

A heated debate continues as to whether or not cities should ban the use of single use "styrofoam" products. Many argue that styrofoam is made from harmful chemicals and it is not biodegradable. However, recent studies have shown, styrofoam may not be as bad as everyone thinks it is.

Styrofoam, also known as polystyrene should not be banned from cities. Of all reasons, one of the ~~obvious~~ most obvious being, it is a resource ~~being~~ used daily in workplaces all around the world. "It is popular because of its light weight, good insulation properties, and advantage as packing material for shipping without adding weight." (Robson, Text 2, line 5) If cities were to ban styrofoam, packing companies and food chains would not be able to cover those losses and could lead to them shutting down. Cities should not ban polystyrene because ultimately it could lead to losses of jobs.

Furthermore, ~~obviously~~ if cities were to discontinue the use of styrofoam people would substitute the styrofoam for other, much more harmful materials. As it turns out, an alternative to styrofoam, say a

paper cup, can actually be much more harmful to an environment. "Producing foam cups doesn't require the use of harsh chemicals such as carbon dioxide, which is needed to bleach the pulp used make cups" (Jackson, Text 3, Line 33) ~~experts say~~. The banning of styrofoam cups in cities should not be allowed because the alternatives to styrofoam cups are much more harmful than the styrofoam itself.

In addition, though styrofoam is not biodegradable, it will not last forever. For example if a piece of styrofoam gets littered over time it will return back into basic chemical units, just from being in the sun. "Sunlight can turn polystyrene from a solid material back into basic chemical units," says Dr. Ward, ~~researcher~~, (Broad, Text 4, line 57) Cities should not ban polystyrene products.

Anchor Level 3–A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*styrofoam may not be as bad as everyone thinks it is and Styrofoam, also known as polystyrene should not be banned from cities*).
- The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*If cities were to ban Styrofoam, packing companies and food chains would not be able to cover those loses and could lead to them shutting down and an alternative to Styrofoam, say a paper cup, can actually be much more harmful to an environment*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Many argue that styrofoam is made from harmful chemicals and it is not biodegradable*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*It is popular because of its light weight, good insulation properties, and advantage as packing material for shipping without adding weight*” and “*Sunlight can turn polystyrene from a solid material back into basic chemical units*”).
- The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, providing only the first line number for multiple lines [(*Robson, Text 2, line 5*) and (*Jackson, Text 3, Line 33*)] and providing inaccurate line numbers [(*Broad, Text 4, line 57*)] as well as copying text incorrectly, *carbon dioxide* for “chlorine dioxide.”

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that introduces a claim against banning styrofoam, followed by two paragraphs that focus on the negative implications of a ban (*because ultimately it could lead to loses of jobs and the alternatives to styrofoam cups are much more harmful than the styrofoam itself*) but loses coherence in the last paragraph (*though Styrofoam is not biodegradable, it will not last forever. For example if a piece of Styrofoam gets littered over time it will return back into basic chemical units, just from being in the sun*), contradicting the assertion that styrofoam is not biodegradable. The essay concludes with a reiteration of the claim (*Cities should not, ban polystyrene products*).
- The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*an alternative to Styrofoam, say a paper cup and if a piece of Styrofoam gets littered*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension (*wether; weight.*” (*Robson, Text 2, line 5*) *If; loses; enviornment; bleech; For example if; gets littered over; Cities should not, ban*).

Cities Should ban Single-use Styrofoam products. Styrofoam products are effecting the environment and the oceans.

One way Styrofoam Should be banned is "its wrecks have on the environment and its not biodegradable". Styrofoam builds ups and ups because it doesn't melt so when people throws Styrofoam they effecting the environment.

Another way Styrofoam should be banned is if ~~it releases chemicals that can affect the environment and the human health.~~ ~~cause bacteria to grow and affect human health.~~ "Chemicals can leach into it and contaminate it affecting human health and reproductive system"

text 2. If you are eating and the person who give it to you on Styrofoam the chemicals can slip in contaminate and health issue inside the body.

