

Section 1:

#1 "Imagine what you would feel if you were a lonely and hopeless orphan sitting in the middle of a deserted street, in a war and about to be blasted?"

Strengths: You've used an emotional appeal to engage your reader immediately. Your opening question encourages empathy by asking readers to put themselves in a vulnerable position.

Weaknesses: Unclear scenario → Your opening scenario combines too many different elements (being an orphan, sitting in a deserted street, being in a war zone) which makes the situation seem unrealistic. The connection between orphanages and war zones isn't well established, making your argument less convincing. Your opening would be stronger if you focused on one clear scenario that directly connects to your main argument.

Exemplar: ***Imagine how frightened a child would feel, alone in an orphanage as bombs fall nearby. Without proper funding, these vulnerable children have nowhere safe to go.***

#2 "All over the world this is currently a devastating event where soldiers are mistaking them as important children on other sides and killing defenceless orphans."

Strengths: You're attempting to establish the global nature of the problem, which gives your argument more weight. You're also trying to highlight the vulnerability of the children.

Weaknesses: Unsubstantiated claim → You've made a very serious claim about soldiers deliberately targeting orphans without providing any context or evidence. This weakens your argument because readers may question the accuracy of your statement. Your writing would be more persuasive if you focused on how orphans are vulnerable during conflicts without making accusations that may not be accurate.

Exemplar: ***Across war-torn regions, orphaned children are particularly vulnerable as they lack the protection of families and properly funded orphanages that could keep them safe from conflict.***

#3 "In conclusion we must donate money to orphanages and ban pointless wars now!"

Strengths: You've provided a clear call to action, telling readers exactly what you want them to do. Your conclusion summarises your main points about donations and preventing wars.

Weaknesses: Simplistic solution → Your conclusion presents an oversimplified solution to extremely complex problems. Banning "pointless wars" is not something an individual reader can accomplish, which makes your call to action less effective. Your writing would be more persuasive if you focused on specific, achievable actions that readers can take.

Exemplar: ***We must support orphanages through donations and awareness campaigns, while also urging our government to pursue peaceful solutions to international conflicts.***

■ Your piece shows genuine passion for helping vulnerable children, which is commendable. However, you need to develop your arguments with more clarity and logical connections. Your main points jump between different ideas without fully explaining how they connect. Try to organise your thoughts into clear paragraphs, each focusing on one main point about why orphanages need support. Also, your writing would be more persuasive if you explained exactly how donations would help orphans rather than making broad claims. Additionally, consider focusing on realistic actions readers can take, rather than suggesting they can "ban wars." You might also want to check your spelling and grammar carefully, as errors can distract from your important message. The emotional appeal in your writing is good, but balance it with clearer reasoning to make your argument stronger. Finally, try reading your work aloud to catch awkward phrasing before finalising it.

Overall score: 36/50

Section 2:

Kindness Now; Ban Wars

Imagine what you ~~would~~ [would] feel if you ~~where~~ [were] a ~~lonley~~ [lonely] and hopeless orphan sitting in the middle of a deserted street, in a war and about to be blasted? #1 Well donate money to orphanages to prevent this from happening. All over the world this is ~~euently~~ [currently] a ~~devistating~~ [devastating] event where ~~solderies~~ [soldiers] are mistaking them as ~~important~~ [important] children on other sides and killing ~~defenceless~~ [defenceless] orphans. #2 This is only happening because orphanages are not being donated enough money so they are forced to kick out orphans and shut down. If those important ~~organisatoins~~ [organisations] shut ~~dow~~ [down] and kick out all the children then the ~~chidren~~ [children] may die of hunger or die in a war if there is one in that city.

Another reason orphanages are ~~shuting~~ [shutting] down most commonly is because ~~solderies~~ [soldiers] are needing food less than orphans do, in a war they blast buildings including the

~~defenceless~~ [defenceless] orphanage and also the ~~government~~ [government] may ask the ~~organisation~~ [organisation] to give money to the ~~solders~~ [soldiers] so they can buy ~~wepons~~ [weapons]. Plus why ~~would~~ [would] any one kill small ~~defenceless~~ [defenceless] orphans? The answer is because wars are cruel! We must donate money to ~~orphanags~~ [orphanages] so they can buy food and rebuild after destruction if there is one. In ~~conclution~~ [conclusion] we must donate money to ~~orphanags~~ [orphanages] and ban pointless wars now! #3