

NAVIGATE

Issue #13

Eunoia Junior College
English Department
2023 General Paper

Contents

Navigate User Guide	3
List of Essays and AQs	4
Essays: 2023 JC2 MYE Paper 1	6
1 Consider the view that the media today gives us what we want, not what we need.	6
2 'While equality is desirable, it is an unachievable goal.' How far is this true in your society?	9
3 'Wars can never be won.' Discuss.	11
4 How effectively are people's voices represented in a democracy?	13
5 'In today's world, the ability to write well is becoming irrelevant.' How far do you agree?	15
5 'In today's world, the ability to write well is becoming irrelevant.' How far do you agree?	18
6 'Education should cater more to the needs of individuals than society.' What is your view?	20
7 To what extent does technology challenge our humanity?	22
9 'When it comes to saving the environment, the outcome is the only thing that matters'. Discuss.	25
10 Consider the importance of stories to your society.	27
11 'We are collectively responsible for addressing poverty'. Discuss.	29
12 'Play is merely for children.' How far do you agree?	30
AQs: 2023 JC2 MYE Paper 2	33
Response 1	33
Response 2	34
Essays: 2023 JC1 MYE Paper 1	36
3 'An unregulated press is dangerous.' How far do you agree?	36
6 'Celebrity culture does more harm than good.' Discuss.	37
AQs: 2023 JC1 MYE Paper 2	41
Response 1	41
Response 2	42
Response 3	43
Response 4	44

Navigate User Guide

What is Navigate?

Navigate is a curated collection of essays and responses to the Application Question written by Eunoians like yourselves. In most cases, these pieces have been written under timed conditions, and except for a smidgen of grammatical polishing, they are left as they come. It is our hope that their raw edges, as much as their skilfully crafted facets, will serve as authentic and empowering learning resources. To help you discover these, the Navigate Team provides a preamble containing a broad overview of the strengths and flaws of each piece, as well as annotations to direct you to key features. What we hope you will take away from Navigate is not mere mimicry, but a deeper understanding of how good writing is crafted, and that you will make these skills your own.

How do I use Navigate?

While your tutors may use some of these resources in class or direct you to them, much can also be gained from reading them independently. To get the most out of your independent reading, consider the guiding points below.

What to read

- Not everything! Save time for reading your other packages, the news and opinion articles.
- Often it is a good idea to read the essays for the questions which you have attempted or would potentially attempt.
- Scan the preambles for features or parts of writing that you struggle with or wish to strengthen your understanding of.
- The ones which look interesting!

How to read

- Read the preamble before you read any text, because it will point out key strengths and areas for improvement that you should keep in mind as you read.
- Be aware of both macro and micro features of the text. You can read closely to notice the details, but you can also read to make sense of the bigger picture. Toggle between these different levels to recognise how the details fit together to make the argument effectively.
- Read actively and make annotations of your own. These can be of:
 - Writing strategies
 - Good ideas and examples
 - Argument development strategies
 - Structure and organisation

List of Essays and AQs

2023 JC2 MYE Paper 1

- 1 Consider the view that the media today gives us what we want, not what we need.
 - Jovielle Jan Javier Bruto, 22-A2
- 2 'While equality is desirable, it is an unachievable goal.' How far is this true in your society?
 - Seah Kai Ling, Claire V, 22-O3
- 3 'Wars can never be won.' Discuss.
 - Zhang Ruijie, 22-I5
- 4 How effectively are people's voices represented in a democracy?
 - Peh Xin Rong, 22-A1
- 5 'In today's world, the ability to write well is becoming irrelevant.' How far do you agree?
 - Ang Kai Ling, 22-E3
 - Wong En-Si, 22-O4
- 6 'Education should cater more to the needs of individuals than society.' What is your view?
 - Audrey Th'ng Kaiyan, 22-I6
- 7 To what extent does technology challenge our humanity?
 - Bethanie Low Xiao Hui, 22-O4
- 8 Can the censorship of art ever be justified?
 - Not represented
- 9 'When it comes to saving the environment, the outcome is the only thing that matters.' Discuss.
 - Ashton Chia 22-A5
- 10 Consider the importance of stories to your society.
 - Andrea Wee, 22-O1
- 11 'We are collectively responsible for addressing poverty.' Discuss.
 - Tan Charmaine, 22-E3
- 12 'Play is merely for children.' How far do you agree?
 - Helena Ding, 22-U3

2023 JC2 MYE Paper 2 AQ

- Response 1 Andrea Wee, 22-A5
- Response 2 Chen Zihua Christine, 22-I6

2023 JC1 JC2 MYE Paper 1

- 1 'Young people today lead a life that the elderly envy.' How true is this of your society?
 - Not represented
- 2 How far is modern technology a solution to the world's problems?
 - Not represented
- 3 'An unregulated press is dangerous.' How far do you agree?
 - Nayomika Shashidhar, 23-E6
- 4 Does tradition still have a place in your society?
 - Not represented
- 5 Do corporations today wield too much power?
 - Not represented
- 6 'Celebrity culture does more harm than good.' Discuss.
 - Nicole Tedja 23-U5
- 7 Is the pursuit of success always desirable?
 - Not represented
- 8 Assess the view that the government should never interfere with people's personal choices.
 - Not represented

2023 JC1 MYE Paper 2 AQ

- | | |
|------------|-------------------|
| Response 1 | Zoe Teng, 23-A3 |
| Response 2 | Wei Xinyu, 23-U5 |
| Response 3 | Bryan Lee, 23-U5 |
| Response 4 | Hannalyn Ng 23-E3 |

Essays: 2023 JC2 MYE Paper 1

1 Consider the view that the media today gives us what we want, not what we need.

Positive/Area for improvement:

Essay demonstrates consistency in its attempts to address the concepts of wants and needs. When successfully attempted, these contain apt real-world examples and coherently unpacked arguments. The level of success when addressing the comparison varies, but this is a valiant attempt nonetheless.

The 21st century has welcomed a series of changes, the most notable of which is the advent of the Internet and new media. Recent technological advancements such as the invention of the internet have led to the democratisation of media, connecting people all over the globe and breaking down geographical barriers. This enables people to share information and stories with a large group of people, by facilitating the exchange of ideas. Optimists argue that this facet of the media has provided us with the necessary information and accessibility to advance ourselves as a society. However, I believe that the media ultimately takes advantage of our own desires, instead of our needs. The media has led to the sensationalism of media content, which detracts from validity of the press, as well as commercialisation, which negatively impacts ourselves. Furthermore, the media enables us to idealise luxurious lives, which harms our state of mind.

