Prompt 3:

In a world that has become smaller through exploration and communication, assess the challenges that are left for the adventurous.

It seems as if most of the world has been explored and the best technology has been created. But there is much of the world that is still yet to be adventured upon. It is only fair to consider both the benefits and drawbacks that are left for the adventurous.

Economically speaking, it may be of great expenses to continue exploring and to continue creating. The costs of equipment and new technology is on the rise. Developing countries that are still trying to stabilize themselves may not be able to afford further exploration. But the countries that can afford it can go on ahead. However, the issue arises to when there is a mishap or failure to succeed. A great amount of money could potentially be lost that could’ve gone to a more important cause, such as healthcare. Although, if the exploration works out, a great deal of money could be brought in. For example, if colonizing space is successful in the future, the economy could gain money from tourism. Overall, the challenge of expenses remains and it seems from this that what is left for the adventurous could take a toll on the economy.

Looking at this from a cultural lens, many conflicts may arise between countries. Countries may not agree that an unexplored area should now be explored; with that, conflict and even war may break...
out. Also, further exploration can create disputes about claiming uncharted land or areas. Along with space exploration as I mentioned earlier, what happens when people begin to inhabit Mars? Fights over land and territory on Mars will bring about many issues. These countries creating enemies or even joining together to become allies.

A social benefit could be the coming together of nations to work as one in the venturing into the unknown. If countries work together, ideas can be shared, and greater things may result. Working as one will be more powerful and thus creating a stronger world, and a stronger chance at exploring the unknown.

Environmentally, it may pose many challenges for what is left for the adventurous. For the technology side of the unknown e-waste could result from the creation of new devices. E-waste is the disposal of mobile devices, and it can be harmful to many. Specifically, it could harm the environment if it is not disposed of properly. This would be detrimental to our already polluted environment. Moreover, for the exploration side of the unknown, transportation and building on lands would not be beneficial. The transportation, such as spaceships for exploring space, may leave behind many unwanted pollutants and chemicals in the atmosphere and on the ground. Also building new lands has the potential to run habitats for many species. With this there are many environmental challenges left for the adventurous.

When exploring what is left for technological developments, it is important to assess what the people want it is very necessary to please the wants of the people. Everyone enjoys leisurely time, so when creating new technology, it has to be something innovative and creative that no one has ever used or seen before. Providing for the needs of the people would be the challenge and creating new technology.

In conclusion, there are a variety of benefits and drawbacks in the challenges that are left for the adventurous. Overall environmentally, social, environmentally, and leisurely the challenges are pretty far from few. Exploring the unknown may be difficult, but certainly not impossible.
EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:

✓ The question largely goes unanswered; “the terms of the question are not adhered to”
  (NAQ)
✓ Tangential; loses focus
Prompt 8:

*Parks, gardens, and open spaces enhance city living. To what extent are features like these important?*

In today's society more than half of the United States' population lives in major cities. People living in modern-day cities do not experience the same natural beauty that people in rural areas encounter daily. As a solution to this problem parks, gardens, and open spaces were incorporated into cities. Features like these may prove to be highly beneficial, but they may have some drawbacks as well.

One of the main reasons people living in the city love specialized places of nature is because of the escape from the city it provides. Normally, living in a city entails a fast-paced lifestyle mainly spent indoors. Having parks and gardens allows people to escape their busy jobs and lives; and enjoy nature. For example, Central Park in New York City is one of the most popular parks in the city. People have been enjoying the park for over 50 years, and it is one of the best features in the city. There are numerous things to do in Central Park from taking a ride in a horse-drawn carriage to bird-watching. Residents of New York and tourists from around the world love visiting Central Park and it provides a place of escape from a busy life.

In addition to providing an escape from the busy life, parks, gardens, and open spaces can help...
improve the quality of life in the city. Cities are highly polluted by all of the cars, buses, and industries. The air is filled with pollutants, and this can cause many breathing problems in city inhabitants, such as asthma. Plants can filter out pollutants in the air, and improve air quality. For instance, Los Angeles, California, has the highest levels of air pollution in the United States. The city of Los Angeles could start making gardens, and parks to help improve air quality. This would overall increase human health, and therefore, enhance city living.

