High School – Argumentative Writing Work Sample: Meets

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: 4

The essay presents a clear claim opposing the school library getting a 3D printer and maintains this position consistently throughout. The writer uses multiple sources, provides relevant reasons (library purpose/mission, legal risks, intellectual property concerns, and threats to creativity), and includes a counterargument section. Explanations are generally clear, though sometimes overstated, and not all reasoning is fully developed. Some misconceptions about legal risk appear, and the essay occasionally relies on emotional or exaggerated statements rather than precise evidence. Nonetheless, the core argument is strong, source-based, and purposeful.

Evidence from Student Work: Ideas and Content
✓ **Clear, Defensible Claim** ○ Opens with a firm stance: "Although the library is a great place to learn about technology, there is no need for ours to have a 3-D printer." ○ Maintains this claim consistently across the essay.
✓ **Relevant, Well-Selected Reasons** ○ Library mission mismatch: Draws heavily on Source #5 to argue that 3D printing is outside the purpose of a library. ▪ Quote: "Tying your library to something like a 3D printer moves you in the wrong direction… that's not your job." ○ Not a manufacturing company: Uses logical reasoning to argue the library should not provide "expensive services" like printing tangible objects. ○ Threat to creativity: Argues that easy copying undermines originality.
✓ **Use of Multiple Sources** ○ Source 5 (Mission Creep) is used prominently and appropriately to support the claim. ○ Source 4 (Penrose Triangle case) used effectively to argue the danger of theft and misattribution. ○ Source 2/3 (legal copying issues) referenced partially when discussing "illegal copying" and copyright/patent penalties. ○ Demonstrates a good range of evidence.
✓ **Counterargument Addressed** ○ Acknowledges that "in some ways, a 3D printer can seem necessary," but rebuts it by explaining why it "has no place in a library."
✓ **Reasoning Is Mostly Solid but Sometimes Overgeneralized** ○ Overstates legal risk to the library ("we could end up in serious trouble," "many people could end up being sued") without clarifying that Source 3 explains most 3D-printed objects are not protected. ○ The creativity argument uses hypothetical extremes ("print a Michelangelo sculpture") not supported by sources. ○ Some emotional language weakens the explanatory force.
✓ **Explanation Depth Varies** ○ Strong development around the role of the library but limited detail about actual 3D-printer misuse policies that could mitigate risk (Source 1).

Organization: 4

The essay follows a clear argumentative structure with a purposeful introduction, logically organized body paragraphs grouped by reason, and a conclusion that reinforces the position. Transitions are functional, and sequencing generally supports clarity. Some internal paragraph shifts could be smoother, and the counterargument is underdeveloped, but overall the organization aligns well with grade-level expectations.

Evidence from Student Work: Organization
✓ **Clear Introduction Establishes Claim and Purpose** ○ States the stance directly and frames the essay as a justification of why a 3D printer is unnecessary in the school library.
✓ **Logical Sequencing of Reasons** ○ Moves from library mission to legal concerns to creativity concerns to conclusion. ○ Each major idea is separated into its own paragraph.
✓ **Functional Transitions** ○ Uses transitions such as "For example," "Also," "In some ways," which support readability. ○ Some transitions are basic but effective.
✓ **Effective Paragraph Boundaries** ○ The paragraph on intellectual property (Penrose triangle example) is distinct and internally coherent.
✓ **Conclusion Provides Closure** ○ Reiterates the claim and underscores the key reasoning: "This is not the time for our school to go on a spending spree… It has no place in a library."
✓ **Minor Organizational Weaknesses** ○ Counterargument paragraph is brief and not integrated with source-based support. ○ Creativity paragraph contains loosely connected ideas that could be more tightly organized.

Voice: 4

The voice is confident, committed to the position, and generally appropriate for an academic argument. The writer uses an authoritative tone and demonstrates clear investment in the issue. At times, however, the voice becomes overly forceful or emotional, drifting slightly away from academic precision.