Introduction effectively sets the concerns for the debate and presents a brief outline of the arguments that will be discussed.

ww

Futurists posit the view that the democratisation of media today has provided us with sorely needed connection and accessibility to information. This is true as the Internet has increased the visibility of pertinent events and information to netizens, which ultimately results in a more educated world. For instance, companies such as the Straits Times have capitalised on the high connectivity that social media offers. The Straits Times now posts live updates on crucial news, such as the Ukraine Crisis and the Covid-19 pandemic. This opened up avenues for the general public to learn about current issues plaguing our world, warning us of the need to prepare ourselves for crises, which improves security. An example of this is the Ukraine Crisis, which emphasised to Singaporeans what the government has been proclaiming for years, which is the vulnerability of small countries like Singapore, to stronger powers, such as Russia. Hence, Singaporeans are emboldened and motivated to better defend ourselves against external threats as we are more informed on the dangers of invasion and other demeaning tactics deployed towards small countries. **Furthermore, the high coverage of such depressing and heartbreaking events, such as families being separated and dislocated from their homes, are extremely hurtful to our psyche. As a result, we desire to ignore such information as it is not what we want.** This is further supported by research that states that humans use denial as a form of protection against hurtful information. However, the media would still end up entering our field of consciousness, providing us with what we need, which is more accessibility to information, instead of what we want, which is a happier state of mind.

ww

The reason why this is so crucial that it is deemed a 'need' needs further unpacking

Attempt at addressing 'need', but line of reasoning needs to be fleshed out further

Plausible, but explanation could be more compelling

Awkward engagement With the term 'want'

A commendable effort made to address both 'need' and 'want', although the latter could be better addressed

<p>On the other hand, I believe that the accessibility provided by the media would eventually end up giving us what we want, which is an engaging and sensational story, instead of what we need, which is reliability of media. While I concede that the media provides more connectivity and accessibility to necessary information, human greed would eventually lead to us receiving a viral story that detracts from the need for reliability. Media companies are often profit-driven and aim to create articles with headlines that attract the most 'clicks'. This means that news companies are incentivised to prioritise events and opinions that inspire the most interest, instead of what is most important, which is the validity of news. For instance, a reputable news company, CNN, posted an article on the Covington Catholic Boys allegedly ridiculing an indigenous protester. Although the only proof of such an act was a photograph of a smiling Caucasian boy, with an indigenous protestor shouting in his face, CNN and other news companies were quick to pick up on the news. These companies hastily posted articles regarding it, with little research into the reliability of the information. This bit of news provided netizens with an engaging and sensational story to rile up righteous sentiments. Netizens could rally together to fight against the prevailing narrative of Caucasians Americans discriminating against African-Americans. Hence, the media provided netizens with want we desire, which is a viral story to share with friends and create discourse over. However, this is not what society needs as these claims were eventually proven fake, but not before severely damaging the reputation and mental stakes of those involved. Hence, this displays how media is able to take advantage of the human desire for entertainment, at the expense of news propagated via social media channels. Thus, the media in this age prioritises providing us with what we want, instead of the need for reliable information, which is the original purpose of the media as a whole.</p>	<p>Line of reasoning could be more clearly fleshed out here in terms of why the reliability of news outlets is so important today and why it should be deemed a need.</p> <p>Apt illustration</p> <p>Focus on the point made earlier (the reliability of the news) needs to be consistent.</p> <p>This idea should have been fleshed out at the start of the paragraph instead of being mentioned in passing.</p>
<p>Moreover, I believe that the media gives us what we want, which is a way to fuel our addictions, instead of what we need, which is stability and security. The media's propensity for rapid-fire information is able to combine with the capitalist nature of companies as well as satisfying the human desire for new things, creating a deadly cocktail called commercialism, which can worsen the emotional and financial stability of vulnerable netizens. In times of crisis, humans are inclined to latch onto coping mechanisms, one of which may be over-spending. We do this in order to satisfy an intrinsic desire for items, which is a replacement for a lack of fulfilment we may feel in our lives, such as dissatisfaction regarding our socio-economic status or relationships. Media takes advantage of netizens during this volatile emotional stage by all pushing an abundance of advertisements to our recommended page on our social media applications. Hence, we are compelled to buy these things as they appeal to us and end up filling a perceived lack in lives. This effect is further amplified by algorithms which lead to targeted advertisements that are carefully curated to appeal to our individual needs. For instance, media companies such as Facebook are known for their invasive algorithm, which takes note of posts or sites that a user most frequently visits. The algorithm then calculates and selects similar posts that would appeal to the user. Facebook also partners with companies, which pay Facebook to have their advertisements for products posted on their sites. While this procedure is seemingly harmless, the addictive nature of media causes these advertised products to have extensive allure and appeal, especially to vulnerable netizens. Hence, the high visibility of information shared on social media and the</p>	<p>Is the media expected to meet these needs in the first place (compare this to the need discussed earlier)</p> <p>Might this then suggest that it could be more of 'need' than a 'want'? Also, does this apply to all forms of crises, say a financial crisis?</p> <p>Valid example</p>

<p>algorithm end up working against our need for financial stability and prudence, as netizens are overly enticed to buy such products. Consequently, this could lead to a serious addiction that drains our pockets, directly impacting our financial stability. This could even worsen our mental state, which has a domino effect as we would have a continued need to buy more things. Hence, the media gives us what we want in the form of a vicious cycle of commercialism to satisfy our short-term needs, which ultimately takes away what we need, which is our emotional and financial stability.</p>	<p>The point made is valid but the distinction between the 'want' and 'need' could be clarified more explicitly.</p>
<p>Lastly, I believe that the media today gives us what we want, which is to provide a sense of escapism by being presented with impossible dream lives, instead of embracing our realities and being fulfilled in the current moment. Avenues of media, such as social media, tend to present posts and videos that portray a perfect life to us. For instance, TikTok and Instagram boast a large variety of accounts that seem to present a 'perfect life'. This can lead to unhealthy perceptions of oneself, such as the desire to have an aesthetically pleasing face or thin body. Hence, people end up becoming extremely dissatisfied with themselves as they are constantly bombarded with evidence of people who lead seemingly better lives than them. Hence, social media deludes people into chasing a standard that is often impossible to reach. For instance, some social media influencers have plastic surgery to make their faces or bodies more appealing to their viewers. Furthermore, they have extravagant lifestyles comprising of visits to 5-star hotels and even meetings with popular celebrities, which are bolstered by their status as an influencer or due to their existing connections. When people are informed day-in and day-out about these ideal lifestyles, they will inevitably compare their mundane lifestyles with such online portrayals, creating a sense of dissatisfaction. This is reflected in the rising trend of women, especially teenage girls, feeling more insecure in their appearance. In the worst cases, this can trigger mental illnesses such as body dysmorphia, anorexia or bulimia, which is dangerous for the human body and mind. Thus, the media is able to attract us by presenting picturesque lifestyles, enabling us to fantasise about following in these individuals' footsteps. However, the nature of media means that these lifestyles are unrealistic, and the pursuit of an ideal can damage our mental states. Consequently, the media is able to give us what we want, which is entertainment in the form of a picture-perfect life. On the other hand, this ultimately warps our expectations to an unhealthy standard, negatively impacting our needs.</p>	<p>Is this a need that is fulfilled by the media?</p> <p>Discussion has veered towards focusing on drawbacks of social media when it should focus on explaining why those are considered frivolous (for better engagement with 'want').</p> <p>This paragraph excessively emphasizes the disadvantages of social media lacking substantial engagement with the concepts of 'wants' and 'needs'.</p>
<p>Overall, the democratisation of media may have led to increased accessibility, creating a more informed world. Unfortunately, this comes with the side effect of more visibility to sensationalised and often unreliable news. Media has also fueled our addictions, such as overspending, which harms our overall security. The media is also able to paint idealised lives to us, which sets unrealistic standards that are harmful to attempt to emulate. In light of this, it is pertinent as the media continues to develop, we should stay wary of new dangers that arise. We should also implement measures such as education campaigns that could be disseminated via media to capitalise on its high accessibility to reduce the threat posed by media to our human needs.</p> <p><i>(Jovielle Jan Javier Bruto, 22-A2)</i></p>	<p>A functional conclusion that reiterates the points made and offers a future projection and call to action.</p>

2 'While equality is desirable, it is an unachievable goal.' How far is this true in your society?

