High School – Argumentative Writing Work Sample: Does Not Yet Meet

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: 2

The essay presents a clear position opposing the school library getting a 3D printer and provides two basic reasons: cost and copyright concerns. While the stance is clear, ideas are minimally developed, rely on incomplete or inaccurate interpretations of sources, and lack the depth expected in high-school argument writing. Evidence is limited, explanations are brief, and the essay does not address required components such as counterarguments. The writing shows emerging understanding of the task but insufficient detail, accuracy, or elaboration.

Evidence from Student Work: Ideas and Content
✓ **Clear, Simple Claim** ○ States the position early: 3D printers "may cause quite a problem" and "are not worth the hassle." ○ The claim is consistent but not well developed.
✓ **Reasons Are Relevant but Underdeveloped** ○ Cost: Mentions the price from Source 2 ("For $1,299, plus shipping") but provides no deeper reasoning or comparison to library priorities. ○ Copyright concerns: Mentions "big trouble" but does not explain the legal distinctions or context from Source 3.
✓ **Very Limited Use of Sources** ○ Only Source 2 and Source 3 are referenced, and both are used partially or inaccurately. ○ Omits important information from Sources 1, 4, and 5.
✓ **Inaccurate Interpretation of Legal Evidence** ○ Writes: "When a piece of work is copyrighted it is protected. No one can take credit for that work…" ▪ This oversimplifies Source 3, which explains that *most* 3D-printed objects are not protected by copyright or patent. ○ States the library might violate copyright rules, but Source 1 provides policies that prevent this—none of which are acknowledged.
✓ **Lack of Counterargument** ○ The essay does not mention or respond to any opposing viewpoints or benefits from the sources.
✓ **Minimal Explanation of Implications** ○ Cost is labeled "pricey," and copyright risk is called "stress," but neither is unpacked with reasoning or evidence.
✓ **Conclusion Repeats the Claim Without Adding Insight** ○ Restates earlier points: "extra stress," "pricey item," "use this money in a more logical way," but provides no new analysis.

Organization: 2

The essay includes an introduction, two short body paragraphs, and a conclusion, but the structure lacks the depth and clarity expected for high school argumentative writing. Paragraphs are brief and underdeveloped, transitions are minimal, and sequencing does not fully support the argument. The lack of a counterargument weakens overall organization.

Evidence from Student Work: Organization
✓ **Basic Introduction With a Simple Claim** ○ Opens with a general statement that 3D printers "may cause quite a problem."
✓ **Body Paragraphs Are Very Short and Underdeveloped** ○ Cost and copyright concerns are each summarized in only one to two sentences. ○ Lacks development, examples, or elaboration.
✓ **Weak Transitions Between Paragraphs** ○ Uses a simple transitional word ("Also") but no logical transitions to show relationships among ideas.
✓ **No Counterargument Structure** ○ The essay omits the required counterargument and rebuttal element.
✓ **Conclusion Repeats Earlier Ideas** ○ Restates that 3D printers are "pricey" and "add extra work," but does not summarize reasoning or provide synthesis.

Voice: 2

The voice is sincere but lacks the academic control expected in high school argumentative writing. Tone is overly conversational and relies on vague or emotional phrasing. Audience awareness is limited, and the argument lacks authoritative presence.

Evidence from Student Work: Voice
✓ **Conversational Tone** ○ Phrases like "big trouble," "added stress," and "not worth the hassle" feel informal and emotional.
✓ **Lacks Academic Authority** ○ Does not reference evidence with confidence or precision; instead relies on personal impressions.
✓ **Audience Awareness Weak** ○ Writes as though speaking to peers rather than school leaders.
✓ **Some Attempt at a Persuasive Tone** ○ The writer expresses genuine concern about misuse and cost.

Word Choice: 2

Word choice is often vague, informal, or general. The essay rarely uses academic or source-based vocabulary and relies on conversational expressions. Some terms are used incorrectly or without clarity.

Evidence from Student Work: Word Choice
✓ **Informal or Vague Language** ○ "Big trouble," "not worth the hassle," "pricey," "added stress."
✓ **Limited Technical Vocabulary** ○ Does not use key legal terms such as "infringement," "patent protection," or "DMCA takedown."
✓ **General Statements Without Precision** ○ "It is protected" does not specify what kind of protection (copyright vs patent).
✓ **Effective Word Choice Appears Rarely** ○ Some understanding of "copyright" is present but not elaborated.

Sentence Fluency: 2

Sentences are readable but lack fluency, variety, and control. Many sentences are short and simple; transitions are minimal, and there is little syntactic complexity. Some repetition occurs, and pacing is somewhat choppy.

Evidence from Student Work: Sentence Fluency
✓ **Mostly Simple Sentences** ○ Many sentences follow the same basic structure and rhythm.
✓ **Limited Variation in Structure** ○ Few complex or compound sentences appear.
✓ **Repetitive Patterns** ○ Similar sentence openings and lengths ("Another reason… Also… This could…").
✓ **Choppy Flow** ○ Abrupt shifts between ideas without internal transitions.

Conventions: 3

Conventions are mostly correct, but the writing shows some issues with punctuation, sentence boundaries, and clarity. Errors do not impede meaning but reflect limited editing.

Evidence from Student Work: Conventions
✓ **Generally Correct Grammar** ○ Most sentences are complete and clear.
✓ **Minor Punctuation Errors** ○ Occasional missing commas or imprecise sentence boundaries.
✓ **Some Word Form Issues** ○ Phrasing is sometimes awkward or unclear.
✓ **Readable but Not Polished** ○ Would benefit from additional proofreading.

Use of Sources: 2

The essay uses sources minimally and often inaccurately. Only one or two sources are referenced, and important details are missing or misunderstood. There is no synthesis, and attribution is weak. Source connections are superficial.

Evidence from Student Work: Use of Sources
✓ **Limited Source Use** ○ Relies on a vague reference to copyright law (Source 3) and cost information (Source 2). ○ Omits Sources 1, 4, and 5 entirely.
✓ **Inaccurate or Oversimplified Interpretation** ○ Suggests large lawsuits are likely, despite Source 3 explaining that most objects are not protected. ○ Does not mention policies from Source 1 that limit misuse.
✓ **No Counterargument or Rebuttal** ○ Does not acknowledge benefits from any sources.
✓ **No Explicit Attribution** ○ Sources are mentioned indirectly without signal phrases.
✓ **No Synthesis Across Sources** ○ Information appears in isolated, undeveloped mentions.