-01-

Section 1:

#1 (First paragraph of smartphones essay) Strengths:

- You've introduced your main argument clearly
- You acknowledge both sides of the debate initially

Weaknesses: Unclear stance \rightarrow Your opening presents conflicting views without establishing a firm position. You begin by agreeing phones make us "dumber" but then immediately contradict this. Your phrase "technically forcing us to rely on them" weakens your argument.

Exemplar: Smartphones enhance our capabilities in countless ways, from instant access to information to connecting globally, though we must be mindful of how we use them.

#2 (First paragraph of richer nations essay) Strengths:

- You state your position confidently
- You preview your main points clearly

Weaknesses: Unsupported claims \rightarrow You make a bold claim about solving world hunger without proper backing. Your statement "If we gave 50% of the total to poorer nations" doesn't specify what "total" refers to.

Exemplar: Wealthy nations have both the resources and moral duty to support developing countries, as this aid could dramatically improve living conditions worldwide.

#3 (Last paragraph of smartphones essay) Strengths:

- You attempt to summarise your main points
- You end with a clear call to action

Weaknesses: Repetitive conclusion \rightarrow Your conclusion simply restates previous points without strengthening your argument. The phrase "smartphones aren't that bad" uses weak language that undermines your position.

Exemplar: Given their vital role in development, daily communication, and reliable information sharing, smartphones have become essential tools that enhance our modern lives.

■ Your persuasive pieces would benefit from stronger evidence to support your claims. Take your smartphone essay's second paragraph - instead of just mentioning the number of phones made, talk about how they've improved education or business. Also, in your richer nations essay, when you discuss solving world hunger, give examples of successful aid programmes. Your arguments need more real-world examples that readers can relate to. Additionally, work on making your conclusions more powerful by explaining why your points matter to the reader. Try taking your third paragraph in the smartphone essay and add specific ways phones helped during Covid, like enabling students to attend classes or helping doctors provide remote care.

Score: 41/50

Section 2:

Are smartphones making us dumber?

In a way, yes, the quick transitions and updates of iphones are making us dumber, technically foreing us to rely on them and using them on a day to day basis. [While smartphones and their frequent updates may create dependency, their benefits far outweigh any concerns.] However, smartphones aren't a bad thing. They are one of the biggest things in development, phones are things we use from [on] a day to day basis and we trust them.

#1 First I will talk about how they develop rapidly. A new Iphone [iPhone] is released every year, and a new samsung [Samsung], the same. This is proof that it is a growing industry. Roughly, 18.22 billion phones have been made since the 1850s, and if that isn't proof of what fast production and evolution is, I don't know what is. Therefore, phones aren't making us dumber.

Next, the usage of phones. Every day, we use a phone, to text or to play. It is something that keeps us together even during a pandemic. Think about what a life saver phones were during Covid [COVID-19], home schooling, meetings and even exams. Around 6 billion people use a phone from [on a] day to day basis. Hence, phones aren't a bad thing.

#3 Last but not least [Finally], we trust them. Weather, driving conditions and news, all of them we know from our phones. Without them, we would have to video them ourselves then send them to family. [Without phones, sharing important information with family would be much more difficult.] How would we be able to do that if there weren't any smartphones? Therefore, smartphones are a core item that keeps us together. Therefore, smartphones aren't bad.

With the points stated above, they are one of the biggest things in development, phones are things we use from [on a] day to day basis and we trust them, smartphones aren't that bad and they don't make us dumber, therefore, I hope you believe that smartphones are crucial.

Should richer countries be required to help poorer nations?

#2 Yes, richer countries must be supporting poorer nations. This is because Rich countries have a lot of money stored. If we gave 50% of the total to poorer nations, we can save world hunger in 5 years. Today I will be talking about what would happen if we did, how easy it is and the impact.

First, what would happen if rich countries donated to poorer nations. Firstly, We can solve world hunger in 5 years, we can build permanent residences for people in places like Africa and poorer nations, but also have money to spare. Countries with a high net wage, like China and the U.S.A will have to give money. Therefore richer countries will have to pay the poorer countries.

