

Let him cook! WA1 english essays

Discursive	Argumentative
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• writer remains neutral and detached from the topic (objective)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• writer's personality and opinions are evident (subjective)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• all sides of the argument are treated equally (unbiased)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• all sides of the argument are looked at, but one side is favoured more than others (bias)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• points are listed sequentially with the most important points first	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• points are structured logically to build up a 'line of argument'
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• uses information to inform the reader of all the relevant issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• uses information and persuasive language to persuade the reader of the writer's opinion

“We are not doing enough to conserve the environment.” How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

Analysis

- We – people. Consider different groups of people, society, govt, communities, individuals.
- Not doing enough – things have been done, but sufficient in the long run?
- Conserve – save or protect
- The environment – our surroundings and physical space. different problems faced and whether people are doing enough to mitigate/solve issue.

P: I agree with this statement.

EEL or smt like that: Governments around the world are not playing their part to protect the environment. Despite the warnings of rising temperatures, global warming gets worse day by day. The problem of deforestation, or the mass burning of forests in countries like Indonesia cannot be stopped by the government although they could do something to change the situation. The extreme air pollution affects locals and animals and people of neighbouring countries too. Hence, this shows that governments are not doing enough to tackle environmental problems.

Counter argument:

P: On the other hand, detractors might argue that some groups of people and countries are putting in effort to conserve the environment.

EEL: Countries like Japan actively encourage helpful and simple practices like recycling that aim to protect the earth in the long run through their [insert fake statistics or free reward system to encourage!]. Furthermore, movements in Western and European countries such as the United States like “Earth Hour” encourage people to switch off their lights in their homes for an hour to conserve the environment.

Countering the counter argument:

However, although it is true that there are already some efforts made, they are still insufficient compared to the lack of effort by many people around the world. Many still litter their surroundings and efforts like “Earth Hour” are one-time and short term that do not have adverse impacts on them. Old habits die hard, after all.

On the whole, society is still not doing enough to protect the environment. Let us get rid of our selfishness and be more serious about protecting our environment so future generations can have a better life. If not us, who? If not now, when?

“Singapore’s efforts in protecting the environment are sufficient”
How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

Yes, sufficient.

- 30/30 → 1 million more trees, helps by reducing CO₂, less global warming, and greenhouse gases in our air.
- Earth Hour → Raise awareness about problems.
- Bloobin (government efforts)
- Very important: Plastic bags 5 cents/bag → reduces amount thrown away, decreases production and demand.

Insufficient, because:

1. As the age-old Chinese maxim asserts: you can only lead the horse to the water, but you cannot make him drink it.
 - Although your resources are given, initiatives set up, incentives that are up for grabs, it is ultimately the people of Singapore who have the choice to harness it.

Conclusion: Yes, sufficient efforts, but relative effectiveness.

Are celebrities always bad influences?

Perimeters: celebrities in the music and acting industry.

Eg: Benedict Cumberbatch is a celebrity, Xixue is not. Twice is, political figures are not.

- Define qn: What draws the line between influential figures and celebrities?

STAND:

No, they are not.

- Good – they are educational.
- Twice's Nayeon → donated S\$25,000 to patients that required surgery in the US, S\$15,000 anonymously.
 - a. Serves as an inspiration that helps her fans to follow in her footsteps.

However, all that glitters might not be gold. - Shakespear. Mr Beast. On the surface, videos surround giving extremely large amounts of \$\$ to fans. Outside, many has seen him talk down waiters, being rude to his staff. Does not practise what he preaches.

Actions might seem good, values are not.

Depends on content produced.

BAD INFLUENCES: Justin Bieber, Travis Scott. (?)

Drug taking, partaking in illegal activity, bad influences for teenagers and young children, gullible and easy to convince them with wrong ideologies.

Should both parents in a family go to work?

Analysis:

- Should – consider whether it is right/good for both to work.
- Go to work — consider end goal: to earn \$\$.
- Family – 3 people at least. Father, mother, child/grandparents.

How to do?

- Consider whether or not both parents should go to work. If both go to work, how would that affect children and family as a whole. Both positive and negative.

Intro:

Parents would usually want to give the best to their children. Be it the best food, clothing, education, it would therefore lead to the obvious: it is indeed necessary to earn enough money to meet the material needs of the children. This is one reason for the rise in many dual income families. However, it is also true that when both parents work, they may not have enough time to communicate with their children and educate them, inculcating values. Nevertheless, I believe that due to the demands of today's world, it is necessary and inevitable for both parents to go to work.

PEEL 1:

As we have just emerged from the Covid-19 pandemic, all of us had to cope with the exponential increase in the rising cost of living. In developed countries like Singapore, many parents would want their children to receive as many opportunities as they could. For example, parents send their children to additional enrichment classes like music lessons to develop their talents. This requires a huge amount of money, that would be a factor to consider in parents' decision to work to ensure that their children can attend such classes.

Should content on the web be better regulated?

Key terms – content = information, things you see, on the web = internet, online spaces.
(especially important: better regulated.)

- Better regulated → implies that it has existing flaws, problems etc. Regulated would mean that some measures have already been put in place, but it's not enough.

No misinformation or fake information, for eg: content that can spur racial disharmony or inaccurate news that causes disputes, riots.

Root cause	Exponential rise in use of generative artificial intelligence = potential for increase in butchered images, doctored and fake images etc.
Measures to curb	IMDA – Online safety code → Allows for authorities to take down info they deem to be false that bypass those of respective social media platforms.
	Also depends on the party that chooses to solve this problem! Social media platform: Could they hire people to be vigilants/ staff that care for the images that they see?
Problem with measures introduced	Although people do exist, lapse of human judgement, different tolerance of content online?

Quotes

Jimmy Gomez – American politician	When fake news is repeated, it becomes difficult for the public to discern what is real, and what isn't.
Unknown	Fake news undermines democracy and influences citizens to do the wrong things.
Unknown	Believe nothing you hear, and only one half that you see.

“Youth sports are too intense.” Do you agree? EYV.

Yes (it is too intense)	No (it isn't too intense)
Potential of injuries during sports	(Counter) If child is careful, no injuries will occur!
Mindset of being 1st and winning inculcated into these children	<p>Nothing seems wrong with this, but it is a matter of degree.</p> <p>Degree = the extent/ drive. → 2 POVs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If healthy, spurs child on → I can do this! Healthy mindset is adopted, pushes them to test their limits • If unhealthy, toxic behaviour is adopted. What will happen in their drive or road to 1st place? Pushing others down, being rude?
<p>Child can be shunned/ looked down upon for their lesser athletic abilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deems or roots their self-worth to being worse, bad than other people • Hence got -ve impact on them – What will this lead to? 	<p>(counter) Can be used to spur them on and encourage them to improve instead?</p> <p>Again about degree or extent of mentality</p>
<p>Families spend too much resources and invest too much to not receive their desired outcomes, or reward in return</p> <p>Dedicate the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Time (driving them to and from practice, lesser family time) Money (training by coaches, facilities, meals, sports sch fees? Higher than the average sch) <p>Expectations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results (On the field and off!) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “One man cannot serve 2 masters” – shows that time has to be dedicated well and planned properly. Focus on sports, or academics? 	