

Section 1

#1: Opening paragraph "What is the impact of technology on human connection and is it good or bad? Today we are going to be answering these decade long questions. To me technology tremendously hinders our ability to communicate with others."

Strengths:

- Your opening directly addresses the question, which helps readers understand what your piece will discuss
- You clearly state your position early, which gives your writing a strong direction

Lack of engagement with the question's complexity → Your opening asks whether technology's impact is "good or bad" but then immediately jumps to stating it's entirely negative. You haven't shown that you've considered both sides before reaching your conclusion. This makes your argument feel one-sided from the start. Think about how you might acknowledge that technology has some positive aspects (like video calls connecting families across distances) before explaining why you believe the negatives outweigh the positives.

Exemplar: *"Whilst technology allows us to message friends instantly and video call relatives overseas, I believe these benefits are overshadowed by the way it consumes our time and distracts us from meaningful face-to-face conversations."*

#2: Second body paragraph "Next, even once you've escaped its grasp you are still constantly thinking about it. It is proven by a Harvard study, that 90% of gamers spend their free time thinking of games."

Strengths:

- You're developing your main argument by adding another dimension beyond just time consumption
- You attempt to use evidence to support your point

Underdeveloped reasoning → You mention that thinking about technology causes distraction, but you don't fully explain *how* this distraction specifically damages human connection. You say people

"just sit there and ponder" and "stay isolated," but these ideas feel rushed and need more development. What does this isolation actually look like? How does thinking about games stop someone from having a conversation? Your paragraph would be stronger if you spent more time building this connection between distraction and poor relationships.

Exemplar: *"When your mind is constantly drifting back to the game you were playing, you might find yourself at the dinner table with your family but not really listening to what they're saying. You might nod along whilst your mum tells you about her day, but you're actually planning your next gaming strategy. This means you miss opportunities to ask questions, share stories, and build deeper understanding with the people around you."*

#3: Final body paragraph "Finally, when exposed to technology many people become instantly hooked, and then only talk about technology to anyone else. This addiction is lethal and limits the amount of good friends you can have."

Strengths:

- You're identifying a concrete way technology affects conversation topics
- You recognise that limited conversation topics can impact friendships

Surface-level explanation → Your paragraph states that talking only about technology limits friendships, but you don't explore *why* this happens or what makes conversations meaningful. You mention creativity going down when you only discuss screens, which is an interesting idea, but it appears suddenly without proper development. Why does variety in conversation topics matter for friendships? What makes a conversation meaningful versus shallow? Your argument needs to dig deeper into what human connection actually requires, not just state that talking about one thing is bad.

Exemplar: *"Meaningful friendships develop when people share different experiences, ideas, and feelings. If you only talk about which YouTuber is funniest or what level you've reached in a game, you're not learning about your friend's hopes, worries, or unique perspectives. You're not discussing the interesting book they read, the place they visited, or the problem they're trying to solve. These deeper conversations help us understand each other and feel connected, but they can't happen if technology is the only topic we know how to discuss."*

■ Your piece tackles an important question about technology's role in our lives, and you've identified several genuine concerns about screen time and distraction. However, your argument would benefit from greater depth and balance. You present technology as entirely harmful without acknowledging any benefits or complexities, which makes your position feel oversimplified. Real-world issues are rarely completely one-sided, and showing that you've considered multiple perspectives before reaching your conclusion would make your argument more convincing.

Your body paragraphs follow a clear structure (time consumption, constant thinking, limited conversation topics), which helps organise your ideas. However, each paragraph needs deeper development. You often state that something is bad without fully explaining *why* it's bad or *how* it damages human connection specifically. For example, in your second paragraph, you could expand on what happens during family time when everyone is distracted—what conversations don't happen? What understanding doesn't develop? Additionally, your third paragraph introduces creativity quite suddenly. If you want to discuss creativity, you need to explain earlier how it relates to human connection, or you might consider focusing more tightly on conversation quality instead.

Your evidence needs strengthening as well. The "Harvard study" about 90% of gamers and the "device university of Minnesota" study about deaths from screen time need more specific details to be credible. Who conducted these studies? When? What exactly did they measure? Without these details, your evidence doesn't add much weight to your argument. Also, consider whether deaths from "too much screen" is really the most relevant evidence for your argument about human connection—you might find research specifically about relationships and technology use more convincing for your particular question.

Your conclusion restates your main points, which is good, but it doesn't leave readers with anything new to think about. What should people do with this information? How might they balance technology use with human connection? A stronger ending might acknowledge the challenge of living in a digital world whilst offering a perspective on how we might approach this challenge thoughtfully.

Overall Score: 40/50

Section 2

#1 What is the impact of technology on human connection and is it good or bad? Today we are going to be answering these ~~decade-long~~ [decade-long] questions. To me, [,] technology tremendously hinders our ability to communicate with others. This is because technology takes up lots of time, you constantly think about it ~~and~~ [,] and people only ever talk about technology. They talk about things like, [:] what games are the best, which ~~TV~~ [TV] shows are entertaining ~~and~~ [,] and which YouTubers are the best at video gaming.

#2 Technology pilfers our time. People play for hours at a time and think to themselves that they have only played for 10 minutes. This deadly trap consumes ~~peoples~~ [people's] life [lives]. People play for the whole day straight, [,] and then fall into the ~~hole~~ [trap] that they have played for barely any time. In a study done by the ~~device university~~ [Device University] of Minnesota, 5 people annually die from too much screen. [time.] This deadly addiction is what many game designers use to their advantage, [:] they ~~will design~~ [design] game [games] that ~~needs~~ [need] a lot of playing time. This means that not much time is left for ~~Quality~~ [quality] family time, which should be the upmost priority. However, [,] technology has taken over and made family time into just sitting at a table on some kind of device.

#3 Next, even once you've escaped its grasp ~~you~~ [,] [you] are still constantly thinking about it. It is proven by a Harvard study, [~~although the comma is acceptable in Australian English, a dash provides better emphasis here~~] that 90% of gamers spend their free time thinking of games. This proves how much of a clasp technology has on us. This causes us to be constantly distracted. When we are constantly distracted, we do not do anything, [:] we just sit there and ponder. To have a healthy connection with other humans ~~you~~ [,] [you] need to be able to communicate with others. [,] ~~Which~~ [which] requires people to meet and speak, instead of staying ~~your~~ [in your] own world. Also ~~when~~ [,] [when] you are constantly distracted ~~you~~ [,] [you] stay isolated, not wanting to talk, just sitting in a corner and thinking about a game. Hence, technology makes you distracted, so we are not able to properly communicate.

Finally, when exposed to technology ~~many~~ [,] [many] people become instantly hooked, and then only talk about technology to anyone else. This addiction is lethal and limits the amount of good friends you can have. ~~As if~~ [If] you constantly talk about games or ~~TV~~ [TV] shows ~~then~~ [,] [then] people will tend to stay away as they will not want to talk about screen all the time. Also ~~when~~ [,] [when] you only talk about screen ~~your~~ [,] [your] creativity will go down, as you are only exposed to one or two ideas, whereas when you read books you get numerous ideas. Hence ~~technology~~ [,] [technology] impacts human connection as you only talk about screen ~~so~~ [,] [so] you will have very limited people to talk to, and at that you will only talk about one thing.

Conclusively, technology impacts human connection significantly as it will take away a lot of your time. ~~And~~ [.] [**And**] in the time it spares you, you constantly think about it. And when you are able to have even a scrap of human connection, you talk about screen. So now, I believe that technology has a considerably bad impact on the quality and amount of human connection you are getting.