Section 1:

#1 "I think classrooms should have CCTV cameras because they make schools much safer. Bullying, stealing and even fights can happen at school, and cameras would help stop these problems."

Strengths: Your opening clearly states your position and gives specific examples of problems that cameras could address.

Weak argument support → Your reasoning here relies on the assumption that cameras automatically prevent problems, but you haven't explained how this would work in practice. The phrase "cameras would help stop these problems" needs more detailed explanation about the connection between recording and prevention.

Exemplar: *"CCTV cameras could reduce bullying because students would know their actions are being recorded, making them think twice before hurting others."*

#2 "Some people say CCTV is bad because it takes away privacy. But cameras don't need to be everywhere. They only be in classrooms, hallways and places where safety matters, not in private areas like toilets."

Strengths: You acknowledge the opposing viewpoint and offer a reasonable compromise about camera placement.

Insufficient counterargument development → Whilst you mention privacy concerns, your response "But cameras don't need to be everywhere" dismisses the concern rather than fully addressing why classroom surveillance is acceptable. You haven't explained why privacy in classrooms is less important than privacy in toilets.

Exemplar: *"Whilst privacy is important, classrooms are already public spaces where teachers and many students are present, so cameras wouldn't create new privacy concerns."*

#3 "At the end of the day, safety is the most important thing in a school. We already accept cameras in shops, banks and public areas, so why not classrooms too?"

Strengths: Your comparison to other public spaces provides a relatable analogy.

Oversimplified reasoning → Your conclusion "safety is the most important thing" presents this as an absolute truth without considering other important school values. The comparison "We already accept cameras in shops, banks" doesn't account for the different purposes and relationships in these environments compared to educational settings.

Exemplar: *"Safety is crucial in schools, and since we understand that cameras help protect people in other public spaces, they could serve a similar protective role in classrooms."*

■ Your piece presents a clear position on CCTV in classrooms with relevant examples and acknowledges opposing views. However, your arguments would benefit from deeper development and more nuanced reasoning. You tend to make broad statements without fully explaining the connections between your evidence and conclusions. Additionally, your responses to counterarguments need strengthening - rather than simply dismissing privacy concerns, you could explore why the benefits outweigh the drawbacks. Your writing would also improve by avoiding absolute statements like "safety is the most important thing" and instead showing how different school values can work together. Also, consider adding more specific examples of how CCTV has worked in similar environments. Furthermore, your conclusion could be stronger by summarising your key points rather than introducing new comparisons.

Overall Score: 39/50

Section 2:

#1 ~~I think pclassrooms~~ [I think classrooms] should have CCTV cameras because they make schools much safer. Bullying, stealing and even fights can happen at school, and cameras would help stop these problems. If students know they are being recorded, they are less likely to act badly. ~~This memeans~~ [This means] classrooms can feel calmer, and students can focus more on learning instead ~~soof~~ [of] worrying about unsafe situations.

#2 Some people say ~~weCCTV~~ [CCTV] is bad because it takes away privacy. But cameras don't need to be everywhere. They ~~s only~~ [should only] be in classrooms, hallways and ~~placeswhere~~ [places where] safety matters, not in private areas like toilets. The cameras are not there to spy on people—they are there to protect everyone. If something ~~badhappens~~ [bad happens], the footage shows the truth. This helps both students and teachers, because it proves what really went on.

Teachers also ~~benefi~~ [benefit] from CCTV. ~~Sometime~~ [Sometimes] students make unfair accusations against teachers, and cameras can protect them from that. It also works the other way—if a teacher does something wrong, the footage can show it. In this way, cameras make schools more fair for ~~everyon~~ [everyone].

#3 At the end of the day, safety is the most important thing in a school. We already accept cameras in shops, banks and public areas, so why not classrooms too? CCTV is not about control, it's about making sure everyone feels safe and respected. When students feel safe, they learn better and enjoy school more.