On the other hand, some people argue that parks and open space take up land that could be used to make money. In densely populated cities space is extremely valuable and expensive. While many people love places of nature for the benefits they provide, some people think that the space they are taking up is more valuable than the benefits associated with them. This is the case with many big business owners. Their mindset is that where an open space is, there could be a company building in its place, making more money.

Also, people may be against places of nature because they do not "pay for themselves." Most parks and open spaces do not charge for admission, but they still have to hire grounds keepers and mainenance crews. This cost money, and the visitors are not the ones paying for the services. Tax money goes towards the maintnence of natural areas in cities, and some people do not think it is a worthy place for their money to go towards.

Overall, it is evident that parks, gardens, and open spaces are very important to city living. Places of nature in the city provide substansial benefits to the inhabitants of the city, while still proving to have some negative aspects. While there are benefits and drawbacks to having specialized places of nature in cities, it is evident that the benefits outweigh the drawbacks, and parks, gardens and open spaces are highly important in city living.
EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:

- Contains some examples but their inconsistent and obvious
- Introduction lacks clear address of the question
- Lacks logical connection between ideas/no meaningful interplay or thoughtful consideration of ideas
Prompt 1:

To what extent should limits be placed upon the state's surveillance of its citizens?

Security is a huge part of keeping many citizens and countries safe. Many people however believe that surveillance can be an invasion of privacy. State surveillance can be very helpful yet very harmful at the same time because it can help protect citizens but it can be intruding on their personal lives.

The main reason for surveillance is to keep citizens safe from harm and to maintain security throughout the state and thousands of court cases security videos have helped find criminals. For example, when the famous singer Beyoncé was beaten by her boyfriend in a hotel elevator, the security cameras capture this crime. Later her boyfriend was charged and justice was served. In this case having surveillance cameras help someone who was in harms way. Another form of state surveillance is security guards. Security guards help in many way and are almost everywhere. Security guards can be found walking city streets or in parks. They can also be found at malls, concerts, and the movie theater. Just like in the Colorado state movie theater shooting there were
security guards that helped take down the gunman, which saved dozens of lives. This is why state surveillance can be vital to protecting its citizens and shouldn't have limits placed on it.

However, many people find state surveillance to be an invasion of privacy. Security cameras can capture images or videos, that people believe the state shouldn't be allowed to see because it is too personal. For example, when citizens are out in public with friends or family; cameras are capturing everything they do. Networks like YouTube have taken newscasts, security videos, and other forms of videos or images, along with voice recordings and have used them to mock people. Another form of surveillance is drones, which are flying video cameras. Drones are now used as a form of security for military bases and are becoming more popular as a form of surveillance for states as well. Having state surveillance may be too big of an invasion of privacy to allow it without limits.

State surveillance can also help in cases of parties or large events by having either cameras are guards monitoring social events. For example this can be very helpful when it comes to concerts. Large concerts in states can bring in many problems for security. For example, in Florida a popular concert is Sunfest which is a five day concert that can sometimes cause a lot of problems. Without security or surveillance at these events many illegal events would happen such as drinking for underage children or the use of drugs. Without security involved it could be a huge problem for the state. This is why state surveillance is necessary for protecting its citizens.

Overall, limits should not be placed upon the state surveillance of its citizens because it is vital for the protection and safety of the citizen. This will help lower crime and protect people from crime along with ensuring their safety.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:

✔ Consistent examples throughout
✔ Logical and focused, but lacks meaningful organization of ideas
Prompt 11:

Books written specifically for children are often enjoyed by adults. Consider why this should be.

Kids all around the world tonight will be tucked in, kissed good night, and ask their parents to read them a bedtime story. It is essential that parents enjoy reading children’s books as much as their children like hearing them. This is because children’s books can offer more than just a good story.