Next, how easy it is. You can either buy food and ship it to countries, but that may result in rotting and failure to transport, or sending money in their currency to each person. Also building houses, wells and schools in poorer nations. Therefore rich countries must give money to poorer nations.

Lastly, the impact. The average age increases from 50 to 70, millions of lives will be saved and hundreds and thousands of people will move out of Africa and start a normal family. Would you really not want that not to happen? Therefore richer countries must give money to poorer nations.

In conclusion, I think that richer countries must help poorer nations because of what would happen if we did, how easy it is and the impact. I now hope you agree with me.

Section 1:

#1 (First paragraph) Strengths:

- Clear introduction of the main topic through thought-provoking questions
- Good hook that engages readers by addressing their daily experiences

Weaknesses: Underdeveloped Opening \rightarrow Your opening raises interesting questions but doesn't fully set up your argument. The questions feel disconnected and don't build towards your main point about later school start times.

I believe schools should start later because the current early start times negatively impact students' wellbeing, personal development, and academic success. Today, I will explain why pushing back school hours would benefit students in multiple ways.

#2 (Second paragraph) Strengths:

- Good focus on hobbies as an important aspect of childhood
- Links hobbies to future career opportunities

Weaknesses: Limited Supporting Details \rightarrow Your paragraph about hobbies lacks specific examples of how early start times actually prevent students from pursuing their interests. You mention that hobbies are important but don't show how current school times affect them.

When schools start early, students often have to choose between getting enough sleep or pursuing activities they love. For instance, a student who loves art might have to give up evening drawing classes because they need to wake up at 6am for school.

#3 (Fourth paragraph) Strengths:

- Addresses student preferences directly
- Uses student opinions to support the argument

Weaknesses: Shallow Evidence \rightarrow Your point about student preferences needs more depth. Simply stating that students want later start times isn't enough to convince readers. You need to explain why they want this change.

Students overwhelmingly support later start times because they struggle to focus and learn effectively when they're tired. Many say they feel more alert and ready to learn when they get enough sleep.

■ Your persuasive piece has a good basic structure and raises important points about school start times. To make your writing more convincing, you need to dig deeper into each argument. For example, when you talk about connecting with family, explain exactly how early starts prevent this - maybe describe a typical morning rush. Also, your paragraphs would be stronger if you added real-life examples that readers can relate to. Your conclusion could be more powerful by reminding readers why this change matters for students' daily lives. Additionally, try linking your points together more smoothly - show how sleep, hobbies, and family time all connect to make students happier and more successful. You could also talk about how later starts might help students learn better because they're more awake and focused.

Score: 38/50

Section 2:

Schools should start later

School, 8.30 start, 3.00 end, repeat that 5 days. [Starting school at 8:30 AM and ending at 3:00 PM, five days a week,] Do kids really get enough time to follow their passions and hobbies? Do they really have enough time to connect? But most importantly, do they even want to? Today, I will talk about if [why] schools should start later. #1

First, because they will have the time to pursue hobbies. Hobbies are one of the most important things in a childhood [;] hobbies can lead to jobs and fun [, which are] Some of the most important aspects in life. However, if the [a] kid doesn't have time to do those things they love, they won't have a fulfilling life. Therefore, schools must start later. #2

Next, Will [will] they really have time to connect? When kids get to school, they always come back with homework, and the only time they even have time to talk [have limited time for conversation]. So if school starts later, They [they] will have enough time to wake up and talk to their family[before going] then go to school. Therefore, schools should start later.

Lastly, do kids even want to do this everyday? Of course school is compulsory, but will students prefer it if it started later? Almost 6 in 10 students want school to start at 10.30 every day. This is a clear example of wanting to start school later. Hence, school should start later. #3

With my points stated above, They [students] will have time to do their hobbies, they will have time to connect and kids want to start school later. I hope you agree with me that school should start later.