High School – Argumentative Writing Work Sample: Exceeds

Task: Your class is studying about computer technology and development. You are given five resources about 3-D printers and how copyright, patent, and trademark law apply to 3D printers.

*Read the sources carefully to **write an argumentative essay** supporting or opposing the school library getting a 3D printer for students to use. Make sure to address potential counterarguments in your essay and support your claim with information from the sources you have examined.*

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

Ideas and Content: 5

The essay presents a clear, well-developed claim supporting the school library obtaining a 3D printer and maintains this position consistently. The writer uses multiple sources accurately (Source 2, Source 3, Source 1), develops reasoning with strong explanations, and integrates counterargument and rebuttal effectively. Ideas demonstrate conceptual understanding of library purpose, personalization benefits, access equity, and intellectual property law. Minor issues include some overgeneralization, a few areas where reasoning could deepen economically, and a slight drift toward promotional language. Overall, this is a strong, well-supported argument that meets high-school expectations.

Evidence from Student Work: Ideas and Content
✓ **Clear, Well-Focused Claim** ○ The claim is explicit and appears early: ▪ "3D printers have many advantages that will greatly benefit the library users…" ○ The argument remains aligned to this claim throughout.
✓ **Relevant, High-Quality Reasons Supporting the Claim** ○ Access + Equity: ▪ Argues that library printers close the "opportunity gap between different social economic statuses." ○ Convenience + Personalization (supported by Source 2): ▪ "Modify and create three-dimensional objects that gear toward the distinct purposes of the user." ○ Public resource expansion: ▪ Fits with modern library missions to provide tools not otherwise accessible.
✓ **Accurate Use of Source Material** ○ Source 3 (copyright vs patent): ▪ Correctly states that most 3D-printed items "would not be protected… unless copyright or an active patent protects them," which reduces IP risk. ○ Source 1 (D.C. Library policy): ▪ Recommends adopting the staff-mediated system where "staff members have the only direct access to the printer," accurately reflecting Source 1's safeguard model. ○ Source 2 (NYT article) indirectly supported through emphasis on customization and user-specific tools.
✓ **Explanations Are Developed and Purposeful** ○ Explains how personalized printing aligns with library purpose: ▪ "Since the purpose of the library is to offer tools and information that may be hard to be obtained by individuals…" ○ Connects access to broader community outcomes "benefit the modern public."
✓ **Counterargument + Rebuttal Included** ○ Acknowledges concerns: "some oppose its use… raising questions of potential misuse or its actual purposes." ○ Rebuttal uses Source 3 and Source 1 effectively to minimize legal concerns.

Evidence from Student Work: Ideas and Content
✓ **Minor Weaknesses** ○ Some overgeneralizations (e.g., “completely transform the library,” “only beneficial,” “harmful to no individual”). ○ Some statements drift toward promotional tone rather than analytical reasoning. ○ Economic implications could be expanded using more specific evidence.

Organization: 5

The essay is well structured, with a clear argumentative progression, purposeful paragraphing, and strong coherence. The introduction establishes the claim, body paragraphs develop distinct reasons, and the conclusion synthesizes the argument. Transitions guide the reader effectively, and ideas build logically with no major gaps. Minor refinements could elevate cohesion, but overall the organization reflects strong high school–level control.

Evidence from Student Work: Organization
✓ **Purposeful Introduction With Clear Claim** ○ The writer establishes the pro-3D-printer stance immediately and previews its relevance to library users.
✓ **Logical Sequencing of Reasons** ○ Moves from: ▪ personalization benefits ▪ library purpose (access to tools) ▪ staff-mediated safety ▪ legal protection analysis ▪ counterargument + rebuttal ▪ conclusion ○ This order creates a coherent, persuasive progression.
✓ **Paragraphs Are Focused and Distinct** ○ Each paragraph centers on one main idea, such as the role of customization, the mission of libraries, or the legal safeguards.
✓ **Transitions Support Clarity** ○ Uses transitions like “Furthermore,” “As expected,” “Despite the concerns,” which effectively show argumentative shifts.
✓ **Effective Conclusion Provides Synthesis** ○ Concludes that 3D printers “will only benefit the modern public,” tying together access equity, safety, and purpose.
✓ **Minor Weaknesses** ○ Some paragraphs blend analysis with promotional tone, which slightly distracts from organizational sharpness.