For starters, when a parent has a long day, reading a book can be a way for them to relax. For example if their entire day was spent struggling they should be able to come home and unwind by reading a book with their kid. When a parent doesn't enjoyed children’s books then not only are they depriving themselves of a wonderful story but they’re also robbing their children of many life lessons that those books can offer.

Children follow in their parents footsteps and if a parent doesn't enjoy reading books with their children then they will never learn to enjoy them and it will become an endless cycle of generation after generation that have been deprived a good story and lesson.
Many parents often turn to children's books when they cannot explain something to their child. It offers a sort of safety net when they don't know what to do. If a parent were to not enjoy children's books then they won't turn to them when in need, and then what? The child just never learns that valuable lesson? For example, the company American Girl Dolls has written a book titled, "The Care and Keeping of You." It was made specifically to teach young girls what to expect during puberty. However, just because the words were written for young girls doesn't mean the book doesn't also help parents. This book would be especially helpful for perhaps a single dad or even just a parent who is confused on how to approach the issue and share the lesson.

Also many children's books and books written especially for children have morals and lessons. A book titled, "the Spider and the Fly" was written to teach about 'stranger danger.' However many books that appear to be only for children are actually written to teach adults. Dr. Seuss wrote many books believed to be allegories. An allegory is a children's book or tale that masks a historical/political event. When people think of Dr. Seuss they immediately think of funny animals and made up words, which is partially true, but there is much more to the story. For example, "the Butter Battle Book "may look like an argument between made up creatures about which side Butter should be on, but it is actually an allegory for the Cold War, fought between the US and the USSR in the 1950s. Dr. Seuss has also written "Yertle the Turtle," which symbolizes a kings anarchy and social class. Another well renowned allegory is the "Wizard of Oz" where many items in the story symbolize that of industrialized America and the world. For example the luscious Poppyfields which cause tiredness is actually a symbol for opium dens. These are only a few of the allegories that contribute to the reason why adult should enjoyed books written specifically for children. Adults can learn lessons alongside the child.

There are many reasons why a parent or adult should enjoy a children's book. Maybe they shouldn't in some cases, maybe in those cases a book is only for the eyes of a child, however a parent or guardian should know what their child is reading. Parents should enjoy reading children's books because ‘monkey see monkey do’ and because it can offer relaxation, even if just for a moment. Also, and maybe the greatest reason of all because adults can learn from them as well.
EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:

✓ Starts slowly and somewhat irrelevantly or obviously, but then picks up speed in support of force and example
Prompt 5:

To what extent do our genes determine our future?

The situational versus dispositional debate has been an open conversation in psychology for a long time. Are our bodies and minds naturally predispositioned to do certain things or are we influenced by our surroundings and environment? Does our biological makeup determine our future relationships, diseases and careers, or are our futures dependent on the situation we find ourselves in? Our genes may have some part in determining our future but not all aspects are controlled by genetics.

Genetics determine a number of factors that can influence your future, such as race, gender, and possible diseases. At one point in history, gender and race were huge determinants of what your possible future would hold. White males for example had every opportunity; yet, females were restricted to being wives with household duties, whereas blacks were restricted to being slaves.

Now, society has tried to illuminate these racist and sexist views. However, these issues still pose hidden threats that can determine one’s future. For example death sentences in the US are more
commonly given to African-American males. This racial and gender factor may determine life or death for a person. Racist and sexist people also view women or African-Americans as inferior, even today, therefore limiting their opportunities for the future in the workplace and beyond, just because they are biologically female or a different skin tone.

Genes may determine the race and sex of a person, but that person can still overcome the obstacles this tends to create, thereby building a future for themselves. Women have overcome these obstacles with the Women's Rights movement in the 1920s and now have the opportunity to rise in the world. Women now hold higher position jobs in the government and in businesses and as a result of the movement can now vote. African-Americans have also overcome their obstacles after the Civil Rights movement. African-Americans also have a quality for their future. This can be easily seen by our President, Barack Obama. Race and gender that is determined by your genes are now less likely to restrict your future opportunities because of the social progress we've cultivated in our world.

