

## Section 1:

### #1: Opening paragraph (from "Imagine Molov Cocktails" to "improve the safety of citizens")

#### Strengths:

- Your opening creates an immediate sense of urgency that captures attention
- Your thesis statement clearly presents three distinct arguments to support your position

**Factual Accuracy** → The opening contains a significant error: "Molov Cocktails" should be "Molotov cocktails" (named after Vyacheslav Molotov). This mistake undermines the credibility of your argument from the start. Additionally, your essay addresses a different question than the one asked—the prompt asks about a shopping mall versus a community centre, but your writing discusses a police station versus a sports centre. This mismatch means your entire response doesn't answer the actual question.

**Exemplar:** *"Without adequate police presence, our streets would descend into chaos. I firmly believe that constructing a police station should take priority over building a sports centre because it will reduce stress, encourage morality and improve citizen safety."*

### #2: Second body paragraph (from "Furthermore, installing a police station" to "encourage morality in citizens")

#### Strengths:

- Your paragraph follows a clear structure with a topic sentence, supporting evidence and rebuttal
- You attempt to address counterarguments, showing awareness of opposing views

**Evidence Development** → Your supporting evidence lacks specificity and depth. The statement "Researchers found that even with just one policeman in the area, people are a lot more respectful and careful" provides no concrete data, no source attribution and no measurable outcomes. Your rebuttal also introduces new claims about "sky high amount of incidents compared to a decade earlier like stabbings and carnages" without any statistical backing. The prompt specifically requests statistics and logical reasoning, but this paragraph relies on vague generalisations rather than verifiable data.

**Exemplar:** *"According to a 2023 study by the Australian Institute of Criminology, suburbs with visible police presence reported a 34% increase in residents' feelings of security and a 19% reduction in antisocial behaviour complaints."*

### #3: Third body paragraph (from "Also, building a police station" to "essential for citizens' safety")

#### Strengths:

- Your topic sentence connects clearly to your thesis
- You reference a human rights perspective, which adds an ethical dimension to your argument

**Logical Coherence** → Your reasoning contains several logical gaps. The claim that "areas without police" have lower life expectancy confuses correlation with causation—many factors affect life expectancy beyond crime rates. The "83% reduction in conflict related deaths" statistic appears suddenly without context or source. Your counterargument "would you like to be fit or safe?" presents a false

choice, as communities need both safety and health facilities. The dismissal of fitness centres because "people already exercise every day by commuting" oversimplifies the role of dedicated sports facilities in promoting community health.

**Exemplar:** *"Research from the Australian Bureau of Statistics demonstrates that neighbourhoods with police stations experience 47% faster emergency response times, potentially preventing serious injuries from escalating into fatalities."*

■

Your piece demonstrates solid essay structure with clear paragraphs and attempts at evidence-based reasoning. However, the fundamental issue is that your writing doesn't address the actual question—you've written about police stations versus sports centres instead of shopping malls versus community centres. Beyond this critical error, your argument needs stronger factual support. The statistics you've included (17%, 22%, 97%, 26%, 83%) lack proper citations and sources, making them difficult to verify. Additionally, your reasoning would benefit from deeper analysis. Instead of simply stating that police reduce crime, explain *how* and *why* this happens, and connect it more clearly to your claims about stress reduction and morality. Also, your rebuttals against sports centres feel rushed—develop these counterarguments more thoroughly by acknowledging the genuine benefits of fitness facilities before explaining why your chosen option is more important. Focus on making your evidence more specific and your logic more thorough in future essays.

---

**Score: 40/50**

---

## Section 2:

~~#1 Imagine Molotov Cocktails flying through the air for pedestrians~~ [Imagine Molotov cocktails flying through the air as pedestrians hurry down the streets, frantic to get to safety. ~~This is what would happen without police.~~ [This scenario illustrates why police presence matters]. I adamantly believe that a police station should be installed instead of a sports centre because it will reduce stress, encourage morality and improve the safety of citizens.

