

Junior

## Does Texting Affect Writing?

MICHAELA CULLINGTON



IT'S TAKING OVER OUR LIVES. We can do it almost anywhere—walking to class, waiting in line at the grocery store, or hanging out at home. It's quick, easy, and convenient. It has become a concern of doctors, parents, and teachers alike. What is it? It's texting!

Text messaging—or texting, as it's more commonly called—is the process of sending and receiving typed messages via a cellular phone. It is a common means of communication among teenagers and is even becoming popular in the business world because it allows quick messages to be sent without people having to commit to a telephone conversation. A person is able to say what is needed, and the other person will receive the information and respond when it's convenient to do so.

In order to more quickly type what they are trying to say, many people use abbreviations instead of words. The language created by these abbreviations is called textspeak. Some people

---

MICHAELA CULLINGTON was a student at Marywood University in Pennsylvania when she wrote this essay, which originally appeared in *Young Scholars in Writing*, an undergraduate journal of writing published by the University of Missouri-Kansas City. She received a masters degree in speech and language pathology from Marywood in 2014 and is a speech language pathologist in Delaware.

## Does Texting Affect Writing?

believe that using these abbreviations is hindering the writing abilities of students, and others argue that texting is actually having a positive effect on writing. In fact, it seems likely that texting has no significant effect on student writing.

Here's the summary of an ongoing debate. For tips on this move, see Chapter 1.

## Concerns about Textspeak

A September 2008 article in *USA Today* entitled "Texting, Texting Destroys Kids' Writing Style" summarizes many of the most common complaints about the effect of texting. It states that according to the National Center for Education Statistics, only 25% of high school seniors are "proficient" writers. The article quotes Jacquie Ream, a former teacher and author of *K.I.S.S.—Keep It Short and Simple*, a guide for writing more effectively. Ream states, "[W]e have a whole generation being raised without communication skills." She blames the use of acronyms and shorthand in text messages for students' inability to spell and ultimately to write well. Ream also points out that students struggle to convey emotion in their writing because, as she states, in text messages "emotions are always sideways smiley faces."

This debate became prominent after some teachers began to believe they were seeing a decline in the writing abilities of their students. Many attributed this perceived decline to the increasing popularity of text messaging and its use of abbreviations. Naomi Baron, a linguistics professor at American University, blames texting for what she sees as the fact that "so much of American society has become sloppy and laissez faire about the mechanics of writing" ("Should We Worry or LOL?"). Teachers report finding "2" for "to," "gr8" for "great," "dat" for "that," and "wut" for "what," among other examples of textspeak, in their students' writing. A Minnesota teacher of the seventh

and ninth grades says that she has to spend extra time in class editing papers and must "explicitly" remind her students that it is not acceptable to use text slang and abbreviations in writing (Walsh). Another English teacher believes that text language has become "second nature" to her students (Carey); they are so used to it that they do not even catch themselves doing it.

Many also complain that because texting does not stress the importance of punctuation, students are neglecting it in their formal writing. Teachers say that their students are forgetting commas, apostrophes, and even capital letters to begin sentences. Another complaint is that text messages lack emotion. Many argue that texts lack feeling because of their tendency to be short, brief, and to the point. Because students are not able to communicate emotion effectively through texts, some teachers worry, they may lose the ability to do so in writing.

To get a more personal perspective on the question of how teachers perceive texting to be influencing student writing, I interviewed two of my former high school teachers—my junior-year English teacher and my senior-year theology teacher. Both teachers stress the importance of writing in their courses. They maintain that they notice text abbreviations in their students' writing often. To correct this problem, they point it out when it occurs and take points off for its use. They also remind their students to use proper sentence structure and complete sentences. The English teacher says that she believes texting inhibits good writing—it reinforces simplistic writing that may be acceptable for conversation but is "not so good for critical thinking or analysis." She suggests that texting tends to generate topic sentences without emphasizing the following explanation. According to these teachers, then, texting is inhibiting good writing. However, their evidence is limited, based on just a few personal experiences rather than on a significant amount of research.