Evidence from Student Work: Voice
✓ **Confident and Purposeful Tone** ○ Strong opening stance shows clear conviction. ○ Uses assertive statements like "There is no need for ours to have a 3-D printer."
✓ **Appropriate Audience Awareness** ○ Frames concerns relevant to a school community costs, purpose, creativity, and legal risk.
✓ **Clear Sense of Authorial Presence** ○ The writer's viewpoint is clear without being overly personal.
✓ **Moments of Overstatement** ○ Phrases like "this will force students to be less creative" or "we could end up in serious trouble" reduce objectivity.
✓ **Occasional Emotional Wording** ○ "Not the time to go on a spending spree" feels more rhetorical than academic. ○ Creativity concerns are presented more as fear-based statements than evidence-backed analysis.

Word Choice: 4

Word choice is generally precise, purposeful, and appropriate for an academic argument. The writer uses effective argumentative vocabulary and integrates quoted material naturally. Some overgeneralizations and emotionally charged words appear, but overall lexical control is solid.

Evidence from Student Work: Word Choice
✓ **Precise Language When Discussing Sources** ○ Uses terms like “unintended propagation,” “illegal copying,” “manufacturing company,” “expensive,” “copyright infringement.”
✓ **Effective Quoting and Paraphrasing** ○ Integrates Source 5’s phrasing accurately: “Tying your library to something like a 3D printer moves you in the wrong direction.”
✓ **Occasional Vague or Overstated Language** ○ “Force students to be less creative,” “serious trouble,” “spending spree.” ○ Some claims lack precise definitions.
✓ **Appropriate Formality Most of the Time** ○ Uses academic vocabulary suited for a research-based argument.

Sentence Fluency: 4

Sentences are clear, varied, and well-constructed. Flow is generally smooth with effective pacing. A few sentences rely on simple constructions or include slightly awkward phrasing, but overall sentence fluency is strong.

Evidence from Student Work: Sentence Fluency
✓ **Varied Sentence Structures** ○ Uses both complex and simple sentences effectively.
✓ **Smooth Transitions Between Ideas** ○ Paragraphs connect logically and flow with minimal disruption.
✓ **Mostly Controlled Rhythm and Pacing** ○ Examples are introduced smoothly, such as the Penrose triangle case.
✓ **Minor Awkwardness** ○ Some sentences become blunt or abrupt, especially when emotionally charged (“This is not the time for a spending spree”).
✓ **Generally Strong Clarity** ○ Sentences are readable and grammatically sound.

Conventions: 5

The writing demonstrates strong control of grammar, punctuation, sentence boundaries, and spelling. Errors are infrequent, and none interfere with meaning. Some minor punctuation refinements could improve clarity, but command of conventions is consistently evident.

Evidence from Student Work: Conventions
✓ **Correct Grammar and Syntax** ○ Sentences are well-formed with clear subjects and predicates.
✓ **Accurate Spelling and Punctuation** ○ No noticeable spelling errors. ○ Punctuation used well in complex sentences.
✓ **Clear Sentence Boundaries** ○ No run-on sentences or fragments.
✓ **Minor Refinements Possible** ○ Occasional comma might aid fluency but does not affect correctness.

Use of Sources: 4

The essay uses multiple sources effectively and accurately. Evidence is well integrated, though attribution could be more explicit in places. Some claims overextend the sources or misinterpret legal implications, but overall the writer demonstrates clear engagement with the text set.

Evidence from Student Work: Use of Sources
✓ **Accurate Use of Source 5 (Mission Focus)** ○ Strongly rooted argument that 3D printing is outside the library's core mission. ○ Well-chosen quotation strengthens the argument.
✓ **Correct Use of Source 4 (Penrose Triangle Case)** ○ Explains file-sharing issues and potential for misattribution. ○ Appropriately connected to concerns about students copying designs without permission.
✓ **Partial, Less Accurate Use of Legal Sources (2 and 3)** ○ Writer suggests lawsuits are likely but does not reflect Source 3's explanation that most objects are not protected by patent/copyright.
✓ **Limited Use of Source 1** ○ Does not mention library policies that reduce risk (permission requirements, deletion, staff mediation).
✓ **No Factual Errors in Quoted Evidence** ○ Quoted text from Source 5 is accurate.
✓ **Some Unsupported Inferences** ○ Suggests students could be sued, though sources state enforcement is difficult and often inapplicable.