

### Section 1:

#1 (First paragraph: "The daily pilgrimage of a child to school...")

**Strengths:** Your opening creates a strong emotional connection by calling school travel a "pilgrimage" and positions the issue as morally important. You clearly state your position right away, which helps readers understand your argument.

**Weakness: Unclear main point structure** → Your opening paragraph tries to cover too many different ideas at once. You mention it being a "moral and logical imperative," a "data-driven solution," and a "statement about values" all in one sentence. This makes it hard for readers to follow which main point you'll focus on first. The phrase "profound moral and logical imperative" packs too many concepts together without explaining what each means.

**Exemplar:** *"Installing pedestrian crossings with flashing lights near schools is essential for child safety. This solution will protect our most vulnerable community members."*

#2 (Second paragraph: "At its core, the argument for a signalised crossing...")

**Strengths:** You include specific statistics (70% reduction) which strengthens your argument with evidence. Your comparison between painted crossings and flashing lights shows clear reasoning.

**Weakness: Missing connection between ideas** → You jump between different supporting points without smooth transitions. You mention "Transport for NSW" data, then discuss human error, then talk about "controlled environments" without clearly linking these ideas together. The sentence "In the equation of road safety, this removes the dangerous variable of chance" feels disconnected from the previous sentence about clear rules.

**Exemplar:** *"This data from Transport for NSW shows why flashing lights work better than painted crossings. Because drivers can see the bright signals more easily, they make fewer mistakes when children are crossing."*

#3 (Fourth paragraph: "This leads to a crucial point of communal responsibility...")

**Strengths:** You connect the crossing issue to broader community values, which strengthens your argument. Mentioning specific community leaders like principals and P&C associations adds credibility.

**Weakness: Vague supporting details** → You mention that "esteemed figures" support these measures but don't explain why their opinions matter or what specific experience they have. The phrase "expert and lived experience" is unclear - what makes these people experts? You also don't explain how installing a crossing actually shows the community is "proactive, compassionate, and prudent."

**Exemplar:** *"School principals support flashing lights because they see near-miss accidents happen regularly. Their daily experience managing student safety gives them important knowledge about what works."*

■ Your piece presents a well-structured argument for installing flashing lights at school crossings. Your writing shows good organisation with clear paragraphs that each focus on different supporting points. However, you can strengthen your content by making connections between ideas clearer and providing more specific details to support your points. Consider explaining why each piece of evidence matters to your main argument. Additionally, some of your sentences try to cover too many ideas at once, which can confuse readers. Try breaking complex sentences into simpler ones that each focus on one main idea. Your emotional appeals work well, but they would be even stronger if paired with more concrete examples of how flashing lights have helped other schools. Also consider adding more specific details about costs, installation processes, or local examples to make your argument more practical and relatable for readers.

---

**Score: 45/50**

---

## **Section 2:**

**#1** The daily pilgrimage of a child to school, a journey toward knowledge and a brighter future, should never be a gamble with their safety. Yet, along the bustling roads that flank our educational institutions, this journey is often fraught with peril. The proposal to install a pedestrian crossing equipped with flashing lights next to a school is, therefore, not a matter of mere convenience but a profound moral and logical imperative. It is a necessary investment in the well-being of our community's most vulnerable, a data-driven solution to a clear and present danger, and a tangible statement about the values we hold.

**#2** At its core, the argument for a ~~signalised~~ [signalled] crossing rests on an undeniable foundation of logic and safety data. Traffic flow near schools is notoriously chaotic, characterised by a high volume of vehicles, fluctuating speeds, and the inherent unpredictability of young children. A standard painted crossing, or "zebra crossing," relies entirely on driver vigilance—a factor dangerously compromised by distractions, adverse weather, or the low sun of an early morning. Flashing lights, however, introduce an active, unambiguous command. They are a universal symbol that cuts through visual noise and demands a driver's attention, transforming a passive suggestion to yield into an active instruction to stop. Road safety authorities, such as Transport for NSW, consistently report a significant reduction in pedestrian incidents following the installation of active warning systems. Indeed, studies indicate that ~~signalised~~ [signalled] crossings can reduce pedestrian-vehicle incidents in school zones by over 70%. By mitigating the risk of human error, such systems create a controlled, predictable environment where the rules are clear for all. In the equation of road safety, this removes the dangerous variable of chance.

Beyond the cold calculus of risk assessment lies the powerful emotional reality of our community. Consider the parent, waving goodbye at the school gate, whose sense of relief is shadowed by a gnawing anxiety until their child is safely home. For every parent who holds their breath until the school gate is crossed, the flashing lights offer a tangible release. This daily emotional burden, carried by countless families, can be significantly lightened by a visible and effective safety measure. The flashing lights of a crossing are more than just signals; they are beacons of reassurance. They represent the community's collective promise to its children: "Your safety is our priority." Furthermore, for the children themselves, having a designated, safe place to cross the road empowers them. It fosters independence and responsible decision-making within a secure framework. What price can be placed on a child's life? What cost is too high to prevent the lifetime of grief that a single, preventable accident would cause a family and the wider community? The peace of mind this infrastructure provides is, in itself, an invaluable asset.

**#3** This leads to a crucial point of communal responsibility and character. A society is rightly judged by how it protects its most vulnerable members. The decision to install a high-visibility crossing is a reflection of a community's character—it signals that we are proactive, compassionate, and prudent. It aligns the actions of our council and transport authorities with the values espoused by our schools and parents. Esteemed figures like school principals, leaders of Parents and Citizens' associations, and local emergency service personnel consistently advocate for such measures. By heeding their expert and lived experience, we build a society that is not only safer but also more cohesive and caring. To choose inaction is to accept an unnecessary risk; to act is to uphold our civic duty and reinforce the foundational belief that a child's welfare is paramount.

Naturally, any such proposal invites scrutiny, with counterarguments typically centred on financial cost, traffic congestion, and the potential for creating a "false sense of security." Opponents may argue the considerable expense could be better allocated, that forcing traffic to halt will create frustrating bottlenecks, and that children may become less vigilant, feeling overly protected by the lights. While these points merit consideration, they do not withstand inspection. Framing the cost as an expense is a fallacy; it is an investment in prevention, far cheaper than the immense societal cost of a single serious accident. The traffic disruption is also minimal and targeted, a minor inconvenience for commuters when weighed against a child's life. Finally, the crossing is not a replacement for road safety education but a vital supplement, providing a structured environment for children to apply their knowledge while placing the ultimate responsibility on the driver, who is confronted by an unmissable signal. It is a multi-layered system, not a single point of failure.

In conclusion, the question is not whether we can afford to install a ~~signalised~~ [signalled] crossing, but whether we can afford not to. The logical evidence for its effectiveness is overwhelming, the emotional relief it would provide to the community is profound, and the moral statement it makes is unequivocal. By prioritising this measure, we move beyond passive hope and take active, demonstrable steps to protect our children. Let us choose foresight over regret, and in doing so, affirm our commitment to a future where every child's journey to school is a safe one.