Essay answers to both contentions within the question. Clear strengths lie in the understanding of the SG context and how it perhaps thrives on some level of inequality. Language is fairly strong, with good control and a range of expression that is wielded confidently. However, structure and organisation are less stellar. Do consider the flow of ideas and the discourse markers used to tie related ideas together.

<p>In Teo You Yenn's anthology of Singaporean essays, <i>This is What Inequality Looks Like</i>, she compares Singaporean society to taking the Mass Rapid Transit (MRT)- any sort of change or societal disruption, like a jerk to the train, is expected to lead to a change in the social order, and yet just like commuters on the train, people quickly forget it ever happened and revert to normalcy. <u>Indeed</u>, Singapore has touted itself to have immense social mobility owing to its meritocracy, but it is not sufficient to eradicate inequality once and for all. As such, while equality is desirable, it is an unachievable goal in Singapore.</p>	<p>Attempted hook does not clarify much about the issue or the SG context.</p> <p>Signpost does not indicate the logical flow</p> <p>Intro should unpack key parts of the question and issue. What is equality? Why is it desirable but perhaps not achievable?</p>
<p>Idealists laud Singapore for being a society that emphasises its meritocratic system that rewards any deserving person, regardless of language, race or religion, enabling people from all walks of society with equal opportunities to succeed. Since its birth, Singapore has been reluctant to distribute handouts to its people, opting instead to empower them to make a living for themselves. It has once been described as a 'trampoline' rather than a 'safety net', the intention being for citizens to 'bounce' back and reintegrate into society rather than simply coddling them with unemployment benefits and its ilk. For example, the establishment of the Central Provident Fund is one of the country's tenets of equality, enabling 90% of its elderly population to save up their incomes and use it to cushion their retirement, without further financial assistance from the government. Another example of equal opportunities given to all is that of the Compulsory Education Act of 2000, which mandates all Singaporean citizens go through at least six years of primary schooling by the time they reach fifteen years of age. <u>The intention is to give everyone an equal starting point to secure a good job with the necessary qualifications. As every citizen is well-equipped with the ability to rise through the ranks and secure a well-paying job that will allow them to live comfortably for the rest of their lives, equality in Singapore is a goal that is barely out of reach owing to the equal opportunities and equitable distribution of resources to the population. The meritocratic system, which is 'blind' to factors like ethnicity and religion, only choosing to reward and punish people according to their raw capabilities, is one that lends Singapore an effective means to attain true equality in society.</u></p>	<p>Relevance to the desirability and achievability of equality?</p> <p>While the CPF example does not really relate to meritocracy, or the assignment of resources by merit, a good link attempted</p> <p>Took a while to get to the point, but a good contextualised argument is eventually realised.</p>
<p>However, such a view is quixotic, and <u>the meritocratic system in Singapore is flawed such that it not only prevents society from being equal, it further reinforces the social divides in Singapore.</u> Tharman Shanmugaratnam, Senior Minister of Singapore, once said that Singapore is an 'exam meritocracy', implying that its definition of what 'merit' is is incredibly narrow and stifling for many that may not necessarily flourish in the education system but have many other talents that are overlooked. Speaking at the anniversary of Raffles Institution, one of the most prestigious educational institutes in Singapore, Mr Chan Chun Sing recognised that 'our meritocracy is under siege'. Indeed, Singapore's meritocracy is flawed, only rewarding a paltry</p>	<p>It is unclear what this has to do with equality.</p> <p>Argument needs to be clarified by establishing the relation to equality.</p> <p>The current explanations are insufficient for readers to get a clear</p>

<p>subset of people with 'merit'. For example, this is seen in an excessively structured education system and a laser-focus on academics above all else. Furthermore, the booming tuition industry, raking in over \$1 billion every year, gives a leg up for those that can afford it and leaves those that cannot in the dust. School examinations are hence a biased barometer for the 'worth' of any child, due to socio-economic factors working for or against their favour. The government's rhetoric of an equitable meritocracy for all has lulled Singaporeans into accepting this as the norm, and has at times allowed them to justify clearly unequal situations. Singaporeans buy wholly into the meritocratic system, believing that some are less successful because they have less inherent worth. Interestingly, those who are underprivileged in society even believe this of themselves. As such, this system reinforces the biases Singaporeans have that the worse-off deserve it due to their own faults, leading to both systemic and psychological barriers that cause Singapore to regress in the march towards equality.</p>	<p>sense of the inequality present, much less an argument about why this inequality will persist.</p> <p>The point only becomes clearer at the end, but when links to the question are left to the end of the paragraph there is a risk of losing the reader who may not have any sense of what the argument is about.</p>
<p>Singapore would find it excruciatingly difficult to build an equal society due to the innate biases of humanity limiting the willingness of the population to work towards it. Human psychology has long known about the in-group favouritism and out-group exclusion that people express. We inherently feel the need to protect our own, sometimes at the cost of others. In a heterogeneous society like Singapore, it is not difficult for a multiplex of divisions to be carved between every single one of us, which can impede the progress of equality. For example, one of the biggest lines of division in Singaporean society is class. A survey by Channel NewsAsia revealed a lack of social mixing between classes, with a person from a non-elite school having less than one friend from an elite school on average. As education history is a litmus test for social class in the future, this was telling of the lack of interaction between people of differing socio-economic status. As we grow closer to our respective groups and the chasms between them only widen with time, the entrenched prejudices against them only become more apparent. Rampant elitism and discrimination in Singapore could hence go unchecked, causing equality to be a distant pipe dream. An egregious example would be that of the migrant worker population in Singapore. As migrant worker dormitories are placed far from Singapore's residential estates, there is a lack of social interaction. As such, during the COVID-19 pandemic, drastic oversights caused much of the migrant worker population to be infected with the disease. The divide between them and Singaporeans was more than apparent- while Singaporeans got to quarantine themselves in repurposed luxurious hotels, the migrant workers were relegated to abandoned schools. This, however, went largely unnoticed by the general public, and politician Josephine Teo even implied that the migrant workers should have a sense of gratitude for the government by expressing the lengths to which they had gone for their sakes. The normalisation of biases in humans, exacerbated by a lack of social mixing, has led to the path to equality being wrought with numerous obstacles.</p>	<p>Signposting would help link this argument to the previous paragraph's.</p> <p>This seems to have been the main type of equality the essay has latched on to</p> <p>This makes the assumption that equality is desirable, but further examination could be made as to whether Singaporeans truly desire to be on equal footing with migrant workers.</p> <p>While a valid point on the existing mindsets is made, consideration could be given to whether there is any movement towards equality via the changing of these biases.</p>
<p>Equality has been made an unachievable goal in Singapore owing to a culture of cut-throat competitiveness that necessitates some form of inequality for Singapore to succeed. For example, the Primary School Leaving Examination is one of the deciding moments in a citizen's life. The old system, determined by the T-score, is measured not by a student's own performance but theirs relative to the entire Singapore cohort. They are sieved through with a fine-tooth comb, with the difference of a single point preventing some students from getting into their desired secondary school. The competitive culture in Singapore even from such a</p>	<p>With the absence of signposts, this and the previous point feel like a listing of unrelated points rather than a coherent argument</p>