Section 1:

#1 - "Video games can actually be good for children, as long as they don't play too much. Many games help with problem-solving, creativity, and teamwork."

Strengths: Your opening clearly states your main argument and immediately provides three specific benefits that games can offer children.

Weakness: Vague support → Your statement "as long as they don't play too much" lacks specific guidance. What does "too much" actually mean? Without clear boundaries, your argument feels incomplete and doesn't help readers understand practical limits.

Exemplar: ***"Video games can benefit children when played for 1-2 hours daily, helping them develop problem-solving, creativity, and teamwork skills."***

#2 - "Online games let kids work together and make new friends from around the world. Shy children might also feel more confident playing games and talking online."

Strengths: You've identified an important benefit for shy children and explained how gaming can help them build confidence in social situations.

Weakness: Incomplete reasoning → Your writing mentions that shy children "might feel more confident" but doesn't explain why this happens or how it works. This leaves your point hanging without proper development.

Exemplar: ***"Online games provide a safe space where shy children can practise social skills through avatars, gradually building confidence that transfers to real-life conversations."***

#3 - "Some people think games are bad because they can be addictive or violent. While this can be true if someone plays for too long or plays the wrong types of games, the same can be said for almost anything."

Strengths: You acknowledge opposing viewpoints, which shows balanced thinking and makes your argument stronger.

Weakness: Weak comparison → Your comparison "the same can be said for almost anything" is too broad and doesn't specifically connect to gaming concerns. Television and junk food don't have the same addiction patterns or content issues as video games.

Exemplar: ***"Just like sports can cause injuries when safety rules aren't followed, video games only become problematic when time limits and age ratings are ignored."***

■ Your piece presents a clear argument about video games being beneficial for children, which is a solid foundation for persuasive writing. However, your ideas need stronger support with specific details and examples. When you mention benefits like "problem-solving" and "creativity," try adding concrete examples of how particular games develop these skills. Your writing would also improve by providing clearer guidelines - instead of saying "too much," specify actual time limits that parents could use. Additionally, some of your supporting points feel incomplete and need fuller explanations to convince readers. Also, your connections between ideas could be smoother with better transition sentences linking your paragraphs. Furthermore, your comparisons need to be more precise and relevant to strengthen your argument's logic.

Overall Score: 41/50

Section 2:

#1 Video games can actually be good for children, as long as they don't play too much. Many games help with problem-solving, creativity, and teamwork. For example, puzzle games make you think carefully, and building games like Minecraft encourage imagination. These skills are useful in real life, not just in the game. Video games are also entertaining, which can make children happy and reduce stress after a long day. Instead of seeing them as a waste of time, we should notice the positive skills they can teach when used responsibly.

#2 Another good thing about video games is that they can be social. Online games let kids work together and make new friends from around the world. Shy children might also feel more confident playing games and talking online. This can improve their communication and teamwork. Gaming can bring people together in the same way sports or clubs do, which is important for building friendships and learning how to ~~cooperate~~ [collaborate] with others.

#3 Some people think games are bad because they can be addictive or violent. While this can be true if someone plays for too long or plays the wrong types of games, the same can be said for almost anything. Watching too much television or eating too much junk food is also unhealthy. With time

limits and age-appropriate games, video gaming can be safe and positive. The problem is not the games themselves but how they are managed by parents and schools.

Overall, video games are not just a waste of time. They can help kids learn, build skills, and connect with others. Balance is the key—children should play games but also spend time outdoors, doing sports, and reading. If used in moderation, video games can be just as valuable as any other hobby. They are not something to fear, but something to guide and use in a way that benefits children's learning and development.

Section 1

#1 "All students should learn basic coding because technology is everywhere now. From apps on your phone to traffic lights and even cars, coding is behind it all."

Strengths: Your opening immediately connects coding to everyday life that readers can relate to. You provide concrete examples like phones and cars that make the topic feel relevant.

