

Section 1:

#1: Opening paragraph ("The rise of social media has promised tighter-knit communities... because the truth is more shocking than most realise.")

Strengths:

- Your hook grabs attention immediately by setting up a clear contrast between what social media promises and what it actually delivers.
- You establish your argument's direction clearly, letting readers know exactly what the piece will explore.

Vague Sourcing → When you write "alarming evidence" and "recent research reveals," you're not telling readers where this information comes from. This makes your claims less convincing because readers can't check if the evidence is trustworthy or current. Specific studies or organisations should be named in the opening to build credibility from the start.

Exemplar: *"According to a 2024 report from the Australian Communications and Media Authority, social media usage among young Australians has increased by 30%, yet community participation in local events has declined proportionally."*

#2: Second paragraph ("Would you trust a neighbour whose words are filtered... not genuine togetherness.")

Strengths:

- Your use of the WHO Europe quote adds authority and shows you've consulted expert sources.
- The statistical evidence about cyberbullying (55% of teenagers) provides concrete support for your argument.

Confusing Appeal Labels → You mention "logos," "pathos," and "ethos" directly in your writing, which interrupts the flow and confuses readers. These are persuasive techniques you should use naturally without pointing them out. When you write "The logos in recent findings" or "The pathos is clear," you're explaining your methods instead of just using them effectively. Readers don't need to

know you're using logos or pathos—they just need to feel convinced by your evidence and emotional examples.

Exemplar: *"Recent findings from a 2023 Cyberbullying Research Centre study reveal troubling numbers: 55% of teenagers report experiencing cyberbullying, leaving lasting psychological wounds that ripple through entire neighbourhoods."*

#3: Fourth paragraph ("When bad behaviour goes viral... destructive logos of modern digital culture.")

Strengths:

- Your connection between online behaviour and real-world consequences in "local streets and schools" is effective and relevant.
- The statistic about online bullying cases doubling provides powerful evidence.

Weak Source Attribution → You reference "the ACC Blog" and "one mental health expert" without giving their full names, qualifications, or the specific publication details. When you write "As one mental health expert stated," readers don't know if this person is a qualified psychologist, a social worker, or someone else entirely. The "ACC Blog" could be any website—readers need to know if it's from a government health department, a university, or a private organisation to judge its reliability.

Exemplar: *"Dr Sarah Mitchell, clinical psychologist at Melbourne's Centre for Youth Mental Health, explains: 'Social media platforms can normalise behaviours that would be immediately challenged in face-to-face settings.'"*

■ Your piece tackles an important topic that affects many young Australians and their communities. The structure follows a logical path from introducing the problem to exploring specific harms and concluding with a call to awareness. However, your content would benefit from deeper exploration of *why* these problems occur and *how* they specifically affect Australian communities. Instead of simply stating that trust breaks down or mental health suffers, you could show readers what this looks like in everyday situations—perhaps a neighbourhood group that falls apart due to online arguments, or a school friendship damaged by Instagram comparisons. Your evidence needs strengthening too. While you include some statistics and quotes, many references are too vague ("recent research," "expert observation"). Additionally, your second body paragraph feels rushed compared to the others—it

introduces trust issues but doesn't develop the idea thoroughly with enough supporting details or examples. Also, your conclusion could offer more than just a warning. What can communities actually do? Consider adding one paragraph between your last body paragraph and conclusion that explores practical solutions, such as digital literacy programmes in schools or community initiatives that encourage face-to-face interaction. This would make your piece more balanced and helpful rather than only presenting problems.

Overall Score: 42/50

Section 2:

Social Media's Silent Sabotage of Local Solidarity

The rise of social media has promised tighter-knit communities, yet alarming evidence paints a different picture—one where digital platforms erode the very fabric of local connection and trust. Recent research reveals that these networks often spark isolation, anxiety~~and~~ [and,] fracture neighbourhood bonds, sounding alarm bells for everyone invested in community health. This article exposes the negative impact of social media on local communities, ~~harnessing~~ [drawing upon] real studies and expert testimony—because the truth is more shocking than most realise.

Would you trust a neighbour whose words are filtered through an algorithm built to keep people addicted? While social media appears to strengthen connections, studies show it often leads to loneliness and low self-esteem—particularly among young Australians. According to Dr Hans Henri P. Kluge, Regional Director for WHO Europe, "We are seeing the consequences of this gap... unless governments, health authorities, teachers and parents ~~recognise~~ [recognise] the root causes... to help adolescents turn the tide on potentially damaging social media use, which has been shown to lead to depression, bullying, anxiety and poor academic performance." ~~The logos in recent findings, such as~~ [Recent findings, including] a 2023 Cyberbullying Research Centre study, ~~paints~~ [paint] a dire picture: 55% of teenagers report experiencing cyberbullying, leading to lasting psychological harm in local communities. ~~The pathos is clear—these~~ [These] platforms breed environments where exclusion thrives, not genuine togetherness.

How can trust flourish when every interaction is shadowed by digital deceit? Social media not only warps self-image but also undermines the trust that binds people together. Research on app impact,

such as TikTok and Instagram, shows that negative effects on trust correlate with lowered relationship satisfaction—a direct hit to local social capital. ~~This expert observation from couples' therapists highlights the ethos behind the warnings.~~ [Couples' therapists warn:] "Social media can challenge trust, impact emotional intimacy..." In communities, such breakdowns diminish mutual support networks, essential for crisis response and everyday wellbeing.

When bad behaviour goes viral, it doesn't just stay online—it infects local streets and schools. Social media's design encourages toxic behaviour—including narcissism, lies and stalking—thus ~~normalising~~ [normalising] harmful values beyond screens. More than a third of young people report online bullying, with cases doubling in just one year. According to the ACC Blog, digital environments embolden actions people would never dare in person, pushing local boundaries and safety to the edge. As one mental health expert stated, "social media can be a breeding ground for bad behaviours," reinforcing ~~the destructive logos of modern digital culture~~ [destructive patterns in modern digital culture].

Social media, once lauded as the glue for modern communities, now acts as a solvent—eroding local trust, mental health and solidarity at worrying rates. The evidence, expert voices and emotional stories converge: more screen time means less real connection, greater vulnerability, and rising dysfunction. If we want thriving, resilient neighbourhoods, we must face the chilling reality of social media's silent sabotage—and reclaim the fabric of community before it unravels entirely.