<p>young age of 12 is one that in fact supports inequality in Singapore. If one has worked hard to get where they were, they would not be willing to share their rewards with everyone else. This has called the desirability of equality in the first place into question. The government's meritocratic system has prided itself on having 'equal opportunities, unequal outcomes'. Singaporeans must navigate and chart their own destiny in a system that does not guarantee wealth and prosperity to everyone, but a select few. This inspires an unprecedented drive in Singaporeans- Singapore is the world's fourth most overworked country, but it also rose from a third-world to first-world country in fifty years. Singapore's students study for over fifty hours a week, but our PISA scores are second in the whole world only after China, and our Primary 4 students were praised for being the best readers globally. It is the inherent inequality in Singapore, and the threat of becoming unsuccessful that pushes every single citizen to soar to greater heights. In this view, inequality drives our competitive culture that brings us economic prosperity and international acclaim. It is not simply an undesirable social phenomenon, but a defining trait of Singapore; an imperfectly perfect system it holds dear to its heart. As such, even if equality is an unachievable goal for Singapore, its desirability pales in comparison to more pragmatic pursuits like economic growth.</p>	<p>While a clear link to desirability is drawn, the question of whether we then have the impetus to pursue high levels of equality could be considered.</p> <p>A thoughtful argument that addresses both desirability and achievability. Strong awareness of Singapore's context and how it affects the issue.</p>
<p>In closing, Singapore is unlikely to ever achieve the ideal of true equality, but values equal chances for all. However, it is not likely to desire the eradication of inequality in society altogether owing to the basic tenet of its meritocratic system that punishes and rewards different people according to their abilities. However, we still cannot rest on our laurels as inherent biases and a flawed meritocracy has not granted equitable opportunities for every member of our society. Moving forward, recognising our privilege and respecting the talents of those that have been overlooked is crucial to hold our society together.</p> <p>(Seah Kai Ling, Claire V, 22-03)</p>	<p>Reasonably ties the arguments together.</p>

3 'Wars can never be won.' Discuss.

<p><i>A strong attempt overall, with a good range of arguments and some clear depth of understanding. Could consider being more nuanced, such as by looking at different types of war and whether they end in victory. Confident and clear writing, with a good range of expression and sentence structure. Organisation could be more thoughtful.</i></p>	
<p>Throughout human history, wars and conflicts have plagued our very existence. Many of these wars were fought over various disagreements, whether ideological or moral. Almost all wars will result in the deaths and suffering of the parties involved, to achieve the goal of the warring parties. However, where can we draw the line as to whether someone wins a war? In my opinion, wars can never be truly won when one takes into account the serious repercussions of war, and the fact that it is impossible to completely annihilate an enemy in a conflict.</p>	<p>Gives a sense of understanding of the issue, but could be strengthened with a more concrete unpacking of what it might mean to win, and hence why it is suggested that wars can never be won</p>
<p>What is considered winning a war? I believe war is only won when the enemy is completely annihilated, and the conflict has brought substantial and justified benefit to the winning party. War can never be won as the consequences of a war are severe and long lasting. It is inevitable that war will bring about deaths and suffering of both parties, when a war occurs, a nation's society breaks down, resulting in the loss of societal welfare, and a serious hit to a</p>	<p>Rather extreme sense of winning cited here</p> <p>Valid point and appropriate reasoning</p>

<p>nation's economy. These repercussions of war impact society so greatly, that most of the time they outweigh the benefits of war in the first place. In long-drawn conflicts like World-War II, the suffering brought about by war impacted not only the Axis powers, but the allies as well, and the focus on war resulted in inadequate resources placed to human development and to the betterment of society, resulting in vastly underdeveloped areas still facing the repercussions of WWII till today. Even though it is generally accepted that the Allied forces were victorious, it may not be justified to say that they won the war. The allied party not only did not gain substantial benefit from war, but also caused unnecessary suffering to their citizens. This shows that even though the battles of war may be victorious, the social consequences of war will never be truly addressed, and the long-lasting repercussions of war, be it psychological or economic, can never be resolved fully due to the large scale that it exists on. No organisation or government in the world is capable of solving such large-scale issues. As such, warring parties will never be able to meet the criteria that allows them to truly win a war.</p>	<p>Suitable and well-developed e.g.</p> <p>Nuanced evaluation</p> <p>Would be good to have evidence for the scale of this.</p> <p>Extreme definition, but a good and important point. Stronger evidence of the repercussions would make this argument more convincing.</p>
<p>Wars can never be won as the ideological nature of humans extends conflicts indefinitely. One must note that war does not necessarily need to consist of physical fighting. In many cases, an ideological war can involve large groups of people that stand for a similar cause, such as religion. The nature of such wars allows them to be fought not on a physical battlefield, but on a psychological or mental one. The nature of humans is that we stick strongly to our beliefs, and it is extremely difficult for opinions to be changed. The cold war is a great example of such ideological warfare. Nations like the US and USSR used resources like propaganda to spread misinformation or ideas to influence members of the other party, resulting in a long conflict of exchanging threats, leading to the brink of nuclear destruction. This ideological conflict has evolved greatly, with the formation of the Russian Federation. To this day, the very things that the US and USSR disagree on are still being talked about when comparing the US and Russia. It is impossible to change the opinions of people who believe strongly in their cause, and have an existing hatred towards the other party. As a result, ideological conflicts between opposing parties, although started a long time ago, still exist in the present day. With such conflicts, the hatred for another group is inevitably bred across generations, adding fuel indefinitely to the fire. As such, an ideological war will never see an end, and consequently will never see a winner to the conflict.</p>	<p>Signposting would lend to coherence.</p> <p>Example highlights continued rivalry</p> <p>Interesting point, though it is not fully convincing in tackling 'never'. This could be argued better. I.e.: how it might be impossible to exterminate ideas, as they are able to go into hiding and resurge.</p>
<p>However, some may say that wars can actually be won as the goal of the war has been met. Some wars are started to liberate a society from suffering, from a dictator for instance, and by overthrowing the ruling party, the war to liberate individuals and communities that are affected by the regime is won. Such wars are seen in places like Afghanistan, where the US invaded and installed a new regime, overthrowing the Taliban who has caused the suffering of many people under it. One could argue that by defeating and ousting the previous dictator, the US has brought more stability to the region, achieving their goal by providing salvation to the people of Afghanistan by driving away the Taliban. This shows that the US were victorious in the war against the oppression of the people in Afghanistan, as without the help of the US, these people would not have had access to the level of education or societal welfare they have today.</p>	<p>Helps to avoid contradiction</p> <p>Good exceptions showing understanding of the complex causes of war</p> <p>Valid OA, but hasn't the conflict resurfaced? There might be better examples that don't present the OA as being uninformed.</p>
<p>However, although the above point is valid, I have to disagree with it. To win a war is not just to achieve the stated goals, but to ensure that history does not repeat itself by the complete elimination of the enemy and their ideology. It is not feasible for many nations to spend</p>	<p>Again, a rather high expectation of what it means to win. This seems rather unfair and</p>

resources to address this, as seen in the political turmoil that plagued Afghanistan after the US took control. Far too many resources were placed into defending Afghanistan from threats, resulting in the US pulling out in 2022. This resulted in the Taliban regaining control and once again implementing harsh laws within the country. It is impossible to stop remnants of groups that once lost a conflict from regrouping and striking back against the people that have once defeated them, and warring parties are not able to eliminate these groups completely due to the complexity and scale of such a task. The horrors and hatred that comes from a war will forever live on in a survivor's mind, and it is these people that spark events that will inevitably relight the flame to a supposedly lost war.	unnecessary. Idea could be extended as it does seem somewhat disingenuous to set up the previous point for failure using this example.
All in all, the nature of war is never one of forgiveness and understanding. Through the involvement of so many people, the scale at which people are affected creates variables that cannot be controlled by any warring party. One will never forget the horrors of war, and this lasting memory will ultimately be one of the driving factors in future conflicts and disagreements, resulting in a perpetual cycle of conflict and hatred. There is no solution to extinguish this indefinitely fuelled fire, as such war can never be won. (Zhang Ruijie, 22-15)	Conceptually insightful Well-written summary of key ideas.