### *Does Texting Affect Writing?*

#### Responses to Concerns about Textspeak

In response to these complaints that texting is having a negative impact on student writing, others insist that texting should be viewed as beneficial because it provides students with motivation to write, practice in specific writing skills, and an opportunity to gain confidence in their writing. For example, Sternberg, Kaplan, and Borck argue that texting is a good way to motivate students: teens enjoy texting, and if they frequently write through texts, they will be more motivated to write formally. Texting also helps to spark students' creativity, these authors argue, because they are always coming up with new ways to express their ideas (417).

In addition, because they are engaging in written communication rather than oral speech, texting teens learn how to convey their message to a reader in as few words as possible. In his book *Texting: The Gr8 Db8*, David Crystal discusses a study that concludes that texting actually helps foster "the ability to summarize and express oneself concisely" in writing (168). Furthermore, Crystal explains that texting actually helps people to "sharpen their diplomatic skills . . . [because] it allows more time to formulate their thoughts and express them carefully" (168). One language arts teacher from Minnesota believes that texting helps students develop their own "individual voice" (qtd. in Walsh). Perfecting such a voice allows the writer to offer personal insights and express feelings that will interest and engage readers.

Supporters of texting also argue that it not only teaches 10 elements of writing but provides extra practice to those who struggle with the conventions of writing. As Crystal points out, children who struggle with literacy will not choose to use a technology that requires them to do something that is difficult

for them. However, if they do choose to text, the experience will help them "overcome their awkwardness and develop their social and communication skills" (*Txtng* 171). Shirley Holm, a junior high school teacher, describes texting as a "comfortable form of communication" (qtd. in Walsh). Teenagers are used to texting, enjoy doing so, and as a result are always writing. Through this experience of writing in ways they enjoy, they can learn to take pleasure in writing formally. If students are continually writing in some form, they will eventually develop better skills.

Furthermore, those who favor texting explain that with practice comes the confidence and courage to try new things, which some observers believe they are seeing happen with writing as a result of texting. Teenagers have, for example, created an entirely new language—one that uses abbreviations and symbols instead of words, does not require punctuation, and uses short, incomplete phrases throughout the entire conversation. It's a way of speaking that is a language in and of itself. Crystal, among others, sees this "language evolution" as a positive effect of texting; he seems, in fact, fascinated that teenagers are capable of creating such a phenomenon, which he describes as the "latest manifestation of the human ability" (*Txtng* 175). David Warlick, a teacher and author of books about technology in the classroom, would agree with Crystal. He believes students should be given credit for "inventing a new language ideal for communicating in a high-tech world" (qtd. in Carey).

### Methods

I decided to conduct my own research into this controversy. I wanted to get different, more personal, perspectives on the issue. First, I surveyed seven students on their opinions about

### Does Texting Affect Writing?

the impact of texting on writing. Second, I questioned two high school teachers, as noted above. Finally, in an effort to compare what students are actually doing to people's perceptions of what they are doing, I analyzed student writing samples for instances of *textspeak*.<sup>1</sup>

To let students speak for themselves, I created a list of questions for seven high school and college students, some of my closest and most reliable friends. Although the number of respondents was small, I could trust my knowledge of them to help me interpret their responses. In addition, these students are very different from one another, and I believed their differences would allow for a wide array of thoughts and opinions on the issue. I was thus confident in the reliability and diversity of their answers but was cautious not to make too many assumptions because of the small sample size.

I asked the students how long they had been texting; how often they texted; what types of abbreviations they used most and how often they used them; and whether they noticed themselves using any type of *textspeak* in their formal writing. In analyzing their responses, I looked for commonalities to help me draw conclusions about the students' texting habits and if/how they believed their writing was affected.

I created a list of questions for teachers similar to the one for the students and asked two of my high school teachers to provide their input. I asked if they had noticed their students using *textspeak* in their writing assignments and, if so, how they dealt with it. I also asked if they believed texting had a positive or negative effect on writing. Next, I asked if they were *texters* themselves. And, finally, I solicited their opinions on what they believed should be done to prevent teens from using text abbreviations and other *textspeak* in their writing.

I was surprised at how different the students' replies and opinions were from the teachers'. I decided to find out for myself whose impressions were more accurate by comparing some students' actual writing with students' and teachers' perceptions of that writing. To do this I looked at twenty samples of student writing—end-of-semester research arguments written in two first-year college writing courses with different instructors. The topics varied from increased airport security after September 11 to the weapons of the Vietnam War to autism, and lengths ranged from eight to ten pages. To analyze the papers for the presence of textspeak, I looked closely for use of abbreviations and other common slang terms, especially those usages which the students had stated in their surveys were most common. These included "hbu" ("How about you?"); "gvg" ("Got to go"); and "cuz" ("because"). I also looked for the numbers 2 and 4 used instead of the words "to" and "for."