Cities should not ban single-use Styrofoam products. Styrofoam can help the environment in some ways.⁽¹⁾ Styrofoam is used to manufacture single-use cups, straws, yogurt containers, disposable razors, plastic tableware and many other things. In conclusion city should ban single-use Styrofoam products.

Anchor Level 3–B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*Cities should ban single-use styrofoam products. Styrofoam products are effecting the environment and the oceans*).
- The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*Styrofoam builds up and up because it doesn't melt so when people throws Styrofoam they effecting the environment and the chemicals can slip in contaminate and health issue inside the body*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims, instead writing a paragraph that directly contradicts the initial claim (*Cities should not ban single-use Styrofoam products*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*its wrecks havoc on the environment and its not biodegradable*” and “*Chemicals can leach into it and contaminate it affecting human health and reproductive system*”).
- The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, providing two texts but omitting line numbers (*text 1* and *text 2*) and not providing a citation for a quote from a third text as well as copying some text incorrectly (*its wrecks havoc and Styrofoam is used to manufacture ... plastic tableware and many othe thing*).

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, with an introductory paragraph that states a claim in favor of banning styrofoam, followed by two paragraphs of support (*Another way Styrofoam Should be banned is it effect human health*), then a paragraph that directly contradicts the claim (*Cities Should not ban single-use styrofoam products. Styrofoam can help the environment in some ways*) and a final paragraph that reiterates the original claim (*In conclusion city should ban single-use Styrofoam products*), failing to create a coherent essay.
- The essay lacks a formal style, using imprecise language and structure. (*Styrofoam builds up and up, they effecting, and chemicals can slip in contaminate and health issue inside the body*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*when people throws; is it effect; person who give it to yo; many othe thing; In conclusion city should ban*) that hinder comprehension.

we should ^{not} have styrofoam Product because it harms the animal's and the nature. In text 1 ~~we~~ say styrofoam can also contribute to pollution, it could also make it into the waterways and can have disastrous effects on animals. This shows that styrofoams can harm the animals and get them sick. Also can end up in our water. In text 2 line 6-7 it says popular because of its light weight good for insulation properties. Also styrofoam has harmful effects. This shows styrofoam is hard to work with because it harmful to the human body. I think we should not have styrofoam because it could harm the ~~body~~ body systems and you also could get sick. The people who thinks we should have styrofoam would say EPS for food are were it less expensive than other products and provides better insulation which helps keep fresh longer. Styrofoam can let out toxins into your food when you are warming up your food, this is why we should have styrofoam because we could get sick at the end of it.

Anchor Level 2–A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*we should not have Styrofoam product because it harms the animal's and the nature*).
- The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*this shows that Styrofoams can harm the animals and get them sick and this is why we should have Styrofoam Be cuse we could get sick at the end of it*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*The people who thinks we should have Styrofoam would say EPS for food are were it less expensive than other products and provides better insulation which helps keep fresh Longer*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas inconsistently, in an attempt to support analysis, placing evidence supportive of a ban (*it could also make it into the waterways and can have disastrous effects on animals*) next to evidence that names some positive qualities of Styrofoam (*it says popular because of it's light weight good for insulation properties*). These latter qualities, however, are simply named with no transitioning and are not developed as evidence to oppose a ban.
- The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, providing citations to only two texts (*In text 1 line 20–21* and *In text 2 Line 6–7*), while other direct or closely paraphrased information is not acknowledged as such.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, consisting of only one paragraph that first states a pro claim, then lists negative aspects of styrofoam, recognizes the argument for styrofoam but does not refute it, and concludes with the claim that *we should have styrofoam Be cuse we could get sick at the end of it* which contradicts the opening position.
- The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*I could harm the boady styems and you also could get sick and Styrofoam can let out toics into your food when you are warming up you food*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay exhibits a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult (*the animal's; nature; in say; this shows; also can end; watter; it say's popular; boady; styems and; pepole who thinks; it less; toics*).