4 How effectively are people's voices represented in a democracy?

<i>A commendable effort, showing a good grasp of the question, strong awareness of the concept of democracy and the current issues surrounding it. Response covers a commendable range of angles in the issue and illustrations come from a good range of democracies, though they perhaps focus on those that are struggling more rather than the others that function with less controversy. That said, at some junctures, essay seems to have traded depth for breadth; not all ideas are developed to their full potential, with some illustrations falling short of fully demonstrating the point being made. Response could also be more cautious about sweeping judgements, and more sensitive to contextual differences.</i>	
In a polarised world which gave rise to politicians such as Donald Trump, it is not surprising that headlines such as "Democracy failing us" are dominating the press. As much as staunch believers of democracy continuing to defend the democratic process and place their trust in the sanctity of the vote, democracy has revealed itself to be less than trustworthy in representing the needs, wants and aspirations of the people. Hence, people's voices are not effectively represented in a democracy in so far as the incentives of politicians and their desire to further consolidate power get in the way, along with the occurrence of the tyranny of the majority. Hence, I believe that the effectiveness of the representation of voices in a democracy has eroded over time.	Valid context Grammar issue Good understanding of the contention Clear reasons, a promising intro.
A key reason for the erosion of effectiveness in terms of representation of voices is that elected representatives have to truly represent the collective interest of the people who have voted for them, which is idealistic at best. Most democracies around the world are representative democracies where the electorate vote for their leaders in a vigorous campaigning process, believing that the elected candidate can best represent their interests and translate them into policy. However, this neglects the interests of individual politicians and parties who tend to use their position to forward their own political agendas due to multiple reasons such as securing their political funding or their position in their respective	Recognition of a systemic issue

<p>parties. Politicians such as Donald Trump turned to advocating for businessmen by implementing tax cuts for the rich though he came to power by promising poor farmers a better life, effectively turning his back on one of his most fervent support bases. Others such as Boris Johnson heavily pushed for Brexit due to aggressive pushing by his political party which has questioned the European Union (EU) for a long period of time, choosing to then leave the country in shambles when the damage of Brexit was too big to handle, leaving his people with a broken promise of prosperity. It is then important to note that the incentives of politicians are often misaligned with that of the electorate, leading to these leaders choosing to hide behind the facade of representing the people while insidiously using their position to their political ends. In a system which perfectly portrays the Principal-Agent problem and causing a distortion of the political structure altogether, people's voices often have to make way for individual incentives, leading to their votes being ineffectively represented.</p>	<p>Appropriate illustration. Could foreground how the voices of people go unheard.</p> <p>Why is this so? This portion needs clearer development</p> <p>Candidates should not expect examiners to be familiar with specific concepts</p> <p>Overall: Clear knowledge of an issue, but rather skimpy on some of the explanations.</p>
<p>Next, people's voices are not represented effectively insofar as the tyranny of the majority continues to permeate in the democracy. Most democracies go by a voting system of first-past-the-post, where the party or candidate with a majority wins the election, regardless of how slim the majority could be. This could have worked where people were more uniform in the past, but has not manifested a world of immense polarisation where most issues are debated across two vastly different perspectives and any form of majority is slight at best, leading to a sizeable minority of voices not being represented. Their interests are hence less likely to be upheld in policy. Such can be seen in South Korea where gender politics dictate voting behaviour, leading to current President Yoon Suk-yeol winning the election by a slim majority of 53%, with his support base comprising of disillusioned young men who tend to be very adverse towards feminism. This has led to the break out of a gender war in which women in South Korea vehemently oppose Yoon's regime, such as by protesting heavily when Yoon proposed to remove the Gender ministry, leading to further polarisation and instability. Such a system hence leads to a convenient lack of consideration for the minority at best and oppression at its worst, such as the African Americans in the USA who continue to be discriminated against. Hence, in a structure of power which demands for strength in numbers instead of striving to represent different opinions, people's voices are not being represented effectively especially when such opinions are diversified over time.</p>	<p>Isn't this part of the nature of a democratic system?</p> <p>Appropriately illustrated, but could reinforce how young women's voices are hence underrepresented</p> <p>Well put</p> <p>Overall: Brings together contextual knowledge and conceptual awareness of democratic processes. Good point, executed reasonably clearly.</p>
<p>However, staunch believers in democracy would believe that people's voices are represented insofar as they have a vote, which happens to be the most effective mechanism for people to assert their will. The sanctity of the vote comes when people can actively use it to eject politicians they detest out of office and invite candidates who they believe can best represent them, forcing the politicians to align their interests with the people. This comes in the election loss of Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil where most people have been disillusioned with his continued attacks on political structures such as the Supreme Court, or in the victory of the Move Forward party in Thailand, marking the end of an era where past military generals were at the apex of power. Both had to gather support of the masses in order to get the position. Thus, seeing that most democracies around the world do not put much restrictions on the voting mechanism except on age, democracies can thus best filter out candidates who have the ability to push for the people's needs and reconcile their own interests with that, thus having the ability to represent most people, especially in view of the fact that each person's individual interests cannot be fully represented.</p>	<p>Overusing of term A salient argument</p> <p>Shows some nuance of recognition of the real limitations while presenting their strengths</p>

<p>This argument does have its merits as the voting mechanism can help people to assert their will and force an alignment of interests. However, this assumes that there is no voter fraud and that people are actively able to influence the outcomes of voting, which is not true. Voter fraud has been on the rise due to political parties trying to hold on to their grip of power such as in Venezuela where Maduro deliberately ordered for some votes to be voided. In the better scenario where voter fraud does not happen due to regulation, it is important to note that people's opinions are greatly shaped by the current administration which has control over the media and national narratives, especially in authoritarian democracies such as Singapore where one party has been dominating the polls since independence. With the media controlled by the state, narratives and facts that are friendly towards the current regime are expounded while others are usually kept under wraps, especially those which question the ruling legitimacy of the state, such as historical facts in Singapore as historian PJ Thum was effectively shut down by Minister K. Shanmugam. People's voices are shaped by the politicians in power which may not be what they believe in if they had access to more information and more accurate facts. <u>Hence, people's voices are not effectively represented when some opinions are deliberately omitted, causing people to follow the direction of the state and unable to assert their will fully through voting</u> as political parties aggressively influence public opinion to consolidate power and opposition does not matter.</p>	<p>Statement comes off as sweeping. Could be argued with more nuance and awareness of contextual differences.</p> <p>A layered argument recognising how people's voices can be easily manipulated</p> <p>Good point, but the sentence is overly lengthy and clunky.</p>
<p>As the voices of people become more diverse, democracy in many ways has not been fully representative of these voices. However, seeing that democracy is the one system which encourages the most involvement of the electorate, championing transparency would be a way forward to allow the voices of the people to be represented more fully and accurately, allowing for democracy to continue serving its function and not "fail" like some headlines make it out to be.</p> <p>(Peh Xin Rong, 22-A1)</p>	<p>Could be a little clearer about why the essay advocates for a change to democracy</p> <p>Conclusion would benefit from a brief reiteration of the key points, but otherwise ties ideas together fairly well</p>

5 'In today's world, the ability to write well is becoming irrelevant.' How far do you agree?