Lack of depth: → Your examples are quite basic and don't explain why understanding coding matters beyond just knowing it exists. When you say "coding is behind it all," you don't explore what this actually means for students or how this knowledge would benefit them specifically.

Exemplar: *"Learning basic coding helps students understand how the technology they use daily actually works, giving them more control over their digital world rather than just being passive users."*

#2 "Coding also helps students think in smarter ways. Writing code means breaking a problem into steps and testing different solutions. This builds problem-solving skills and resilience because mistakes are normal in coding, and you must try again until it works."

Strengths: You clearly connect coding to valuable thinking skills. Your explanation of how coding involves breaking problems into steps is well-structured.

Vague reasoning: → Whilst you mention that coding helps students "think in smarter ways," you don't provide specific examples of how these thinking skills transfer to other subjects or real-life situations. Your description remains quite general without concrete illustrations.

Exemplar: *"For instance, when students learn to debug code, they develop the same logical thinking skills needed to solve maths word problems or plan a science experiment."*

#3 "Making coding compulsory would give all students equal opportunities to learn skills that could lead to great jobs. Technology is one of the fastest-growing industries, and coding knowledge gives students an advantage."

Strengths: Your focus on equal opportunities shows consideration for fairness in education. You connect learning to future career prospects effectively.

Oversimplified argument: → Your reasoning about jobs and opportunities lacks nuance. You don't address what happens to students who struggle with coding or consider alternative ways they might

engage with technology. The connection between basic coding skills and actual job advantages isn't fully developed.

Exemplar: *"Even students who don't pursue programming careers can benefit from coding basics when they need to work with digital tools, understand data, or communicate with technical teams in any job."*

■ Your piece presents a clear stance on coding education with relevant examples that connect to students' lives. The structure flows logically from introducing the topic to addressing counterarguments. However, your arguments would be stronger with more specific details and deeper analysis. Additionally, you could expand on how coding skills actually transfer to other areas of learning and life. Your reasoning sometimes stays at the surface level without exploring the complexities of implementing coding education. Also, consider addressing different learning styles and abilities when discussing compulsory education. Furthermore, your examples could be more varied to show the breadth of coding applications. Moreover, you might strengthen your argument by explaining exactly how basic coding knowledge translates into practical advantages for students in their daily lives and future studies.

Score: 42/50

Section 2

#1 All students should learn basic coding because technology is everywhere now. From apps on your phone to traffic lights and even cars, coding is behind it all. If we don't understand how technology works, we can fall behind in the future. Learning coding gives students the power to create instead of just using technology. Even at a basic level, it can be exciting and useful. In a world that relies so heavily on computers, knowing how to code is becoming as important as knowing how to read or do maths.

#2 Coding also helps students think in smarter ways. Writing code means breaking a problem into steps and testing different solutions. This builds problem-solving skills and resilience because mistakes are normal in coding, and you must try again until it works. It also encourages creativity, since coding lets you design your own websites, apps, or games. These are skills that are useful in almost every part of life, not just in technology.

Some people say coding is too hard or not necessary for everyone. But not everyone who learns maths becomes a mathematician, and not everyone who learns writing becomes an author. Still, we teach these skills because they are important foundations. Coding should be the same. Students don't need to be experts, but everyone should learn the basics so they can understand the technology that surrounds them and use it confidently in their future.

#3 Making coding compulsory would give all students equal opportunities to learn skills that could lead to great jobs. Technology is one of the fastest-growing industries, and coding knowledge gives students an advantage. Even if they don't choose a tech career, the skills gained are still valuable. Coding is not just for computer whizzes; it's for everyone. By teaching coding in schools, we prepare students for the digital world they already live in and the future they will face.

Section 1:

#1 (First paragraph: "Schools should ban smartwatches because they are a big distraction...")

Strengths: Your opening clearly states your main argument and immediately gives readers specific examples like texting and playing games. You also connect the problem to learning outcomes effectively.