However, genetics also determine your health. Some people are predisposition to a disease; they have a higher likelihood of being diagnosed with it. Some examples would be cancer, Alzheimer's, or vision problems. These issues and many more are strongly determined by our genes. If you have the gene for a disease than you can easily imagine a future with that disease. These medical ailments are often acquired through our biological makeup and may hinder our future endeavors.

Meanwhile, some people still believe that through a healthy lifestyle, these elements can be prevented. If a person takes preventative measures than they may have a chance of overcoming these diseases. However, if a person does not have the predisposition for a disease like heart disease yet lives an unhealthy lifestyle, then they too can acquire the disease despite a clean gene record. Therefore your lifestyle affects your future just as much as your genes do.

There are numerous psychological studies that show how our biological makeup may have other effects on our life. A study by Dematle showed that people can actually choose a mate based on their genetic makeup, so your choice in relationships may be determined by your genes. Another study shows that a larger hippocampus can mean you're more likely to empathize. This can
determine your future career. Specifically, this study revealed that participants who have a brain hardwired for more empathy usually take part in careers involving social sciences while those with more critical or analytical brains have careers in physical science. This shows that your biological makeup can affect your future relationships or even your career.

However, other studies in the field of research show that there are other aspects that influence our future. Your morals are developed by your parents, teachers and friends. How you think is shaped by your society, environment, and whom you surround yourself with, in another words the theory of nurture as opposed to nature. As a result of this, it is possible for us to overcome our biological determinants by means of our environment. A study done by Zimbardo shows that your situation can have a major impact on your behavior. Further studies by Milgram support this who came to the conclusion that people can choose who they want to become despite their genes.

Therefore, your biological makeup or genes may play a large role in determining health, race or sex, but ultimately people have free will. Peoples futures are more determined by the way they are raised and the situation of their environment. Yet, some biological determinants have a strong influence in our choices and future.
EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:

✓ Range of examples and illustration
✓ Logically/meaningfully ordered; thoughtfully unravels the pro/con sides of the issue
Prompt 11:
'Celebrities promoting charitable causes do more harm than good.' How far is the statement justifiable?

With today's technology, there are numerous ways to get the attention of the public eye. From advertisements on the television to advertisements in magazines, companies try their hardest to capture the audience's attention in order to persuade their audience to buy a product or send money to a charity. One method marketing businesses use is using celebrities to promote charitable causes. This approach contains several advantages and disadvantages.

From a social standpoint, celebrities promoting charitable causes does more good than harm because it is a form of social acceptance and exclusivity. If the popular culture is donating to the charity being advertised, then the normal human being will also want to donate so they can fit in. After someone donates their money to a charity, they feel a sense of accomplishment because they were able to do the same thing a celebrity did. When an individual gives money to a charity that a famous person supports, they feel as if they joined an exclusive club. Therefore, it also gives the audience a sense of exclusivity. Therefore, celebrities promoting charities is a good idea because it gives society a sense of acceptance. Additionally, celebrities promoting charitable causes is a beneficial idea economically because it generates more money than advertisements.
with the celebrity in them. In this sense, social and economic motivations a line because of people gain exclusivity by donating then more people will donate guaranteeing more money.

The main purpose of advertisements is to make a profit, however, which is why adverts are not always trustworthy. Since the celebrities are promoting a charity, people trust the campaigns because it is a famous person speaking to them. Therefore the audience tries their hardest to donate as much money to the charity as they can manage. In this way, famous people supporting charities is advantageous because it encourages the public to donate more money than a campaign with unknown people would.

Celebrities promoting charitable causes does more harm than good because it can improve the well-being and health of the people of the charity. If celebrities motivate the public to donate more money to the charity, then the surplus of money can be used on the helpless people within the charity. Many charities are focused on serving the lives of cancer patients, for instance. If money is coming in because celebrities then this money can go towards finding a cure. In this way celebrities are beneficial because they give charity more money to improve the medical condition of society.