<p><i>This essay is a largely relevant response with an understanding of what constitutes 'writing well'. There is a clear and effective chain of reasoning, though some paragraphs could have looked at the big picture (traits of writing well) more instead of just the examples, which were not always the most relevant. Nonetheless, an overall convincing essay.</i></p>	
<p>In a world where communication is the most fundamental way of expressing your ideas and thus is of utmost importance, language and writing have become especially important and prevalent in our lives today. However, as we continue to develop technology that has become increasingly realistic at mimicking human writing, and language continues to evolve around the globe, has the ability to write well perhaps become redundant or irrelevant? While one may feel that, on the surface level, developments have made good writing less important in recent years, it is in fact the opposite – be it through literature or through the more mundane tasks like resume writing, the ability to write well has, in fact, not lost any of its relevance, but perhaps gained even more relevance.</p>	<p>Clear stand articulated and with awareness of context demonstrated</p>
<p>We live in a world that is becoming increasingly competitive, and as such, the ability to write</p>	<p>Relevant topic sentence</p>

<p>and express yourself well is an essential skill to stand out amongst the crowd. Although writing certainly is not the only medium to communicate your thoughts and ideas, it is one of the main ways that one must learn how to use effectively; after all, university applications and job applications all require a resume or portfolio to be submitted first – and that document is key to distinguishing you from the rest of the applicants. As education becomes more and more accessible to the population in the past few decades, more and more will also be able to learn how to express themselves through writing. As such, not only is writing not becoming irrelevant in today's context, but it has perhaps become more relevant today; otherwise, without writing, how will you be able to express your ideas, which would be worthless unless shared? This need for better writing quality can be seen through this very paper and exam script – as the ability to write well has become more important, the Ministry of Education here in Singapore has also become aware of this trend, and as such has made the H1 General Paper subject a compulsory one for majority of students (except those who have taken on H2 Knowledge and Inquiry, which would arguably demand for a higher level of language ability). A country which relies heavily on local talent to drive their economy and stay competitive amidst other countries with access to natural resources, Singapore recognises the importance of being able to express and communicate ideas via one's writing, and thus has created the General Paper as a means of elevating students' writing ability. Through essay writing, students are able to learn how to translate their opinions onto paper effectively, which has become a skill that many universities have started to look out for in applicants' essays. Thus, through the creation of the H1 General Paper subject, we can see how even states and ministries have become aware of the importance and relevance of good writing today, and how it can distinguish one from the rest. Certainly, the ability to write well has not become irrelevant in the modern context and has in fact begun to play a bigger role in differentiating people's skill level.</p>	<p>and great explanation of standing out in the competitive world. However, do explain what traits of writing allow us to stand out</p> <p>While valid, the example is a little narrow and not the best to describe standing out since it is an exam</p>
<p>Shifting the focus to more artistic and descriptive writing: the ability to write good literature has become more relevant as more nuance is needed to capture the increasingly complex world today. Both the 20th and 21st century have been filled with numerous historical events that have reshaped the very context that we lived in today. Without the ability to write well, how else would one be able to capture the fear and loss of hope during the World Wars, or the isolation and anxiousness that arose during the COVID-19 pandemic? Especially as we become more interconnected and cultures merge and mix, better writing in literature is needed to capture the nuance and complexity of the extremely complicated contexts that we traverse through every day, or details could be lost. Literature is ultimately a reflection of the human condition, and with increasing interconnectedness comes an ever-expanding definition of what it means to be human. An example of good writing becoming essential to capture this is during the mid-20th century, during the time of the World Wars – before that era, poets were usually confined to a strict set of poetry forms which followed certain rules and conventions, such as a set number of stanzas or a certain rhyme scheme. As poets struggled with the loss of hope and the extreme despair of war, many decided to forgo the ideas of such rigid structures to create free verse, which lacks a set form as they felt that such forms would not encapsulate the intensity of their emotion. While one could argue that such verse presents less boundaries or restrictions and is thus easier to write in, it is still evident that one's grasp of language, especially in poetry, must be strong to encapsulate the complexity of emotion in times of crisis. There were similar events that occurred too during the COVID-19 pandemic: in order to capture the idea of isolation and quarantine, many played with poetic</p>	<p>Again, relevant topic sentence and clear chain of reasoning. Relevant to the demands of the question and in this paragraph traits of writing well were apparent.</p> <p>Example here is not about today's world – should have focused on the COVID eg mentioned earlier in the para.</p>

<p>form in order to create a sense of distance and segregation. Only with a great grasp of writing and language can one manipulate form to reflect the common struggles during that year. Therefore, in an age of unprecedented events and complicated contexts and backgrounds, the ability to write well is essential in literature to be able to accurately portray the human condition.</p>	
<p>The opposing side may argue, however, that the development of artificial intelligence (AI) and other language bots could show that the ability to write well is losing its relevance. As AI becomes more advanced at studying human language and replicating it, there seems to be less need for people to possess good writing skills – after all, why bother if you could ask AI to generate a professional write-up for you in varying levels of vocabulary? The most obvious example for this in recent years would be the famous chatbot, ChatGPT. ChatGPT is a language AI model that produces scarily human-like responses, and users can ask it to perform a variety of tasks, such as writing a short excerpt about two characters or providing a summary of events. While such language models are not exactly new, ChatGPT is one of the most accessible language models to the public, which is what makes it so powerful. If such AI models are able to produce language that is perhaps even more nuanced than our own, this could show that the ability to write well is becoming less relevant. Without the need to produce the perfect vocabulary to explain our thoughts on our own, one can simply type a prompt into ChatGPT and have it perfectly written out to them. This provides an extra boost to those who are perhaps weaker in writing ability, and disincentivises the work that goes into producing a good piece of writing. Though only time will be able to tell us the long-term effects of ChatGPT on writing, the current trends definitely show a shift towards a de-emphasis on good writing skills.</p>	<p>Relevant, though a little example driven as para focuses only on AI</p> <p>Good explanation within the example, but again, look beyond the example and maybe talk about the threat of tech in general? Valid example nonetheless.</p> <p>EXP</p>
<p>Despite the rather depressing trend of people putting less effort into writing because of such AI language models, however, there is still something that AI will likely never be able to do: capturing the essence of the human condition. As mentioned earlier, the very basis of literature is to capture human thoughts and emotion, and express them in the form of writing. While AI can do a great job of mimicking or replicating human writing by learning from different works, it can never truly generate an original piece of writing with its own opinions and emotions. After all, an AI is simply not sentient; it cannot experience the emotion, connection or complex thought that defines us as humans. Without the ability to feel, AI fundamentally cannot produce literature, even if it can replicate it. Even outside the context of literature and art, the most crucial part of writing is expressing your personal opinions, and convincing the reader to agree with you. Something as mundane as a resume serves the most basic purpose of presenting one's qualifications and experiences, and then convincing the reader of one's ability and skill, which requires the ability to write well. As the use of ChatGPT becomes more common in schools, the workplace or anywhere else which requires writing, the value of human writing, in fact, goes up to capture the things that AI cannot understand. Thus, the ability to write well is not irrelevant, but even more relevant with the introduction of AI.</p>	<p>While valid, there are overlaps in this paragraph with what was put forth in supporting argument 2. A unique point for the relevance of writing well would have strengthened the overall argument.</p>
<p>To conclude, writing is one of the most essential modes of communication, and the ability to write well is, at its core, the ability to communicate your ideas well. As the world continues to evolve and become increasingly competitive or uncertain, what does remain constant is the human condition, and the power of writing to express oneself. Thus, while the ability to write well may seem to be becoming irrelevant in modern times, there is in fact a greater demand</p>	<p>Effective conclusion with a summary of points and focus on the future.</p>

for high quality writing, or else the complexity of human thought may be lost forever. (Ang Kai Ling, 22-E3)	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

5 'In today's world, the ability to write well is becoming irrelevant.' How far do you agree?

