

Some people say children no longer need to develop handwriting skills. Others believe that handwriting is still important.

Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Even though nobody can question the influence and therefore the importance of a legible longhand, regarding the pace of writing in shorthand compared with that of writing in hand and more importantly and obviously the amount of time and attempt that mastery in either of them takes, it goes without saying that people have understandably lost their interest in writing since its priority has become lower and lower. The question here is whether that if it is still rational to allocate children's time to this subject.

Stunned by the beauty of a script, the audience of the letter would think of a writer as someone highly educated and of a high social level. This is the reason why as to why people become convinced to dedicate grant their children's time to improving their handwriting. The better a handwriting in a letter, the faster and more desirable the response, the advocates of the importance of a good handwriting do claim. Even those of them, who agree that rarely would one's handwriting be seen due to the recently immense popularity of typing, argue that, for instance, a congratulatory note ion lyric in an eye-catching script on a, for example, gift can impress someone in ways so greatly that hardly would anything else do, but is it merely to be written by the giver/sender or anybody can have someone do that for them?

According to opponents, an impressive handwriting used to be worth the time and energy that was spent on it, though not now that not although/of course now that everyone lacks time and energy to allot to doing many other things, which these people believe, are of higher importance. They frankly assert that the priority of writing attractively and neatly is the lowest and consequently not reason enough to convince them or even put them in a dilemma of whether or not children should, they say, waste time improving their handwriting that seldom would it be of any help to them, but they must be asked if they would rather be embarrassed because of their spidery handwriting than spending an objectively adequate time practicing it.

Followed from the above, the advocates' claim is not compelling, nor is that of the critics. Yet, I agree with them both, but with ~~both either~~ to some extent. Children must have a limited number of courses on which they practice their longhand skills inasmuch as to have enough remaining time to be spent on more important things, namely studying and enjoying free time.