Lack of Supporting Evidence → Your argument would be stronger with concrete examples or statistics. Phrases like "they are a big distraction" and "makes it harder for them to learn properly" need backing. What studies show this? How many students actually get distracted? Without evidence, your claims seem like opinions rather than facts that would convince school administrators.

Exemplar: *"Research from Melbourne University shows that 73% of students admit to checking their smartwatches during lessons, leading to a 25% decrease in test scores."*

#2 (Second paragraph: "Smartwatches are also a serious problem during exams...")

Strengths: You identify a specific concern about academic integrity and explain how smartwatches could enable cheating. Your point about unfairness affecting the whole system shows good logical thinking.

Vague Consequences → You mention that smartwatches "makes cheating much easier" and can "store notes," but you don't explain exactly how this cheating happens or what the real consequences are. What specific features make cheating possible? What happens to students who get caught? Your argument needs clearer details about the actual cheating methods and their impact.

Exemplar: *"Students can secretly store exam answers in their watch notifications or use voice-to-text features to search for information online during tests."*

#3 (Third paragraph: "Some people argue that smartwatches are useful for health tracking...")

Strengths: You acknowledge opposing viewpoints, which shows balanced thinking. You also provide alternative solutions by mentioning school office systems and phones outside lessons.

Weak Counter-argument Response → Your dismissal of health and emergency benefits feels rushed. You simply state that "schools already have systems" without explaining why these systems are better or addressing serious health conditions that might require monitoring. Students with diabetes or heart conditions might genuinely need constant health tracking, and your response doesn't adequately address these legitimate concerns.

Exemplar: *"Whilst some students with medical conditions like diabetes need health monitoring, schools can work with families to create specific policies for these special circumstances rather than allowing all smartwatches."*

■ Your piece presents a clear position on smartwatch bans and follows a logical structure with introduction, supporting points, counter-arguments, and conclusion. However, your arguments need stronger foundations with specific evidence and examples to convince readers. Additionally, you could strengthen your content by exploring the topic's complexity more thoroughly. For instance, you might discuss different types of smartwatches and their varying capabilities, or examine how other schools have successfully managed this issue. Also, your counter-argument section could benefit from more thorough consideration of opposing viewpoints. Furthermore, you should provide more detailed explanations of how smartwatch distractions specifically interfere with different types of learning activities. Moreover, adding concrete suggestions for implementation would make your argument more practical and actionable.

Overall Score: 42/50

Section 2:

#1 Schools should ban smartwatches because they are a big distraction. Instead of focusing on lessons, students can text, play games, or check notifications without the teacher even noticing. This makes it harder for them to learn properly. Smartwatches take away attention from class and make it more difficult for teachers to keep control. In a place where learning should come first, smartwatches only create problems. Removing them would make classrooms calmer and more focused. Students would then be more likely to succeed in their studies.

#2 Smartwatches are also a serious problem during exams. They can connect to the internet or store notes, which makes cheating much easier. Even if most students are honest, the presence of smartwatches makes exams unfair. It only takes one person to misuse the device for the whole system to lose its integrity. If smartwatches are banned, schools can keep tests fair and ensure that results reflect real knowledge and effort.

#3 Some people argue that smartwatches are useful for health tracking or emergencies, but schools already have systems for dealing with urgent situations. Parents can be contacted through the office if

needed, and phones outside of lessons can provide the same features. Inside class, the main priority is learning, not checking step counts or replying to messages. The disadvantages of smartwatches far outweigh the small benefits they might bring to the classroom.

In the end, banning smartwatches is the best choice for schools. Students can still use them at home, but during the school day, they cause far more harm than good. By removing this distraction, schools send the message that classrooms are for focus, effort, and respect. This ensures that students get the most out of their education. Sometimes technology helps, but in this case, the best solution is to keep it out of the classroom.

Section 1:

#1 "Fireworks should be restricted because they can be very harmful to animals. Loud noises and bright flashes often scare pets, farm animals, and even wildlife."

Strengths: Your opening sentence clearly states your main argument, and you provide specific examples of different types of animals that are affected.