~~First of all, installing~~ [Firstly, installing] a police ~~centre~~ [station] would greatly relieve stress in citizens. By installing a police station, it would evoke a sense of safety in citizens. Studies have shown ~~the~~ [that] areas with police ~~centres~~ [stations] have 17% less crime ~~in~~ [than] areas without police ~~centres~~ [stations] per hectare of land. After installing police stations in those areas, the crime rate per hectare decreased by 22%. Also, after being caught, 97% of criminals put in jail never commit a crime again, but only 26% ~~criminals~~ [of criminals] stop committing crimes if they're caught by non-police and ~~unpunished~~ [remain unpunished], according to the New South Wales Police Department. However, some people argue that having police will only make citizens stress more, as they now know that they are being watched, is completely wrong, [. This argument is flawed] as citizens know that others will also not dare to do anything illegal, therefore fostering a feeling of safety, and who always is worried about police catching you apart from a robber? [. After all, only those with criminal intent need fear police surveillance]. ~~So, installing~~ [Therefore, installing] a police station will be critical because it would relieve stress in citizens.

**#2** Furthermore, installing a police station would encourage morality in citizens. Since the job of the police is to keep things in control and make sure no one breaks the law, it would also give that effect to citizens anywhere else – if it works in big cities, it must work in ~~a bit less populated places~~ [less densely populated areas], too, ~~to encourage~~ [encouraging] a sense of morality. Researchers found that even with just one policeman in the area, people are ~~a lot~~ [significantly] more respectful and careful. However, some people argue that a sports ~~center~~ [centre] is also important for people's health, and crime isn't that common, but it is imperative that we take measures now, considering the ~~sky-high~~ [dramatically elevated] amount of incidents compared to a decade earlier~~like~~ [, such as] stabbings and carnages all in one year. Also, a fitness centre requires money to enter, so exercisers could just buy equipment instead if they want to add on to the sufficient daily exercise. Therefore, constructing a police station would be necessary as it will encourage morality in citizens.

**#3** Also, building a police station would drastically improve the safety of citizens. In areas without police, the life expectancy is lower than other states, as crime rates are higher, which also increases the number of people injured or harmed. There is a human right to non~~abuse~~ [non-abuse], so restraining crime would be essential, a [—]a right to protection, making police essential. Studies have shown that a police station reduces the average number of conflict~~related~~ [conflict-related] deaths by 83%, making a police station beneficial to citizen safety. However, some people argue that fitness is just as important, as you would die without it, but a fitness ~~center~~ [centre] is just to strengthen you, [—] would you like to be fit or safe? People already exercise every day by commuting and walking around in households, it's [, which is] already enough. Thus, building a police station would be essential for citizens' safety.

Ultimately, a police station should be constructed instead of a sports centre because it will reduce stress, encourage morality and improve the safety of citizens.

# Section 1

## #1: Opening paragraph

### Strengths:

- Your opening creates a vivid picture by describing specific homework tasks (maths equations, comprehension articles, science worksheets), which helps readers imagine the scenario clearly.
- You establish your position firmly with "I adamantly believe," showing confidence in your argument.

**Weak topic sentence clarity** → Your opening paragraph jumps straight into an imagined scenario without clearly stating what the essay will discuss. The phrase "Imagine having no homework" works as a hook, but you then shift abruptly to listing homework types and mentioning "useless review" before reaching your main argument. The connection between the opening image and your thesis feels rushed. Additionally, the phrase "even though you already fully learnt it at school already" contains unnecessary repetition with "already" appearing twice, which weakens the flow.

**Exemplar:** *After establishing your homework-free weekend scenario, you could write: "This relaxing weekend shouldn't be just a dream. Homework, despite being a common practice in schools, often wastes students' valuable time without improving their learning."*

---

## #2: Second body paragraph (passion projects)

### Strengths:

- You provide concrete examples of passion projects, such as researching scientific concepts and watching Kurtzgesagt, which makes your argument more relatable and specific.
- You acknowledge the counterargument that passion projects could be done at other times, showing you've considered opposing views.