### Discussion of Findings

My research suggests that texting actually has a minimal effect on student writing. It showed that students do not believe textspeak is appropriate in formal writing assignments. They recognize the difference between texting friends and writing formally and know what is appropriate in each situation. This was proven true in the student samples, in which no examples of textspeak were used. Many experts would agree that there is no harm in textspeak, as long as students continue to be taught and reminded that occasions where formal language is expected are not the place for it. As Crystal explains, the purpose of the abbreviations used in text messages is not to replace language but rather to make quick communications shorter and easier, since in a standard text message,

### Does Texting Affect Writing?

the texter is allowed only 160 characters for a communication ("Texting" 81).

Dennis Baron, an English and linguistics professor at the University of Illinois, has done much research on the effect of technology on writing, and his findings are aligned with those of my own study. In his book *A Better Pencil: Readers, Writers, and the Digital Revolution*, he concludes that students do not use textspeak in their writing. In fact, he suggests students do not even use abbreviations in their text messages very often. Baron says that college students have "put away such childish things, and many of them had already abandoned such signs of middle-school immaturity in high school" (qtd. in Golden).

In surveying the high school and college students, I found that most have been texting for a few years, usually starting around ninth grade. The students said they generally text between thirty and a hundred messages every day but use abbreviations only occasionally, with the most common being "lol" ("Laugh out loud"), "gvg" ("Got to go"), "hbu" ("How about you?"), "cuz" ("because"), and "jk" ("Just kidding"). None of them believed texting abbreviations were acceptable in formal writing. In fact, research has found that most students report that they do not use textspeak in formal writing. As one Minnesota high school student says, "[T]here is a time and a place for everything," and formal writing is not the place for communicating the way she would if she were texting her friends (qtd. in Walsh). Another student admits that in writing for school she sometimes finds herself using these abbreviations. However, she notices and corrects them before handing in her final paper (Carey). One teacher reports that, despite texting, her students' "formal writing remains solid." She occasionally sees an abbreviation; however, it is in informal, "warm-up" writing. She believes that what students choose to use in

everyday types of writing is up to them as long as they use standard English in formal writing (qtd. in Walsh).

Also supporting my own research findings are those from a 20 study which took place at a midwestern research university. This study involved eighty-six students who were taking an Introduction to Education course at the university. The participants were asked to complete a questionnaire that included questions about their texting habits, the spelling instruction they had received, and their proficiency at spelling. They also took a standardized spelling test. Before starting the study, the researchers had hypothesized that texting and the use of abbreviations would have a negative impact on the spelling abilities of the students. However, they found that the results did not support their hypothesis. The researchers did note that text messaging is continuing to increase in popularity; therefore, this issue should continue to be examined (Shaw et al.).

I myself am a frequent texter. I chat with my friends from home every day through texting. I also use texting to communicate with my school friends, perhaps to discuss what time we are going to meet for dinner or to ask quick questions about homework. According to my cell phone bill, I send and receive around 6,400 texts a month. In the messages I send, I rarely notice myself using abbreviations. The only time I use them is if I do not have time to write out the complete phrase. However, sometimes I find it more time-consuming to try to figure out how to abbreviate something so that my message will still be comprehensible.

Since I rarely use abbreviations in my texting, I never use them in my formal writing. I know that they are unacceptable and that it would make me look unintelligent if I included acronyms and symbols instead of proper and formal language. I also have not noticed an effect on my spelling as a result

### Does Texting Affect Writing?

I am confident in my spelling abilities, and even when I use an abbreviation, I know how to spell the word(s) it stands for.

On the basis of my own research, expert research, and personal observations, I can confidently state that texting is not interfering with students' use of standard written English and has no effect on their writing abilities in general. It is interesting to look at the dynamics of the arguments over these issues. Teachers and parents who claim that they are seeing a decline in the writing abilities of their students and children mainly support the negative-impact argument. Other teachers and researchers suggest that texting provides a way for teens to practice writing in a casual setting and thus helps prepare them to write formally. Experts and students themselves, however, report that they see no effect, positive or negative. Anecdotal experiences should not overshadow the actual evidence.