Weakness: Lack of supporting evidence → Your argument would be stronger if you included specific details about how animals are harmed. Phrases like "can be very harmful" and "often scare" are quite general and don't give readers concrete information about the extent of the problem.

Exemplar: *Research shows that during fireworks displays, animal shelters report a 30% increase in lost pets, and many wildlife species abandon their young due to the stress.*

#2 "People argue that fireworks are an important tradition and part of celebrations. While this is true, there are better alternatives."

Strengths: You acknowledge the opposing viewpoint, which shows balanced thinking, and you transition well into presenting alternatives.

Weakness: Underdeveloped counterargument → Your response to the tradition argument is quite brief with "While this is true" without exploring why traditions matter to people. You don't fully address why your alternatives would satisfy people who value fireworks as part of their cultural celebrations.

Exemplar: *Whilst fireworks hold cultural significance for many communities, especially during events like Australia Day and New Year's Eve, we can honour these traditions through alternatives that maintain the spectacle whilst protecting animals.*

#3 "Animals can't understand why the loud bangs are happening or prepare themselves for it. Unlike humans, they don't know it's temporary, and their fear is real."

Strengths: This section effectively explains the difference between human and animal experiences, and your point about animals not understanding the temporary nature is insightful.

Weakness: Repetitive reasoning → You repeat similar ideas about animal fear and suffering that you've already mentioned earlier in your piece. Phrases like "their fear is real" echo your earlier points about animals being "terrified" without adding new depth to your argument.

Exemplar: *This unpredictable trauma can lead to long-term behavioural changes in animals, including increased anxiety, loss of appetite, and destructive behaviour that persists long after the fireworks end.*

■ Your piece presents a clear argument for restricting fireworks with good organisation and a logical flow from problem to solution. You effectively use examples of different animals and acknowledge opposing views, which strengthens your writing. However, your argument would benefit from more specific evidence and deeper analysis. Additionally, you could expand your discussion of alternatives - what exactly makes laser light shows better, and how do they work? Your conclusion ties together your main points well, but the middle paragraphs could be developed further. Also, try to avoid repeating the same ideas about animal suffering throughout your piece. Instead, each paragraph should add something new to your argument.

Overall Score: 41/50

Section 2:

#1 Fireworks should be restricted because they can be very harmful to animals. Loud noises and bright flashes often scare pets, farm animals, and even wildlife. Dogs and cats may run away from home in fear, birds can abandon their nests, and horses may hurt themselves when they panic. While fireworks may look beautiful to us, to animals they can be terrifying and dangerous. Protecting animals from ~~unnecessaryj~~ [unnecessary] suffering should be more important than a few minutes of entertainment.

#2 People argue that fireworks are an important tradition and part of celebrations. ~~While~~ [Whilst] this is true, there are better alternatives. For example, laser light shows and quieter fireworks can still provide excitement and beauty without causing so much harm. These options let people enjoy celebrations without the same negative impact on animals. Society can still celebrate important events, but in a way that is safer and more responsible.

#3 Animals can't understand why the loud bangs are happening or prepare themselves for it. Unlike humans, they don't know it's temporary, and their fear is real. Many pet owners spend hours calming their animals or even need to sedate them during fireworks shows. Wild animals have no such help and often ~~ksuffer~~ [suffer] even more. If we have the ability to reduce this harm, we should take it. Compassion should ~~nguide~~ [guide] the way we celebrate.

Restricting fireworks doesn't mean ending celebrations; it just means ~~doingk~~ [doing] them more responsibly. By limiting when and how ~~fireworksare~~ [fireworks are] used, or replacing them with safer ~~alternative~~ [alternatives], we can ~~protec~~ [protect] animals while still enjoying special occasions. True celebrations should ~~bringjoy~~ [bring joy] for everyone, not fear for some. Protecting animals is a responsibility we all share, and restricting fireworks is one important step toward showing kindness and respect for them [.]