

Sample of Multi-Draft Reading with Student Writing

Dear Stillwater County News Editor,

When people own and drive cars, it provides a sense of responsibility and enjoyment. Driving the car itself creates a task that needs to be completed and there is a feeling of accomplishment when it is done. Then you add driverless cars into the pot. The driverless car would just be another boring way of transportation like the subway or train. Why would you want a car that drives itself?

When teens buy their first car, they feel like they have crested the hill of independence and responsibility. If every person is required to have a driverless car, it is like being told that the only way to get around is by train. I understand that these cars could be the future and it could help people with disabilities. They need a way to get around and a car that drives itself would be perfect for those who are blind or have a disorder. No one will buy a driverless car unless they have a disability.

In the article published by the McClatchy-Tribune, Professor John D. Lee says that the new technology will “make driving safety in the United States a lot better.” The article also says that the driverless cars will reduce human error while on the roadway. Although these cars are safer, Scott Le Vine and some other researchers ran some tests on these cars and found that these cars don’t always have ethical decision making skills. In his article, he sets up an extreme scenario. What if a crash is unavoidable and you had three things that you could hit: a mother pushing a baby stroller, an elderly couple, or a brick wall. Since these cars only obey their preprogrammed algorithm, they will pick the lightest and safest choice. Therefore, we could assume the car would pick the mother and the baby.

Another problem with driverless cars is how they hold up in traffic. In California intersections, there was a 20 second delay when there were driverless cars among normal cars. The reason for this delay was the need for a comfortable ride in order to not jostle the passengers. The acceleration and deceleration of the car had to be smoothed out creating the extra delay.

In conclusion, driverless cars need to become a thing of the past. If they are updated and depended on, gone will be the days of joy rides and road trips. It is not about the destination as much as it is about the journey.

Dear Stillwater County News Editor,

When people own and drive cars, it provides a sense of **responsibility and enjoyment**. Driving the car itself creates a task that needs to be completed and there is a feeling of accomplishment when it is done. Then you add driverless cars into the pot. The driverless car would just be another **boring way of transportation like the subway or train**. **Why would you want a car that drives itself?**

When teens buy their first car, they feel like they have crested the hill of **independence and responsibility**. If every person is required to have a driverless car, it is like being told that the only way to get around is by train. I understand that these cars could be the future and it could help people with disabilities. They need a way to get around and a car that drives itself would be perfect for those who are blind or have a disorder. **No one will buy a driverless car unless they have a disability.**

In the article published by the McClatchy-Tribune, Professor John D. Lee says that the new technology will “make driving safety in the United States a lot better.” The article also says that the driverless cars will **reduce human error** while on the roadway. Although these cars are safer, Scott Le Vine and some other researchers ran some tests on these cars and found that these cars don’t always **have ethical decision making skills**. In his article, he sets up an extreme scenario. What if a crash is unavoidable and you had three things that you could hit: a mother pushing a baby stroller, an elderly couple, or a brick wall. Since these cars only obey their preprogrammed algorithm, they will pick the lightest and safest choice. Therefore, we could assume the car would pick the mother and the baby.

Another problem with driverless cars is how they hold up in traffic. In California intersections, there was a 20 second delay when there were driverless cars among normal cars. **The reason for this delay was the need for a comfortable ride in order to not jostle the passengers. The acceleration and deceleration of the car had to be smoothed out creating the extra delay.**

In conclusion, driverless cars need to become a thing of the past. If they are updated and depended on, gone will be the days of joy rides and road trips. **It is not about the destination as much as it is about the journey.**

Something happened—Issue

Early Claim—Question launches the argument’s focus and position

Multiple Views: Teen view and countering view—People with disabilities

Rebuttal—connects back to Early Claim

Multiple Views: Countering evidence on safety and rebuttal evidence on poor ethical choices that develop responsibility

And so, now...Claim
Revises original claim

Stretching Students into Understanding the Function of the Common Moves

POSSIBLE CHART: Teacher Model for Small Group Work [Note: Creating and discussing analysis with this degree of detail will lengthen the lesson. Some teachers may elect to annotate the moves on the reading and only chart function.]

“Ethical, and Efficiency, Tradeoffs” by Scott Le Vine [Note: This model is one reader’s understanding of the moves and function. It is not a “right” answer. This may be a first effort to describe a purposeful argument. An essential skill is naming the moves and using key words from the text to describe the function.]

Chunk of Text	Argument Move	Function for Argument
Headline		Key words identify focus: ethical, efficiency, tradeoffs
Paragraph 1	Claim Commentary	States claim to identify key focus for argument—ethical tradeoffs. Commentary introduces the attraction for speed and supporting evidence on crash risks.
Paragraph 2	Commentary	Commentary develops contrasting views of <u>human drivers</u> and supporting evidence on <u>pre-programmed algorithms</u> of driverless cars and poses an unsolved problem .
Textbox		Key words emphasize contrast between humans and <u>self-driving technology</u> and focuses on <u>speed</u> and <u>speed-limit laws</u> .
Paragraph 3	Multiple Views	Countering evidence states speed is a key problem and suggests in <u>some circumstances</u> driverless cars <u>reportedly</u> may be <u>safer</u> than human drivers. Key words seem to question evidence.
Paragraph 4	Commentary Claim	Commentary clarifies claim by imagining the problem with a future of <u>autonomous vehicles</u> and the call for <u>state legislatures</u> to respond.
Paragraph 5	Commentary Multiple Views	Commentary shifts the focus and illustrates the <u>promises</u> and the <u>unintended consequences</u> with <u>self-driving technology</u> with countering and refuting evidence.
Paragraph 6	Claim	Refined claim shifts the focus from speed and the choice of should we or shouldn’t we have this <u>self-driving technology</u> to the expected impact on ways to <u>think about efficiency and ethical tradeoffs</u> .