### Note

1. All participants in the study have given permission for their responses to be published.

### WORKS CITED

- Baron, Dennis. *A Better Pencil: Readers, Writers, and the Digital Revolution*. Oxford UP, 2009.
- Carey, Bridget. "The Rise of Text, Instant Messaging Vernacular Slips into Schoolwork." *Miami Herald*, 6 Mar. 2007. *Academic Search Elite*, www.ebscohost.com/academic/academic-search-elite. Accessed 27 Oct. 2009.
- Crystal, David. "Texting." *ELT Journal*, vol. 62, no. 1, Jan. 2008, pp. 77-83. *WilsonWeb*, doi:10.1093/elt/62.1.77. Accessed 8 Nov. 2009.
- . *Texting: The G88 Db8*. Oxford UP, 2008.

3. What kinds of sources does Cullington cite, and how does she incorporate their ideas in her essay? Look at paragraph 18, for instance: how well does she introduce and explain Dennis Baron's ideas? (See pp. 45–49 on framing quotations.)
4. Cullington focuses on how texting affects writing, whereas Sherry Turkle is concerned with the way it affects communication more broadly (pp. 541–59). How do you think Cullington would respond to Turkle's concerns?
5. Cullington "send[s] and receive[s] around 6,400 texts a month" (paragraph 21). About how many do you send and receive? Write a paragraph reflecting on how your texting affects your other writing.

MICHAELA CULLINGTON

Golden, Serena. Review of *A Better Pencil*, by Dennis Baron. *Inside Higher Ed*, 18 Sept. 2009. [www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/09/18/barron](http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/09/18/barron). Accessed 9 Nov. 2009.

Shaw, Donita M., et al. "An Exploratory Investigation into the Relationship between Text Messaging and Spelling." *New England Reading Association Journal*, vol. 43, no. 1, June 2007, pp. 57–62. EBSCOhost, connection [ebSCOhost.com/c/articles/25648081/exploratory-investigation-relationship-between-text-messaging-spelling](http://ebSCOhost.com/c/articles/25648081/exploratory-investigation-relationship-between-text-messaging-spelling). Accessed 8 Nov. 2009.

"Should We Worry or LOL?" *NEA Today*, vol. 22, no. 6, Mar. 2004, p. 12. EBSCOhost, connection [ebSCOhost.com/c/articles/12405267/should-we-worry-lol](http://ebSCOhost.com/c/articles/12405267/should-we-worry-lol). Accessed 27 Oct. 2009.

Sternberg, Betty, et al. "Enhancing Adolescent Literacy Achievement through Integration of Technology in the Classroom." *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 3, July–Sept. 2007, pp. 416–20. ERIC, [eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ767777](http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ767777). Accessed 8 Nov. 2009.

"Texting, Testing Destroys Kids' Writing Style." *USA Today*, vol. 137, no. 2760, Sept. 2008, p. 8. EBSCOhost, connection [ebSCOhost.com/c/articles/34214935/texting-testing-destroys-kids-writing-style](http://ebSCOhost.com/c/articles/34214935/texting-testing-destroys-kids-writing-style). Accessed 9 Nov. 2009.

Walsh, James. "Txt Msgs Creep in2 class—Some Say That's gr8." *Star Tribune*, 23 Oct. 2007. *Academic Search Elite*, [www.ebscohost.com/academic/academic-search-elite](http://www.ebscohost.com/academic/academic-search-elite). Accessed 27 Oct. 2009.

Joining the Conversation

1. Michaela Cullington makes clear in her first paragraph what viewpoint she's responding to. What is this view (her "they say"), and what is her view (her "I say")? What kinds of evidence does she offer in support of her argument?
2. Cullington acknowledges the views of quite a few naysayers, including teachers who believe that texting has a negative effect on their students' writing. How—and where in her essay—does she respond to this criticism? Is her response persuasive—and if not, why not?