I said cities should not ban single used "styrofoam". It's OK for produce. Many people think it can be dangerous for animals but I think if it's used right. Text 1 says "The idea is that banning such products will reduce littering and protect some of the animals that mistake EPS waste for food or nesting material". This quote means it can be dangerous if you get a mistake with it and animals. This quote is saying that we have to make sure we don't use the one that is not for the animals. This quote supports my claim because I think this is not good to make a mistake with it. As long as we're careful with styrofoam.

Anchor Level 2-B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a claim (*I said citys should not ban singleused “styrofoam”*).
- The essay demonstrates confused or unclear analysis of the texts (*it can be dangrus if you get a mistake with it and animals*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims.

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents little evidence from the texts (“*The idea is that baning such products will ... protect some of the animals that mistake EPS waste for food an nesting material*”) with only a single quote.
- The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, citing only a single quote (*Text 1 says*).

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits little organization of ideas and information, consisting of a single paragraph that states a claim that objects to supporting a ban on single use polystyrene, followed by a quote that does not support the claim with explanations that are incoherent (*This quote is saying that we have to make shure we dont used the one that is not for the animals and This quote support my claim because I think this is not good to make a mistake with it*), concluding with a sentence that conditions the original claim (*As long as were carefull with styrofoam*).
- The essay lacks a formal style, using language that is sometimes inappropriate and imprecise (*singleused* for “single-use,”; *its OK*; *for an animals*; *an* for “and”; *if you get a mistake*; *were* for “we’re”).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*I said citys*; *its*; *for produced*; *peple*; *distrus*; *Text 1 says* “*The*; *baning*; *material*; *dangrus*; *shure*; *we dont used*; *This quote support*; *carefull*”) that make comprehension difficult.

Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – A

Cities should ban single-use "Styrofoam" products because it affects people and the world in different ways. Some ways are not only pollutes the air, but also has a result of liquid and solid toxic waste. This can affect negative environmental and health effects.

Anchor Level 1-A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a claim (*Cities should ban single-use "Styrofoam" products because it affects people and the world in different ways*).
- The essay demonstrates a confused or unclear analysis of the texts (*Some ways are not only pollutes the air, but also has a result of liquid and solid toxic waste*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims.

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents little evidence from the texts.
- The essay does not make use of citations.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay is minimal, making assessment of organization and coherence unreliable.
- The essay is minimal, making assessment of the use of language unreliable.

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.

Global warming and pollution is a very big problem today. It is something that scientist and environmentalist have been working on saving for years and years. Part of that problem being styrofoam. It is a very helpful tool and something that people do not think much about.

Anchor Level 1-B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay does not introduce a claim but provides two opposing ideas (*Part of that problem being styrofoam and It is a very helpful tool*).
- The essay does not demonstrate analysis of the texts.

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents no evidence from the texts.
- The essay does not make use of citations.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay is minimal, making assessment of organization and coherence unreliable.
- The essay is minimal, making assessment of language unreliable.

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.

Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

Polystyrene, referred to by many as "Styrofoam" is a material used to create many different products, especially in the food service industry. Recently, styrofoam has sparked many debates over its effect on the environment, and some regions have already banned the use of it in making products. Though styrofoam seems like it should definitely be banned on the surface, there are a number of details, including the extra cost of switching to a different material, the real effect it has on the environment, and that it is significantly more biodegradable than many people believe, that means it would actually be beneficial to continue using styrofoam instead of banning it and switching to an alternative.

Styrofoam is widely used because it is very cheap to produce, buy, and transport. Most companies prefer "EPS food ware because it's less expensive than other products and provides better insulation" (Text 1, lines 8-9). Because styrofoam is so cheap, it means consumers can get better quality food for lower prices. In some places that have already banned styrofoam, we have already seen some consequences. Businesses and consumers are forced to bear the costs of transitioning to other materials... A paper cup costs about two-and-one-half times what a styrofoam cup costs... Many small businesses operate on such narrow profit margins that a ban, even one including waivers, could be a death sentence.

Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

for them" (Text 3, lines 20-27). Switching to more expensive alternatives to styrofoam would be too expensive for a large number of small, family-owned restaurants, which could force them to close. It would also mean that consumers would have to pay more for the same food.

Another reason we should not switch to styrofoam alternatives is because producing styrofoam ~~does~~ does not have the same effects on the environment that producing other products has. Compared to producing styrofoam cups, paper cups "require 12 times more water and 36 times more electricity to manufacture" (Text 3 line 31). Styrofoam uses significantly fewer resources than paper alternatives. Paper cups also have to use harsh, environmentally damaging chemicals that are not used in styrofoam production.¹⁰ Producing foam cups doesn't require the use of harsh chemicals such as chlorine dioxide" (Text 3, lines 33-34). Since the most common alternative to styrofoam is paper products, the environment would actually be effected more if the world switched to paper.

Many people vastly underestimate the biodegradability of styrofoam products, which is a key argument ~~why~~ to put bans into place. ~~they~~ ~~say~~ Many will argue that EPS foam is "not biodegradable and therefore takes up a lot of space in landfills, which adds to the pollution problem" (Text 1, lines 16-18). This isn't exactly true. In the environment where styrofoam litter can be found, it can be broken down as quickly as a couple decades by sunlight, "breaking down polystyrene into basic

Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

chemical units of organic carbon, which dissolves into seawater. By the end of this process, the plastic has effectively disappeared from the environment" (Fact 4, Issues 27-30). Styrofoam is nowhere near as big of a problem to the environment than most people believe. It does not take "a million years" to break down.

If styrofoam was banned in many more regions, the world would suffer more than if we continued to use styrofoam products because the cost of switching would be too high, the environment would be impacted worse, and the main reason for the ban, Styrofoam's degradability, is not true.

A heated debate continues on whether or not cities should ban the single-use "Styrofoam" products. Some people argue that cities should ban the single-use "Styrofoam" products, however single-use "Styrofoam" products are beneficial, cheap, and used in everyday objects and should not be banned.

Styrofoam products are very beneficial for our food service industries because they "generally favors EPS for food ware because it's less expensive than other products and provides better insulation, which helps keep food fresh longer" (Text 1, lines 8-9). This quote shows that not only are we using styrofoam in our everyday products, but they're being used in a beneficial way that most of us don't even see.

Some may argue that less styrofoam will equal less pollution in our streets, parks, and beaches but that isn't necessarily true because "Styrofoam litter will ~~simply be replaced by~~ simply be replaced by the alternatives to polystyrene take-out food containers and drink cups." (Text 3, lines 15-16). This ~~shows~~ shows that ~~whether~~ whether we choose to ban styrofoam or not the amount of pollution compared to its substitution will be the same. "A California Water Resources Control Board report says there would be no improvement because 'mere substitution would not result in reduced trash generation if such product substitution would be discarded in the same manner as the banned item.'" (Text 3, lines 17-19) If we were to ban styrofoam products the only ~~a~~ substitution we would see is styrofoam in our

streets, parks, and beaches to its counterpart in our streets, parks, and beaches.

Another thing people may argue is that styrofoam is hurting the wildlife in the sea. Previous studies had shown that in the sea styrofoam is basically eternal, lasting thousands of years in the water. That is until a recent study came out, ~~saying that~~ five scientists found that sunlight can degrade polystyrene in centuries or even decades." (Text 4, lines 6-7). Part of the justification for a ban of styrofoam was that it takes forever to degrade but a huge part of the argument was taken out with this research. People may argue that even though it will break down it is still there, in the water, adding onto pollution and climate change, but a ~~new~~ new experiment shows "sunlight does even more, breaking down polystyrene into basic chemical units of organic carbon, which dissolves in seawater, and trace amounts of carbon dioxide, at levels too ~~far~~ low to play a role in climate change. By the end of ~~this~~ this process the plastic has effectively disappeared from the environment." (Text 4, lines 27-30). This quote shows that in as little as ten years the styrofoam will be completely gone as if it were never there, ~~never~~ having a minimal effect on the planet.