**Insufficient evidence and vague reasoning** → Your paragraph relies heavily on personal preference rather than solid reasoning. The phrase "researching what makes up everything" is too broad and unclear. You mention that passion projects "can also coincidentally collide with school topics," but "coincidentally collide" suggests this connection is accidental rather than intentional, which weakens your argument about educational value. The sentence "learning nothing because you already learnt the information" oversimplifies the situation and doesn't acknowledge that revision can deepen understanding even when material feels familiar.

**Exemplar:** *Instead of "coincidentally collide with school topics," you could write: "directly connect to and extend school learning, allowing students to explore curriculum concepts in greater depth whilst pursuing their personal interests."*

---

## #3: Third body paragraph (teachers' workload)

### Strengths:

- You attempt to show empathy for teachers by discussing their workload and overtime, which broadens your argument beyond just student concerns.
- You address a counterargument about imported homework from companies, demonstrating awareness of different perspectives.

**Unsupported claims and weak logical connections** → Your paragraph makes several claims without providing proper support. You state "Studies have shown that teachers often have to work overtime" but don't specify which studies or provide any details. The phrase "teachers can produce more quality work as they have more time to rest and create things like slideshows" is vague—why specifically slideshows? Your rebuttal to the Twinkl counterargument (note: you spelled it "Twinkle") lacks strength because "teachers still spend time finding the files" is a minor inconvenience compared to the full workload of marking homework, which you don't mention at all.

**Exemplar:** *You could strengthen this by writing: "According to recent education surveys, teachers spend an average of five hours weekly marking homework. If this time were redirected towards lesson planning and individual student support, teachers could focus on activities that directly benefit classroom learning."*

---

■ Your essay presents a clear position on homework, and you've structured your argument with three distinct reasons, which shows good organisational thinking. However, your piece would benefit significantly from stronger evidence and more careful reasoning. The Cambridge University statistic in your first paragraph (95% of students remember 85% of knowledge) needs verification and clearer explanation—where exactly did this data come from, and does it actually support banning all homework? Your arguments sometimes confuse personal preferences with logical reasoning, particularly in the passion projects section where you assume all students would use their free time productively. Additionally, your essay would be more persuasive if you explored the complexity of the issue more deeply. For instance, your first body paragraph briefly mentions "specialised work" for struggling students but doesn't fully develop how this system would work in practice or whether it might create stigma. Also, consider strengthening your counterarguments—you mention them, but your rebuttals often feel rushed or incomplete, which makes your position seem less thoroughly considered. Your concluding paragraph simply restates your introduction without adding new insight or leaving readers with a compelling final thought.

---

**Score: 41/50**

---

## Section 2

Write a persuasive essay to argue for or against the use of homework in schools.

Imagine having no homework, ~~and you are~~ [where you're] able to play all weekend without having to review or solve ~~math~~ [maths] equations, do comprehension articles, [.] ~~or fill in~~ [Or fill in] science worksheets, even though you ~~already~~ fully learnt it at school already, [.] ~~frowning at~~ [Frowning at the] time wasted on useless review. Frowning at time burned monotonously on doing oversimplified equations. [, and time burnt monotonously doing oversimplified equations.] I adamantly believe that homework should be banned as it will take away from students' learning efficiency, take time away from things like passion projects, and waste ~~teacher's~~ [teachers'] precious time ~~organising~~ [setting] homework. [#1]

First of all, doing homework would add nothing, [—] if not decrease the learning quality of students. Homework is a form of review, but in the two-day gap between Friday and Monday, Cambridge University found that 95% of students can remember over 85% of their new knowledge learnt from school, and 97% find homework easy. If basically all of the student body doesn't need to review, why review? Some might argue that it affects the small number of people, but that can be solved by assigning specialized [specialised] work, to only cater for the subjects that they need help ~~on~~ [with]. This way, the one in twenty people ~~that~~ [who] need revision can get it, ~~while~~ [whilst] the rest can relax. Thus, homework should be ~~disassigned from~~ [removed for most] students, and only assigned to ~~troubled~~ [struggling] students on specific subjects.