Voice: 4

The voice is confident, informed, and appropriate for an academic argumentative essay. The writer demonstrates strong engagement with the issue and expresses a clear stance. At times, advocacy becomes slightly overconfident or promotional, but overall the tone remains professional and audience-aware.

Evidence from Student Work: Voice
✓ **Confident and Persuasive Tone** ○ Statements like "Their usefulness is endless" show conviction (though mildly overstated).
✓ **Audience-Aware Framing** ○ Discusses benefits to "modern public," "students," and "various users," showing awareness of educational context.
✓ **Appropriate Academic Voice** ○ Uses formal, academic language throughout most of the essay.
✓ **Occasional Overstatement or Promotional Language** ○ Phrases like "only beneficial" and "usefulness is endless" lack nuance. ○ Some sentences drift toward advocacy rather than evidence-based reasoning.
✓ **Consistent Purpose** ○ Maintains argumentative stance clearly without becoming overly emotional.

Word Choice: 4

Word choice is mostly precise, varied, and appropriate for an academic argument. The writer uses a strong range of vocabulary related to intellectual property, library services, and technological access. Occasional exaggerated or promotional phrases weaken precision but do not significantly detract from quality.

Evidence from Student Work: Word Choice
✓ **Precise Academic Word Use** ○ Uses terms such as "distinct purposes," "public resource," "copyright," "policy," "regulations."
✓ **Effective Integration of Source Language** ○ Incorporates key phrases accurately, such as "would not be protected by copyright."
✓ **Occasional Overgeneralization** ○ "Usefulness is endless," "only beneficial," "close the opportunity gap" (without specifying how).
✓ **Strong Verb Choices** ○ "Expand," "benefit," "modify," "create," "positively impact."
✓ **Mostly Clear and Disciplined Diction** ○ Avoids excessive conversational language; maintains formal tone.

Sentence Fluency: 4

Sentences flow smoothly with consistent clarity and variation in structure. Some moments of awkward or dense phrasing occur, but overall the fluency supports readability and maintains an academic tone.

Evidence from Student Work: Sentence Fluency
✓ **Varied Sentence Structures** ○ Uses compound and complex sentences effectively.
✓ **Generally Strong Rhythm and Pacing** ○ Explanations unfold in a logical, readable manner.

Evidence from Student Work: Sentence Fluency
✓ **Minor Awkwardness** ○ Occasional overly long sentences or repeated phrases.
✓ **Clear Control of Syntax** ○ Sentences are grammatical and cohesive.

Conventions: 5

The essay demonstrates consistent control of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and sentence boundaries. Errors are minimal and do not impede meaning.

Evidence from Student Work: Conventions
✓ **Accurate Grammar and Syntax** ○ Clear, correct sentence construction throughout.
✓ **Proper Punctuation Use** ○ Commas, periods, and quotation marks appear correctly.
✓ **Correct Spelling** ○ No significant spelling issues.
✓ **No Sentence Boundary Errors** ○ No run-ons or fragments.

Use of Sources: 5

The essay demonstrates accurate, meaningful integration of multiple sources. Evidence is correctly interpreted, well explained, and effectively linked to the writer's argument. Source use enhances credibility without dominating the voice.

Evidence from Student Work: Use of Sources
✓ **Accurate Use of Source 3** ○ Correctly notes that most items made with 3D printers "would not be protected… unless copyright or an active patent protects them," showing nuanced understanding of IP law.
✓ **Effective Use of Source 1** ○ Uses the DC library model to argue for staff-mediated printing and regulated access.
✓ **Implicit Use of Source 2 (Customization Benefits)** ○ Incorporates the key idea of personalization and user-specific design, consistent with the article's examples.
✓ **Use of Multiple Sources Strengthens Argument** ○ Combines legal protections (Source 3) with policy recommendations (Source 1) and library-purpose reasoning (Source 5's ideas indirectly).
✓ **Accurate Explanation Following Evidence** ○ Reasoning consistently follows from evidence presented.
✓ **Minor Opportunities for Further Depth** ○ Could explicitly cite Source 4 to discuss takedown procedures.