the source material also affect accuracy.

Evidence from Student Work: Ideas and Content
✓ **Clear Claim & Purpose** ○ The claim is implied but not clearly stated: "all of the evidents states that technology is more dangerous then trash for that is what the clames state." ○ The purpose—to argue for technology recycling—is present but not clearly framed at the beginning. ○ The essay reads more like a list of concerns than a structured argument.
✓ **Relevant, Accurate Reasons & Evidence** ○ Some information aligns with source ideas, such as: ○ "landfills and warehouses will be filled unless some plans to recycle old gadgets" (Source 3 concept). ○ "CRTs have high lead properties that can be extremely hazardous if not recycles" (Source 3). ○ "The U.S.A deposes over 660 million pounds of every year" (misquoted but loosely based on source details). ○ However, many statements are inaccurate or incomplete: ▪ "electronics cause wasteland of old electronics for miles and miles" (overgeneralization not in sources). ▪ "bulkier the glass the more trash builds up" (inaccurate interpretation). ○ Evidence is repeated multiple times across paragraphs instead of expanded.
✓ **Development, Reasoning & Explanation** ○ Little explanation is provided for why hazards exist or how recycling helps. ○ Paragraphs repeat the same ideas without elaboration: "more and more are thrown away," "bulkier the glass… more containment in the water." ○ No comparison to the alternative option (highway cleanup). ○ Reasoning is often unclear or incorrect (e.g., misinterpreting glass bulk as causing pollution).
✓ **Focus & Relevance to the Argument** ○ Stays loosely focused on technology waste, but the writing often drifts into repeated statements rather than supporting the argument. ○ Conclusion attempts to restate the claim, but without synthesis or clarity. ○ Repetition of similar lines ("more and more are thrown away") weakens focus.

Organization: 2

The essay has an introduction, body, and conclusion, but the structure is uneven, ideas repeat frequently, and transitions are limited. Paragraphs mix unrelated points, and reasoning does not build logically from one idea to the next. Overall, the structure does not clearly guide the reader through an argument.

Evidence from Student Work: Organization
✓ **Weak or Unclear Introduction** ○ Opens abruptly: "The problem with technolgy is that it cause many peoblems…" ○ Does not introduce a clear claim or preview reasons. ○ Mixes claim with random statements about "miles and miles" of wasteland.
✓ **Sequencing Lacks Logical Flow** ○ Ideas are repeated in different paragraphs without progression ("bulkier the glass…," "more and more are thrown away"). ○ No consistent structure for reasons; content jumps from pollution to landfills to water contamination without clear order.
✓ **Transitions Are Minimal or Missing** ○ Sentences and paragraphs often begin abruptly. ○ Uses few transitions (e.g., "another reason") and often without showing relationships.
✓ **Conclusion Provides Closure but Not Synthesis** ○ Restates the purpose vaguely: "technology is more dangerous then trash." ○ Does not summarize key reasons or strengthen the argument.

Voice: 2

The writer's voice is earnest but inconsistent. Tone shifts between emotional, conversational, and informational, making the argument less convincing. Repetitive phrasing and informal language reduce the effectiveness of the message.

Evidence from Student Work: Voice
✓ **Engaged Voice but Limited Control** ○ Shows concern ("we need to do something about technology trash") but lacks a clear persuasive stance.
✓ **Informal or Inconsistent Tone** ○ Frequent conversational language: "cause many peoblems," "many side effects," "this will make more containment in the water."
✓ **Emotional Language Without Supporting Evidence** ○ Statements such as "this will cause bad containment of the water" or "this poisons the Earth" feel dramatic, not analytical.
✓ **Repetition Weakens Impact** ○ Repeats general lines ("more and more are thrown away") without adding insight.

Word Choice: 2

Word choice is often vague, repetitive, or incorrect. The writer uses general, emotional, or inaccurate vocabulary instead of precise environmental or technological terms. Incorrect spelling also affects clarity.

Evidence from Student Work: Word Choice
✓ **Vague or General Vocabulary** ○ Frequent use of “bad,” “poisen,” “many problems,” “side effects,” “containment,” without clarity.
✓ **Repetitive Word Choice** ○ Repeats phrases such as “more and more,” “poisons the Earth,” “bulkier the glass.”
✓ **Inaccurate or Misused Words** ○ “Containment of the water” is used incorrectly. ○ “Miles and miles of wasteland” is not accurate nor supported by sources.
✓ **Missing Domain-Specific Words** ○ Key vocabulary absent: “e-waste,” “groundwater contamination,” “hazardous materials,” “refurbishing,” “recycling systems.”

Sentence Fluency: 2

Sentence structure is inconsistent, often choppy or run-on, with unclear phrasing. Many sentences combine multiple ideas without proper punctuation, while others are fragmented or repetitive.

Evidence from Student Work: Sentence Fluency
✓ **Run-On Sentences** ○ Example: “Alot do contain lead and poisen the water that we drink another reason is that landfills and warehouses will be filled unless some plans…” ○ Multiple ideas in a single sentence without boundaries.
✓ **Choppy, Fragmented Phrasing** ○ Sentences such as “The bulkier the glass the more it contains. And the more poisen in rivers.” ✓
✓ **Repetitive Sentence Beginnings** ○ Many sentences begin with “Another reason,” “This,” or “Most of the time,” creating monotony.
✓ **Inconsistent Rhythm** ○ Frequent changes between very short and very long sentences disrupt flow.

Conventions: 2

Frequent errors in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and sentence boundaries interfere with clarity. These issues do not completely obscure meaning but significantly weaken readability.

Evidence from Student Work: Conventions
✓ **Significant Spelling Errors** ○ “Evidents,” “peoblems,” “poisen,” “containment,” “technolgy,” “warehouses,” etc. ○ Errors appear frequently and disrupt meaning.
✓ **Punctuation Errors** ○ Missing commas in complex sentences. ○ Run-on sentences without periods or conjunctions.

Evidence from Student Work: Conventions
✓ **Capitalization Problems** ○ Inconsistent capitalization of “Earth,” “Technology,” and sentence beginnings.
✓ **Grammar and Agreement Issues** ○ Misuse of plurals/singular forms (“many side effects,” “more containment”). ○ Problems with verb tense and word forms.

Use of Sources: 2

The writer attempts to use sources but does so inaccurately and inconsistently. Key details from the articles are misquoted, misunderstood, or misapplied. Evidence is repeated instead of expanded, and attribution is unclear or missing.

Evidence from Student Work: Use of Sources	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Use of Sources
✓ **Attempts to Use Source Material** ○ Mentions CRTs and lead hazards found in Source 3. ○ References recycling/refurbishing, though descriptions are incomplete.	➢ **Correct Misinterpretations** ○ Remove inaccurate claims and replace with precise paraphrases.
✓ **Inaccurate or Misused Evidence** ○ “Bulkier the glass the more trash builds up” inaccurately interprets CRT content. ○ “Miles and miles of old electronics” is unsupported. ○ “The U.S.A deposes over 660 million pounds every year” is incorrectly stated.	➢ **Use Evidence Accurately** ○ Revisit the sources to ensure quotes and facts are correct.
✓ **No Attribution** ○ Evidence is presented without “According to Source __” or context.	➢ **Add Explicit Attribution** ○ Use clear signal phrases (“Source 3 states…”) before evidence.
✓ **Minimal Explanation of Evidence** ○ Few statements explain why the evidence matters or how it supports the claim.	➢ **Explain How Evidence Supports the Claim** ○ Follow each piece of evidence with reasoning showing why it proves tech recycling is needed.