Some people argue that the styrofoam products should ~~be~~ be banned because "it's not biodegradable and therefore takes up a lot of space in landfills, which adds to the pollution problem. If littered, EPS foam sometimes breaks into smaller pieces that are more

Part 2 – Practice Paper – B

difficult to clean up." (Text 1, line 16-20). This would be a valid argument if it weren't for the sun being able to break the styrofoam down into nothing. In the worst case scenario the styrofoam will be thrown into a body of water by wind and then broken down in a couple decades.

In conclusion the styrofoam ban argument is an ~~stupid~~ argument that doesn't need to be around anymore. It is cheaper, provides protection for food and shipping products, and will be broken down by sunlight.

Part 2 – Practice Paper – C

keep styraphone! I use it an it
don't hurt me. I like it cuz it
is strong and keep my food an
drink warm an cold how I like
it. Text 1 proves it "Keep food
fresh longer". That show its
good for partys. And goin home
with ~~restarant~~ what I coulnt eat
for dinner.

Text 3 says baning styraphone
can kill people an make sum
poor. Why would I want that?
wen I bin have fresh food
instead. I just use styraphone
cup last week at freinds house
an my spdg stayed fresh till
I like it.

So keep styraphone an be
happy an healthy!

Part 2 – Practice Paper – D

After ^{four} thoroughly reading all ~~the~~ passages I have found that Styrofoam should be banned. When I read the article one I found that EPS products absolutely kill the environment, as well as it can be broken into pieces which then get blown by the wind into many spots which hurt the environment. Throughout text two I never realized how it effect us humans, which causes there skin to be irritated as well as there eyes to be irritated and it can even effect your upper respiratory system. There was one bad part that I would consider keeping the Styrofoam and that would be that it absolutely kills businesses because many business use this resource as it stated in text 3. So to wrap up I ~~don't~~ still do think that for the best, they should ban the Styrofoam.

Part 2 – Practice Paper – E

I think Styrofoam is good
because it's good for covering things
up, and when you burn it, it brings up
into nothing.

Practice Paper A – Score Level 5

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 5. The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim against banning styrofoam with a thorough analysis of the texts. It presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of relevant evidence and demonstrates proper citation of sources. The essay exhibits logical organization, creating a cohesive and coherent essay maintaining a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure. The essay demonstrates control of conventions with occasional errors when using sophisticated language.

Practice Paper B – Score Level 4

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 4. The essay introduces a precise claim with appropriate and accurate analysis and distinguishes the claim from opposing claims. The essay presents ideas sufficiently with predominantly proper citations and exhibits acceptable organization with a formal style and appropriate structure, demonstrating partial control of conventions.

Practice Paper C – Score Level 2

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 2. The essay introduces a claim in favor of keeping styrofoam followed by a confused analysis and no counterclaim. The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately, with a vague reference to Text 1 and an inaccurate reference to Text 3, using no line numbers. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization, failing to create coherence. The essay lacks a formal style, by using inappropriate and imprecise language. There is a lack of control of conventions with frequent errors that make comprehension difficult.

Practice Paper D – Score Level 3

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 3. The essay introduces a reasonable claim with some analysis of the texts but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas briefly, paraphrasing some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis. The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources, omitting line numbers when dealing with paraphrased material. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay, but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure. The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting errors that hinder comprehension.

Practice Paper E – Score Level 1

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 1. The essay introduces a claim, but makes no reference to the content of any text, including neither analysis nor citations. Because of its minimal nature, assessment of organization, language, and conventions is unreliable.