<i>This was a well-written essay with controlled and clear language (particularly the inter-paragraph links and use of discourse markers to signal nuance). There was depth of insight regarding the quality of writing (e.g., going beyond the writing to the intellectual qualities that come with it), though the definition of 'writing well' tends to be on the abstract side.</i>	
The modern world we live in is characterised by the rise of new technology, dominance of the Science, Technology, Environment and Mathematics (STEM) sector and its fast pace. With such weight being placed on the technological field, leading to more concise and coded language being preferred, alongside the perennial lack of time we have, it begs the question on whether the skill to write well is still relevant today. In this essay, writing well would be defined as the transfer of thoughts to written words in ways which are insightful, thought-provoking, engaging and clear. Such a way of writing, although admittedly a declining skillset, is one that is still highly relevant today. This is due to its enhancement of our aforementioned technologically bombarded world, as well as its ability to put forth our perspectives in nuanced ways - an important skill to have in the polarised world we live in.	Clear stand with good contextualisation
The fast-paced world of today often demands simple, functional and concise writing, overriding the need for thought-provoking pieces. With everything now being very time-dependent, shorter seems better. The faster we can put forth our ideas, the faster others can read our thoughts, the more advantage we seem to have in our modern cut-throat society. It seems to be that when we can summarise our thoughts into little bullet-sized packets, ready to be quickly fired out, people listen. Take for example Twitter's 280 character limit, or the often rapidly typed comments under YouTube videos. With these two platforms being one of the most used platforms in knowledge transfer for social media, it is no wonder that writing well takes the back seat. Writing fast and writing short takes the forefront instead. People no longer take the time to analyse what they had just viewed, or carefully frame their thoughts into words. Instead, they instantly type off the top of their heads in reaction to circumstances around them. As such, the once-revered ability to intellectually write about issues and opinions has been now reduced to being seen as long-winded and unnecessary. This has led to a dangerous situation, where our world is becoming increasingly polarised. Without the platform of good, nuanced writing to balance out differing opinions, people begin to take very one-sided and myopic views of the world and its issues. After all, there is a limit to how much thought can be translated into a 280-character tweet.	<p>Could be a bit more explicit in the TS - what is the link between 'writing well' and 'thought provoking pieces'?</p> <p>Good evaluation of why shorter writing =/= writing well.</p> <p>Overall: A well-argued paragraph with strong personal voice. An attempt to link to the rebuttal in the next paragraph.</p>
Thus, I would argue that this polarisation of the world brought about by its fast pace makes writing well a skill that is even more relevant in the modern day and age. These days, it is so easy to be polarised about anything. From politics, to values, to social discrimination, views tend to range to the extremes. Such views are propagated ubiquitously online, and with the algorithms of online platforms, we tend to be stuck in our own echo-chambers. This can be clearly seen in the right-wing and left-wing movements, or even in the recent Uvalde school	<p>Again, strong personal voice demonstrated in terms of language.</p> <p>There is also good contextualisation to the world today.</p>

<p>shootings, where people tend to either defend the police or demand that the police be held accountable for the atrocity committed. With such views being taken, and with the danger that divisions due to ideological differences can bring, writing well has an immensely relevant role. Writing well brings up insight. It allows for ideas to lucidly flow and to bring others along our train of thought. It is no longer the mere spitting out of our thoughts, but seeking to enable others to understand why we think in a certain way. Instead of being divided because of different opinions we hold, we learn to empathise and see from others' viewpoints. This would be impossible without writing well, for writing well is a vehicle to our thoughts. If we lose the ability to write in a way that others can see the world from our eyes, the polarisations would exponentially worsen and we would each be trapped in our own views.</p>	<p>Good evaluation of what comprises writing well and why it would be of relevance today.</p>
<p>Apart from decreasing polarisation's sting, writing well also feeds the brain intellectually after being immersed daily in the STEM dominated world. In the world we live in, facts, numbers and figures are increasingly what seem to matter. Everything is becoming statistics related, where words are more of a side-player than the main theme. It has become a world very concerned about the 'what' and the 'how' of the things we do, but not so much of the 'why'. This is where writing well has its role. Not only is writing well able to clearly give these facts and figures for consumption in a logical way, it is also able to delve beneath the hypotheses and into why we want to carry things out in the first place. Writing well gives us an avenue to stimulate our own thoughts, present our transcribed thoughts to those around and then stimulate their thinking. It is beyond the mere results of research we have conducted, but putting meaning into these results and allowing others to engage in the outcomes in ways that are applicable to them. Writing merely functionally could get the job done, but writing well elevates the response that we get. Not only do people see what happened, they also now understand the way we see it and then build their views. This would explain the difference between research papers and news articles written based on the papers. A well written news article takes the functionally written research paper, injects thought and context into it, and condenses it into a piece that is relevant and applicable to our lives. The emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) may be threatening to this relevance of writing well as programmes like ChatGPT are also trained to take information from their large databases before summarising it to the needs of the user. However, I believe that there is a certain human aspect in writing well that can never be embodied by AI. The whole understanding we have, our biases, our values, all these things when injected into writing a piece elevates the written work and makes it much more personable. This allows us to then engage with our STEM filled world in a way which is much more human.</p>	<p>Effective link from the idea raised in the earlier para</p> <p>Good evaluation of the nature of 'writing well' and its role today. While eggs could have been more concrete, the point is still convincingly argued.</p> <p>Good attempt to weave nuance into the argument</p>
<p>All things considered, writing well is definitely maintaining and even increasing in relevance today. The modern world brings about unprecedented challenges that we have to grapple with, and words are often the vent through which we express our opinions on these challenges. Thus, to be able to write well, to bring others for that short moment to see things through our eyes, and then to inspire them to build their own multifaceted views on issues, that would enable us to thrive in the world we live in today.</p> <p><i>(Wong En-Si, 22-O4)</i></p>	<p>An effective conclusion that reiterates the relevance of writing well today, without merely repeating what has already been said.</p>

6 'Education should cater more to the needs of individuals than society.' What is your view?

This is a well-argued essay with clear and well-explained topic sentences. Language was controlled and sensible. The requirement of comparison was consistently done throughout, and examples were relevant. That said, they were rather brief and could have had greater range and significance.

