

Section 1:

#1 "To start off with, solar power is unusually bulky, and takes up more space rather than helps. Would you want our luscious green fields to be wasted would you? Well, if solar power becomes mandatory, then those fields will be wasted. Imagine what that would lead to? To more playgrounds and no more places to run wild. All this would all be because of mandatory solar power."

Strengths:

- You've used emotive language effectively to create a visual image of "luscious green fields"
- Your rhetorical question engages the reader directly

Weakness: Unclear argument flow → Your argument jumps between several different points without fully developing them. First, you mention bulkiness, then wasted fields, then playgrounds. The reader might struggle to follow your reasoning. For example, the statement "To more playgrounds and no more places to run wild" doesn't clearly connect to your main point about space usage.

Exemplar: *"To start off with, solar power installations are unusually bulky, occupying vast amounts of precious land. Would you want our luscious green fields to be sacrificed? If solar power becomes mandatory, these natural spaces will be converted into industrial zones filled with panels, leaving fewer places for children to play and wildlife to thrive."*

#2 "Moreover, solar power costs an extreme amount of money. We are currently not using solar power a lot as a country, so the transition will be expensive. Plus, are we going to make any profit or get any of that money back? There is absolutely no point in having the whole country to switch if we are not going to make anything out of it. Mandatory solar power is just another way we will waste money."

Strengths:

- You've identified a practical concern about cost that many readers would relate to
- You use questions effectively to make readers think about financial implications

Weakness: Unsupported claims → Your argument about costs lacks specific examples or evidence. Terms like "extreme amount" and "expensive" are vague. You claim there is "absolutely no point" without explaining why the investment wouldn't pay off. This weakens your position because readers might wonder about long-term savings or environmental benefits that could offset initial costs.

Exemplar: *"Moreover, solar power installations require a massive upfront investment from homeowners. The average Australian household would need to spend \$10,000-\$15,000 for a basic system. With our current limited solar infrastructure, the nationwide transition costs would be staggering. These expenses would burden families financially for years before any meaningful return on investment could be realised."*

#3 "In addition, solar power is fragile and easy to break. This will mean we will have to take extra care to make sure our energy source won't break. But why do that when you can choose to not use solar power and not have to have any care. It is clear that solar power is just a complete waste of time and effort and by making solar power mandatory we are just wasting everyone's time."

Strengths:

- You've introduced a practical concern about maintenance that many might not consider
- Your writing has a strong, confident tone that reinforces your position

Weakness: Repetitive phrasing → This paragraph repeats words like "break," "care," and "waste" multiple times, which makes your writing seem less sophisticated. The structure also becomes repetitive with several sentences following the same pattern. This affects the flow of your argument and misses opportunities to expand on your point about fragility with specific examples.

Exemplar: *"In addition, solar panels are vulnerable to damage from severe weather conditions like hailstorms and cyclones. This vulnerability requires constant monitoring and expensive maintenance to ensure reliable power generation. Traditional energy sources don't demand this level of ongoing attention and investment, making them more dependable for everyday Australians."*

■ Your persuasive piece shows passion for your position against mandatory solar power. However, your arguments could benefit from more depth and specific details. Try strengthening each paragraph by focusing on one clear point and supporting it with

concrete examples. For instance, when discussing costs, mention specific figures that show how expensive installation might be for an average family. When talking about space concerns, provide measurements or comparisons that help readers visualise the problem. Your conclusion restates your position well, but could be stronger by briefly summarising your main points. Also, consider acknowledging the opposing viewpoint briefly before explaining why your position is stronger. This shows readers you've thought about all sides of the issue. You could improve the flow between paragraphs by using clearer transitions that show how each point connects to your overall argument.

Overall Score: 40/50

Section 2:

Imagine a world where pure green fields are all wasted for the sake of one thing, solar power. The egregious idea of mandatory solar power will lead to multiple consequences, not environmental solutions. Mandatory solar power for homes will be a serious issue, and certainly not solve any global problems. Solar power takes up an extreme amount of space, costs an unnecessary amount of money, and is overly fragile and hard to maintain. Let's explore the economic, environmental, and logistical reasons why solar power must be banned.

#1 To start off with, solar power is unusually bulky, and takes up more space rather than helps. Would you want our luscious green fields to be wasted ~~would you~~? Well, if solar power becomes mandatory, then those fields will be wasted. Imagine what that would lead to? ~~To more~~ [To fewer] playgrounds and no more places to run wild. ~~All this would all be~~ [All this would be] because of mandatory solar power. If ~~we can~~ [we make] solar power mandatory to all homes, then where would the storage space used by those huge items be ~~replaced~~ [found]?

#2 Moreover, solar power costs an extreme amount of money. We are currently not using solar power a lot as a country, so the transition will be expensive. Plus, are we going to make any profit or get any of that money back? There is absolutely no point in having the whole country ~~to switch~~ [switch] if we are not going to make anything out of it. Mandatory solar power is just another way we will waste money.

#3 In addition, solar power is fragile and easy to break. This will mean we will have to take extra care to make sure our energy source won't break. ~~But why do that when you can choose to not use solar power and not have to have any care.~~ [But why do that when you can choose not to use solar power and avoid this extra responsibility altogether?] It is clear that solar power is just a complete waste of time and effort and ~~by~~ [by] making solar power mandatory we are just wasting everyone's time.

In summation, mandatory solar power is an egregious idea. It is a waste of space, money, and time. It is unquestionable that mandatory solar power must not be implemented in Australia. So for the sake of our community, make sure the use of solar power does not become mandatory, and I guarantee our community will continue to strive for excellence.