However, a drawback that is present throughout is that advertising companies can present misleading information. Celebrities promoting charitable causes can do more harm than good in this way because business is going ultimately you celebrities to lower the public in for the wrong reasons. The use of celebrities can be false advertisement. Charities could simply hire a famous person and tell them exactly what to say by a script just to get their charity money. A celebrity promoting this charity does not necessarily mean that the celebrity actually donate or supports the program however. Therefore, from this perspective, celebrity supporting a charity is a bad thing because the charity might use the money earned in a wrong way then what the advertisement promised.

In conclusion, advertisements will continue to be used to promote a specific good or service. After weighing the advantages and disadvantages, celebrities promoting charitable causes does more good than harm. Even though some information may be misleading, celebrities help both the charity and companies socially, economically, and medically.
EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:

✓ Great ideas but lacks development/development very broad/vague
✓ No examples to clarify broad points
SAMPLE 7 (MChr)  “top of Band 3+

Expression: 16/20 (Band 2)
Content: 19/30 (Band 3+)

This Essay = 2
Other Essay = 2
Overall = 70/100, A

Prompt 1:

To what extent should limits be placed upon the state surveillance of its citizens?

With newly invented technologies, surveillance of citizens has increased drastically. From traffic cameras to drones, there is virtually no where a person can go unseen. Also encourage this change, other suppose it’s happening.

Those in favor of unlimited surveillance of citizens by the state claims that the world would become save it. This is due to the fact that many criminals would be deterred and those caught by a surveillance system are more likely to be found. If a man rob the bank, surveillance camera may have a video of him. If this video contains a shot of his face, your Daughetys would know whether suspect looks like. This would make him far easier to locate. In addition, once located, the video would be strong evidence against the robber and could lead to imprisoning the criminal. The world is then safer because there is no longer that criminal lurking about. The surveillance tape helps with identification, capture, and prosecution of a guilty criminal. Some believe that the surveillance of citizens by the state is justifiable in the sense because it would make the world safer.

Well sums the unlimited surveillance of citizens by the state to make for a safer world, others directly negate this, saying that the world would become more dangerous. They worry that if a
database of surveillance of ordinary citizens was breached, they would be more vulnerable to the axle criminals. For instance, if a criminal managed to access a camera, such as a traffic camera, that recorded a particular car leaving at nearly the same time every weekday, the criminal might infer that the man's house is empty and unguarded, giving the criminal the chance to rob it. If the surveillance above did not exist, the criminal would not have been able to track the man's daily schedule. This is just one reason why unlimited surveillance of citizens by the state could be dangerous.

Although some disagree, some others say that the state should have unlimited ability to play surveillance on its citizens; proponents of this believe that if you have nothing to hide, you should not be worried. This suggests that on noncriminal should not fret because they have done nothing wrong. For example, there should be nothing to worry about if the state sees you driving, eating, or doing any other legal action because there is no reason for the state to think twice about that particular surveillance information. Unlimited ability to surveillance citizens is hereby justifiable because no law-abiding citizen should have anything to fear.

In spite of those who say one should have nothing to hide, many law abiding citizens still feel the need for privacy. One can be made uneasy by the thought that someone is always watching them. A person could feel like they are never truly alone. Also, they may never know who's watching them. It gives the feeling often referred to as "big brother. "This is because some think that it is not right for the state to always be watching. A person can desire privacy for any reason, not just to hide wrongdoings. This is why some believe that the unlimited surveillance of citizens by the state would hurt society.

It is clear that there are reasons to both support and reviewed the notion that there should be limits on the state surveillance of its citizens. Some argue for the reduction of criminal activity, others for citizens to have the right to privacy. With this evidence in mind, unlimited surveillance of citizens by the state would have a greater positive effect of the negative.
EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:

✓ No examples but explanations of broad points are lucid/detailed enough to convey logical point