## How I Learned to Love Snapchat

JENNA WORTHAM



IN THE MID-'80s, a German engineer named Friedhelm Hillebrand helped devise a way for cellphones to send and receive text messages. Back then, mobile bandwidth was extremely limited, which meant that the messages needed to be as lightweight as possible. The story goes that Hillebrand experimented with a variety of greetings and phrases and concluded, in very German fashion, that most things that needed saying could be done so in an economical 160 characters or fewer. "This is perfectly sufficient," he said of his findings. Eventually the infrastructure improved so that there were no limits to how much text we could transmit at once. And by 2007, texting had surpassed voice calls as the preferred, if not default, mode of communication.

As most rapid advances in technology tend to do, this transition inspired a low-grade, intergenerational moral panic. Many

---

JENNA WORTHAM writes for the *New York Times*, where she also contributes to *Still Processing*, a podcast on culture. Her work has appeared in *Bust* magazine, *Jezebel*, the *Village Voice*, *Vogue*, and *Wired*. Her Twitter handle is @Jennydeluxe. This essay first appeared in the *New York Times Magazine* on May 22, 2016.

## How I Learned to Love Snapchat

feared that we would become asocial creatures, misanthropes who would rather hide behind the safety of a screen than face the intimacy of a spoken conversation. And maybe there's some truth in that, but there's another way of looking at it. Maybe we didn't hate talking—just the way older phone technologies forced us to talk. Texting freed a generation from the strictures and inconvenience (and awkwardness) of phone calls, while allowing people to be more loosely and constantly connected.

I thought about this shift recently when trying to make sense of the rise of Snapchat, the latest wellspring of technosocial hand-wringing. Like texting, Snapchat flourished amid scarcity, though of an entirely different kind. We no longer live in Hillebrand's era, when there were hard limits on how much we could say over text; but words alone can be an imperfect technology. So much of what we mean lies not just in what we say, or in the exact words we choose, but also in the light that animates our eyes (or doesn't) when we deliver them and the sharpness (or softness) of the tone we use. Text barely captures even a fraction of that emotional depth and texture, even when we can type as much as we want. Snapchat is just the latest and most well-realized example of the various ways we are regaining the layers of meaning we lost when we began digitizing so many important interactions.

Most efforts to approximate normal human behavior in software tend to be creepy or annoying. The oblong gray bubble that pops up when your conversation partner is typing (officially called the "typing awareness indicator") is no doubt intended to be helpful, the virtual version of watching someone inhale and then part their lips to speak. But it becomes panic-inducing if it appears and then disappears—an indication that someone wrote something, then, for any number of reasons,

deleted it. Similarly, “read” receipts, designed to let you know that someone opened and read your message, are perhaps best at letting you know when you’re being ignored. In a strange turn of events, texting has evolved to become almost as awkward as the phone calls it made obsolete.

In 2012, I calculated that I sent about 7,000 texts a month; 5 now, thanks to the creeping unwieldiness of phones and the misfirings of autocorrect, I can barely manage to peck out half a sentence before I become aggravated by the effort and give up. To combat that fatigue, I’ve turned to newer ways to talk and interact with friends, primarily voice memos. These function like a highly evolved version of voice mail—there’s no expectation of a return call, or even a simultaneous conversation. Freed from that pressure, my friends and I leave one another memos about episodes of *RuPaul’s Drag Race* and *Empire*, the themes of *Lemonade* or even just a detailed account of a date or run-in with an ex. The trend is catching on elsewhere: According to an article on Vice’s website *Motherboard*, voice notes have become so popular in Argentina that they’ve virtually replaced text messages altogether.

This is not to say that text is irredeemable. A significant humanization of our text interactions happened quietly in 2011, when emoji were introduced as part of an Apple iOS software update. They offered a palette of punctuation that clarified intent. Tacking on emoji like hearts, skulls, grins and bugged-out eyes to a short message made it infinitely easier to confidently project sarcasm, humor, grief and love across a medium that had been, until then, emotionally arid. If you want proof that we see ourselves in the emoji we use, consider the ever-present disputes over emoji inclusivity: Initially, the characters all had the same skin tone, and even now, the only “professional” emoji are male.

See Chapter 6  
for more ways  
to address a  
skeptical reader.

And though the catalog of emoji has expanded in response to user demand, it still struggles to keep up with the multiplicity of human experiences. As a result, a new bespoke-emoji economy has begun to emerge, in apps like Bitmoji, which let people create personalized avatars to adorn their text messages. If our emoji couldn’t become us, we would become our emoji.

