

Section 1

#1: Introduction paragraph

Strengths:

- Your opening clearly states your position on the topic, which helps the reader understand your viewpoint straight away.
- You've included a preview of your main reasons, giving your piece a clear structure.

Underdeveloped argument → Your introduction relies on a limited understanding of what AI can do. The statement "AI is not going to be doing any jobs (except helping teenagers write an essay)" dismisses many real-world applications of AI that already exist, such as AI systems that help doctors analyse medical scans, assist pilots in flying aeroplanes, or help scientists predict weather patterns. These examples show that AI already performs valuable work alongside humans in many fields. To strengthen your argument, you should acknowledge what AI can currently do and then explain specifically why you believe it has limitations for certain types of jobs, rather than making a sweeping claim that ignores existing uses.

Exemplar: *Whilst AI currently assists in various jobs like medical diagnosis and data analysis, it cannot fully replace humans in roles requiring physical presence and complex decision-making.*

#2: Body paragraph about AI lacking a humanoid form

Strengths:

- You've used a specific example (firefighting) to illustrate your point, which makes your argument more concrete.
- The rhetorical question about high-fiving and crawling adds some personality to your writing.

Narrow reasoning → Your paragraph assumes that all important jobs require a physical human body, but this overlooks the many vital jobs that don't need physical presence. For instance, AI systems already help monitor hospital patients, detect fraud in banking systems, translate languages in real time, and control traffic lights in cities. When you write "How is AI going to put out a fire, when it

can't even high-five someone or crawl?" you're only considering one type of job. Your argument would be stronger if you acknowledged that different jobs have different requirements, and then explained why physical jobs specifically cannot be done by AI, rather than suggesting all jobs need a humanoid form.

Exemplar: *Although AI cannot perform physical tasks like firefighting that require a human body, it can still assist in vital jobs that involve analysing information, making calculations, or monitoring systems.*

#3: Body paragraph about electricity requirements

Strengths:

- You've attempted to address a potential counterargument by mentioning solar panels, which shows you're thinking about different perspectives.
- Your scenario of an AI "chasing a criminal" creates a vivid image that supports your point.

Oversimplified comparison → Your paragraph suggests that because AI needs electricity, it's completely unreliable, but this doesn't account for how technology actually works in important jobs today. You write that AI might shut down whilst chasing a criminal, but this ignores that humans also have limitations—we need food, water, sleep, and rest, and we can get injured or ill. Modern technology that runs on electricity, like pacemakers that keep hearts beating or computers that control aeroplanes, have backup power systems and are designed to be very reliable. Your argument would be more convincing if you compared the specific limitations of both AI and humans fairly, rather than only pointing out AI's weaknesses whilst ignoring human limitations.

Exemplar: *Whilst AI systems require electricity and backup power sources, humans also need regular breaks, sleep, and sustenance, meaning both have different types of limitations to consider.*

■ Your piece takes a clear stance against AI replacing humans in important jobs, and you've organised your thoughts into separate paragraphs with distinct reasons. However, your argument needs more depth and balance to be truly persuasive. Currently, you're only looking at one side of the issue—the problems with AI—without acknowledging its actual capabilities or fairly comparing it to human workers. To improve the substance of your writing, you should research what AI can and cannot do today, then focus your argument on specific types of jobs where human qualities are truly irreplaceable.

For example, your second body paragraph could be strengthened by acknowledging that some vital jobs (like analysing data or monitoring systems) don't require a physical body, then explaining why jobs that do require physical presence are important and why robots might not be suitable for them. Additionally, your third paragraph about costs needs more specific information—you claim people are "cheaper and probably even free" and are "born, resourceless," but humans actually require years of education, training, food, housing, and healthcare, all of which cost money. A more balanced comparison would acknowledge both the costs of developing AI and the costs of training and supporting human workers. Also, your conclusion could be more effective if you summarised your strongest points rather than ending with a rhetorical question. Throughout your piece, try to show that you understand the complexity of the topic by acknowledging valid points on both sides before explaining why you still hold your position.

Overall Score: 41/50

Section 2

~~#1 AI is definitely not taking over valuable jobs from humans.~~ [Whilst some people worry about AI replacing human workers, there are several significant reasons why AI cannot take over valuable jobs from humans.] AI isn't a humanoid yet, relies on electricity to work [and] will ~~take~~ [require] a lot of money. Therefore, AI is not going to be doing any jobs (except helping teenagers write an essay).

#2 To begin with, AI is not a humanoid yet. AI doesn't have a body, arms, hands or legs. How is AI going to put out a fire when it can't even high-five someone or crawl? For that reason, AI can't do vital jobs.

Additionally, it requires electricity to work. AI isn't a human,; it's basically a robot. Say they somehow give AI humanoid properties, but it will still run on electricity. [Even if engineers somehow give AI humanoid properties, it would still run on electricity.] Imagine AI is chasing a criminal,; then, "NO POWER. SHUTTING DOWN." And if you're thinking of solar panels, how about if it's night time [night-time]? Plus, it [they] would really weigh them down, meaning they will be slower. So,[Therefore,] AI is unreliable for important jobs.

~~#3 To end with~~ [Finally], AI will ~~take~~ [require] a lot of money. AI will take time to train and ~~program~~ [programme], and it's not like that's free. People on the other hand, are cheaper and probably even free. AI needs resources to build, but people? They're just born, resourceless. Thus, AI is more expensive.

In conclusion, AI will never be running vital jobs. They aren't humanoids yet [and] when they are they ~~take~~ [will require] electricity to run, making them unreliable and ~~will be~~ very expensive to make. Do you want to waste a lot of precious resources just to make some robot that takes forever to train?