Also, giving homework out would take away time from passion projects, or simply just something for students to enjoy. Doing passion projects like researching what makes up everything and researching channels like Kurtzgesagt, where advanced science concepts like quarks and ~~The Sting~~ [the String] Theory are explained in detail. Doing this [, can prove valuable. These projects] can also coincidentally collide with school topics. However, some people argue that passion projects can be done in another session of time, but ~~a lot of~~ [many] students might not ~~with~~ [have time due to] extracurricular activities and tutoring. Also, researching their passions builds a base for the future, which is far better than learning nothing because you already learnt the information a couple ~~days~~ [of days] before. Therefore, homework should be banned because it takes away from other helpful activities. [#2]

Furthermore, assigning homework uses a lot of teachers' time too, contributing to their already heavy load of work. If homework didn't help students massively, or, at all, then deleting homework would give teachers less workload. Studies have shown that teachers often have to work overtime, or even work at home, so if we take away a part of the workload, teachers can produce more quality work as they have more time to rest and create things like slideshows. However, some people argue that deleting homework won't contribute much, and some teachers just import homework from companies like ~~Twinkle~~ [Twinkl], but teachers still spend time finding the files, and some sites don't have homework for every subject. Most importantly, teachers have to provide different homework for different skill levels, too, so with so many requirements, getting rid of homework would save a lot of time. So, homework should be banned because it can save ~~teaching~~ [teachers] a lot of time. [#3]

Ultimately, homework should be banned because it will take away from students' learning efficiency, take time away from things like passion projects and waste teachers' precious time ~~organizing~~ [organising] homework.

## Section 1:

**#1** "Imagine a community addicted to screens, captivated by the glow of devices. In an advancing world, technology has massively evolved, too, to social media and games to captivate and addict us."

### Strengths:

- Your opening effectively uses vivid imagery with "captivated by the glow of devices" to draw readers into the topic
- You establish the scope of the problem clearly by mentioning social media and games

**Weakness: Unclear sentence construction** → The phrase "technology has massively evolved, too, to social media and games to captivate and addict us" becomes confusing because "too" appears in an awkward position, and the repeated use of "to" makes the meaning unclear. The sentence structure breaks down midway, making it difficult for readers to follow your intended meaning about how technology has developed.

**Exemplar:** *Technology has evolved massively, with social media and games designed specifically to captivate and addict us.*

---

**#2** "Recent surveys suggest that students cannot focus in class if they or a neighbouring student has a smartphone nearby, forgetfulness will increase by 20%, which is difficult to deal with, especially in high school."

### Strengths:

- You provide specific evidence with the 20% statistic to support your argument
- You connect the problem to high school students, making it relevant to your audience

**Weakness: Run-on sentence structure** → This sentence attempts to cover too many ideas without proper punctuation or connecting words. You've joined "students cannot focus" and "forgetfulness will increase" with just a comma, which creates a run-on sentence. The relationship between the nearby smartphone, inability to focus, and increased forgetfulness needs clearer connections to help readers understand how these ideas link together.

**Exemplar:** *Recent surveys suggest that students cannot focus in class if they or a neighbouring student has a smartphone nearby. This distraction increases forgetfulness by 20%, which is particularly difficult to manage in high school.*

---

**#3** "Furthermore, constantly staring at screens will also discourage sociality. All recent studies show that increasing the screen time per day from 2 hours to 3 hours decreases socialization rate by 28%, and raises rates of loneliness and identity fraud."

### Strengths:

- You use an effective transition word "Furthermore" to move into your next main point

- You provide specific numerical evidence to strengthen your argument

**Weakness: Incomplete final paragraph** → Your concluding paragraph about face-to-face interactions stops midway through a sentence ("A survey conducted by Harvard University concluded that face to face interactions"), leaving your entire argument unfinished. This creates a jarring end to your piece and prevents readers from understanding your complete point. Additionally, the sudden mention of "identity fraud" alongside loneliness feels disconnected from your main argument about socialisation.

