We say things to each other that we would never say face to face. Shouldn't we know better by now?

- Presents opinion as fact so that readers will agree without question
- Use of collective pronoun ("we") to generalise; makes it seem like everyone is part of this problem
- Use of declarative extremes / absolutes to show bias or put across a strong view ("always", "never", etc)
- Use of rhetorical question with implied answer ('Wouldn't', 'Shouldn't', 'Couldn't') to lead the reader to make a certain conclusion

Astoundingly, Dr. Turkle says, many people still forget that they're speaking out loud when they communicate online… "So what if you say 'I hate you' on this tiny little thing? It's like a toy. It doesn't feel consequential."

- Use sensational / hyperbolic language ('Astoundingly') to suggest that people's behaviour is shocking and impossible to believe
- Expert opinion ('Dr') lends further credibility to the argument
- Use of vague words ('many') to hint at the large scope of the problem
- Rhetorical question ('So what…') to lead the reader to imagine the negative consequences.
- Simile compares mobile phones to toys, which are meant to be fun
- Adjectives 'tiny' and 'little' make it hard to believe that rude behaviour can have serious consequences.

Still, he sometimes can't restrain himself from fanning the flames. When a political discussion thread becomes heated and he doesn't like the way it is going… he messages one of his "attack dog" friends

- Use of the word 'still' to suggest that everyone, like Bolcik has a polite side and the potential to act rudely; that it's an on-going problem.
- The verb 'restrain' implies that it takes considerable effort for people to control their behaviour
- Use of metaphorical language to suggest the severity of online arguments ('flames'/'heated' – suggests intense, uncomfortable, painful; 'attack dog' – suggests aggression, viciousness, a pack mentality and a predatory nature)