But messages that include little actual messaging seem to be the wave of the future, and Snapchat is leading the way. The app, which allows users to send short videos and images that disappear after a short period of time, is intimate by design, something that sets it apart from its social-media peers. Most of the “snaps” I send and receive are tightly framed, with angles that could be considered unflattering. They’re low resolution too, the images speckled with grain. Snapchat does have filters, but the dumb ones are the most fun, especially the ones that add a comically hideous effect—bloating your face into a red tomato, or distorting it into an animal mask.

If we are to believe the theories about how people want to communicate nowadays—largely through anesthetized, hypermediated and impersonal exchanges—Snapchat’s recent surge in popularity makes little sense. During the first few years of Snapchat’s existence, the only people I knew using the service (beyond journalists like me who were trying to understand it) were my youngest relatives, still in high school and college. And of course there was the attendant moral panic: When it first blew up around 2012, the press seemed to assume it would primarily be used by horny teenagers swapping nudes.

If that was ever the case, it has since expanded. Each time I check the app, I’m surprised to see who else in my network has started using the service. My circle includes every demographic, age and locale: co-workers who send snaps of their dogs, friends on strange adventures in the desert, people I talk to mostly



online sending videos from their travels. The videos are rarely elaborate: just a few seconds of my favorite people's faces on a large screen, smiling, or singing, or showing off their view, before they fade and disappear.

Its entire aesthetic flies in the face of how most people behave on Facebook, Instagram and Twitter—as if we're waiting to be plucked from obscurity by a talent agent or model scout. But Snapchat isn't the place where you go to be pretty. It's the place where you go to be yourself, and that is made easy thanks to the app's inbuilt ephemerality. Away from the fave-based economies of mainstream social media, there's less pressure to be dolled up, or funny. For all the advances in tech that let us try on various guises to play around with who we are, it seems that we just want new ways to be ourselves. As it turns out, the mundanity of our regular lives is the most captivating thing we could share with one another.

*Joining the Conversation*

1. How would you summarize Jenna Wortham's argument about the appeal of Snapchat? How does she place its appeal in the ongoing history of online communication?
2. Wortham begins her piece with a short narrative about a German engineer's invention of text messaging more than thirty years ago. Why do you think she chooses to start her essay this way? How else might the piece have begun?
3. Wortham uses connecting words, phrases, and sentences to link different parts of her argument. For example, at the beginning of paragraph 6, after explaining what she dislikes about text messaging, she writes, "This is not to say that text is irredeemable" and discusses some recent improvements.

*How I Learned to Love Snapchat*

Find another place where she makes a similar transition, and explain how you think it develops her argument.

4. Sherry Turkle (pp. 541–59) writes that young women often "prefer to deal with strong feelings from the safe haven of the Net" and that doing so provides "an alternative to processing emotions in real time." Given what Wortham seems to value most about Snapchat, how might she respond to Turkle?
5. In your own view, what are the benefits and limitations of Snapchat as a form of communication? More broadly, write about developing your own argument about the larger effects of digital media, citing your experiences as well

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Junior Summer Reading 2019**

Directions: Read the texts, and then respond to ALL of the questions. You can use the sentence frames to help you, or you can write your own paragraph and attach it.

**Passage 1: "Does Texting Affect Writing" by Michaela Cullington.**

1. The general argument Michaela Cullington is responding to is the belief that \_\_\_\_\_

In response, she writes her own view which is \_\_\_\_\_

One example she offers to support her response is \_\_\_\_\_

This evidence is suggesting that \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2.

1. The general argument made by Jenna Wortham is \_\_\_\_\_.

One example she offers to support her argument is \_\_\_\_\_.

She places Snapchat's appeal in the ongoing history of communication when saying \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_ . This proves that \_\_\_\_\_.

Passage 2: "How I Learned to Love Snapchat" by Jenna Wortham.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

5.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

4.

because \_\_\_\_\_

This supports the idea that \_\_\_\_\_

In my experience, digital and social media \_\_\_\_\_

Generally, the limitations are \_\_\_\_\_

For example, \_\_\_\_\_

More specifically, I believe that the benefits are \_\_\_\_\_

5. In my view \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_