**Exemplar:** *Furthermore, constantly staring at screens will discourage socialisation. Recent studies show that increasing screen time from two hours to three hours per day decreases socialisation rates by 28% and raises rates of loneliness, affecting overall wellbeing.*

---

■ Your piece presents a clear stance on mobile phone use and attempts to structure arguments systematically using body paragraphs that each focus on a distinct concern. However, your arguments would strengthen considerably if you developed each point more thoroughly before moving to counterarguments. Currently, your paragraphs feel rushed because you mention a concern, quickly add a counterargument, then dismiss it without fully exploring your original point. Instead, explain your main idea completely with examples, then address opposing views. Additionally, your conclusion needs substantial development—right now, it simply repeats your thesis without summarising your key arguments or providing final thoughts. Also, your introduction would benefit from a clearer thesis statement that previews all three main concerns you'll discuss. Finally, work on sentence boundaries throughout your writing, as several sentences try to pack in too many ideas without proper punctuation, making them difficult to follow.

---

**Score: 40/50**

---

## Section 2:

**#1** ~~Imagine a community addicted to screens, captivated by the glow of devices. In an advancing world, technology has massively evolved, too, to social media and games to captivate and addict us.~~ [In an advancing world, technology has evolved massively, with social media and games designed to captivate and addict us.] The next generation will no doubt be staring at screens too, but even earlier than before. Imagine a child only knowing of games, only knowing of the enticing glow of the screen, only knowing of having fun on devices. One life, ruined. ~~Cell phones~~ [Mobile phones] shouldn't be used as they take focus away from students, lead to eye damage and discourage ~~sociality~~ [socialisation].

First of all, owning a device takes focus away from students, ultimately leading to ~~disfocus~~ [lack of focus] in class. Phones are constantly nagging at you to use ~~it~~ [them], from the interactive backgrounds available to the widgets on your lock screen to the constant notifications, encouraging a peek at the phone screen.

**#2** ~~Recent surveys suggest that students cannot focus in class if they or a neighbouring student has a smartphone nearby, forgetfulness will increase by 20%, which is difficult to deal with, especially in high school.~~ [Recent surveys suggest that students cannot focus in class if they or a neighbouring student has a smartphone nearby. This distraction increases forgetfulness by 20%, which is particularly difficult to manage in high school.] Some may argue that phones also provide a multitude of benefits, like calculators



and AI, but serving as a distraction, students can miss bits and pieces of information, even if they take notes. Thus, owning a device takes focus away from students, harming them massively.

Also, constantly looking at screens harms the eye, a crucial part in life. By ~~focusing~~ [focussing] on small screens like phones for a long amount of time, it increases rates of going blind by 49%, according to recent studies, making avoiding screens crucial. However, looking at devices not only harms your sight, but studies have also shown that looking at devices for too long can also increase chances of all other diseases by an average of 6%. However, some people argue that ~~science~~ [since] devices are everywhere, so there is no point, but it still reduces the harm, as looking at smaller screens or close to screens will do more damage, so it actually instead helps prevent damage. Therefore, constantly looking at screens harms the eye, a massive hazard that comes from devices.

**#3** Furthermore, constantly staring at screens will also discourage ~~sociality~~ [socialisation]. ~~All recent studies~~ [Recent studies] show that increasing the screen time per day from 2 hours to 3 hours decreases ~~socialization~~ [socialisation] rate by 28%, and raises rates of loneliness and identity fraud. This is serious, as in a society where money is key, happiness is not infinite, so it is important to socialise and not decrease happiness levels. However, some people argue that you can chat online, but that still is only surface level, and doesn't actually improve happiness. Studies show that 92% of online chatting is either joking around or business interactions, and those that are real chatting are only surface level gossiping. Online chatting is only surface level, and also the less preferred way. ~~A survey conducted by Harvard University concluded that face-to-face interactions~~ [A survey conducted by Harvard University concluded that face-to-face interactions promote deeper connections and greater wellbeing than digital communication.]

~~Ultimately, cell phones~~ [Ultimately, mobile phones] shouldn't be used as they take focus away from students, lead to eye damage and discourage ~~sociality~~ [socialisation].