<p>Should education cater more to the needs of individuals than society? This conundrum has been widely debated and has not reached a definite conclusion. While some believe that education should cater more to the needs of individuals to better satisfy their needs for fulfilment, others posit that education should instead be catered more to the needs of society to ensure greater economic prospects for society as well as to enable societal stability and pence. Despite this, to view the two camps as mutually exclusive is parochial and myopic, given that they present a false dichotomy. Hence, this essay shall explore both sides of the argument, while also reconciling them in presenting why education can be catered to both the needs of individuals and society concurrently.</p>	<p>Some further context could be given</p> <p>The essay's stand on the matter could be clearer</p>
<p>Proponents of the view that education should cater more to the needs of society rather than individuals assert that adhering to societal trends will better ensure economic growth and prospects for society in the long run rather than only strictly addressing the needs of individuals, which might not meet the demands of the economy. A main function of education is to equip students with the necessary skill sets and knowledge for employment. Individuals are employed based on their law of supply and demand-where they have the ability to meet the ever changing needs of the labour market. As such, education should cater more to the needs of society by imparting relevant and vital knowledge and skill sets that individuals are able to apply to their jobs, therefore fulfilling the demands of the labour market in the long run. Conversely, if education purely caters to the needs of individuals and compromises on empowering them with said knowledge and skills to contribute to the economy, they will be quickly rendered obsolete and will likely be displaced from their jobs. For instance, with the advent of science and technology in today's modern age, the Finnish education system has introduced mandatory coding classes, which may not cater to the interests of students, into the elementary school syllabus to better prepare their students for a future that will be dominated by automation. This exemplifies that education should hence cater to the needs of society to allow for sustainable growth and continuous improvements to be made in the economy in the long run.</p>	<p>Clear topic sentence with a relevant basis of comparison - good!</p> <p>Example is apt but a little too brief, would appreciate having more for both sides.</p>
<p>In terms of being a social leveller, education should cater more to the needs of society to improve inequality and inequity rather than that of an individual, which can oftentimes be self-centred and selfish. Other than being a tool to boost economic prosperity, education is also used as a powerful weapon to ensure that individuals are able to come to a common consensus and unite, which is imperative in achieving social stability and allowing it to function well. This is especially so in heterogeneous societies, where individuals come from differing backgrounds and experiences. As such, education is able to provide a common ground, paving way for collaboration and cooperation. By contrast, if education is purely catered to the needs of individuals, this may amplify their differences and cause greater rifts between them. For instance, Singapore's founding Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, introduced the Bilingual Policy in the 1960s which made the English Language the instructional first language in the education system. Meanwhile, the other mother tongues of the various ethnic</p>	<p>Again, a relevant point and basis of comparison</p> <p>Good explanation that is supported by an apt example that linked back to the key contention of the question</p>

<p>groups became the second language. This allowed Singaporeans to foster a sense of unity despite their diverse cultures and practices, which would not have been achieved should the education policy priorities individual needs, perhaps by mandating the various mother tongue languages as the first language of the different ethnic groups. Thus, this suggests that education, when catered to the needs of society, can better foster a sense of community and togetherness, which is imperative for social cohesion and stability, which the prioritisation of individual needs may not be able to achieve.</p>	
<p>On the other hand, others may argue that education should cater more to the needs of individuals to provide them with a sense of psychological fulfilment and accomplishment by expounding on their personal strengths and meeting individual goals, which an education catering to societal needs may fail to do. Education serves as a conduit for knowledge to be imparted to individuals, which they may derive a sense of joy and accomplishment from. Moreover, individuals may also have personal goals which could be attained through informal education. The needs of individuals deriving such validation may not always align with societal needs, given that individual needs may be more frivolous and catered to individual interests that serve no practical value. For instance, the plethora of informal education platforms such as Coursera allow individuals to explore their inherent mindless pursuits, for instance- making handicrafts- which can aid in individual fulfilment that an education catered solely to societal needs will not be able to achieve. Therefore, education should cater to the needs of individuals as it is more able to cater to their self interest and result in greater levels of fulfilment and accomplishment.</p>	<p>Good balance point, but there is a need to explain why catering to societal needs may fail to provide psychological fulfilment.</p> <p>Could have been more clearly linked to the idea of psychological needs. Perhaps, a better example would help to show that fulfilment.</p>
<p>However, the above arguments present a false dichotomy that the impacts of education on individuals and society are mutually exclusive. Such views are rather one-sided and biased, given that there are instances where education is able to cater to the needs of both individuals and society concurrently. Individuals are the subset and vital building blocks of society, thus they have a symbiotic relationship rather than a segregated one. By catering to the needs of individuals, education is able to create a ripple effect that will meet the needs of society. Conversely, addressing societal concerns through education will gradually trickle down and fulfil the needs of individuals. This can be seen in the rehabilitative justice system, where individuals continue to be awarded the right to receive education - which allows the individual to be empowered with the relevant skill sets that cater to their interest, meeting their individual needs while also equipping them with the ability to seek employment beyond prison, thus aiding societal stability and lowering recidivism rates. As such, this exemplifies that the polarities between the needs of the individual and society may not necessarily always be present such that both can work in tandem and be complementary.</p>	<p>Relevant reconciliation of both stakeholders' needs, with clear explanation.</p> <p>Good example</p>
<p>In conclusion, education should cater more to the needs of either stakeholder depending on the intended effect. However, it is worthy to note that there are still instances that both goals are able to converge, allowing both individual and societal needs to be fulfilled.</p> <p>(Audrey Thng, 22-16)</p>	<p>Rushed conclusion</p>

7 To what extent does technology challenge our humanity?

This essay is very fluent and logically developed with sound arguments, clear reasoning and apt examples. While the last body paragraph could be more clearly linked to what defines us as humans, essay shows thoughtfulness in its overall organising of arguments used by starting from more 'distant' challenges and drawing the reader into more current and present challenges.

In this age of rapid technological advancement, technology has become both a boon and a bane. For every problem it solves, new fears about its overarching impact on us appear. When we constantly view technology as something cold and unfeeling, in contrast to our own human traits, new fears about how further interactions with it can diminish our own humanity arise. While some may argue that rather than challenging our humanity, technology reinforces it by forcing us to rely on our human traits more, this may not hold true in the future. Instead, this essay argues that technology challenges our humanity to a large extent. Not only has the Internet negatively impacted our ability to empathise, technology has also diminished our creativity and made us less sociable.

Good consideration of short vs long-term impacts to craft a balanced stand.

A clear preview of arguments provided

Some may argue that technology reinforces our humanity instead of challenging it. This is because increasing automation and rapid innovations in artificial intelligence (AI) have resulted in the loss of jobs for many. With the use of computers and other programmes, technology is able to complete a task with greater efficiency and precision than humans can, hence less companies see the need to hold onto human workers that are expensive to pay for. The wave of lay-offs by 'big tech' companies like Google and Amazon in 2023 was rooted in the ability of generative AI like ChatGPT to write good code much faster than human coders. Similarly, Goldman Sachs has reported that by 2030, 300 million jobs could be replaced by AI. However, it is crucial to note that the jobs being replaced are jobs that do not require much human touch at their core. Technology has not advanced so far as to be able to fully understand human emotions, yet that is an ability intrinsic to humans. Thus, jobs that require this human touch are still safe from being replaced by technology. As such, the threat of AI and automation replacing humans in the workplace forces us to capitalise on our humanity to stay relevant in the job market. For example, analysts have forecasted rapid growth in the care industry, where it is not enough for patients to receive medicine dispensed by robots but also to have their emotional and psychological needs met by human caretakers. Therefore, in creating this need to capitalise on our humanity in an age of mass job displacement due to technology, it may seem to reinforce rather than challenge our humanity.

A well-developed opposing argument with substantiation that demonstrates an awareness of current employment trends. Going beyond AI might broaden this part of the discussion.

Neatly ties what has been discussed thus far into a clear and relevant topic sentence.

Evidence for this point is not as well-substantiated.

However, this may not hold true in the long run and further advancements in technology may actually further cripple our ability to understand human emotions rather than push us to develop that ability further. The wonders of technology today continue to inspire people to further develop it and take it to new heights. Disregarding the awe-inspiring nature of new innovations, there is also an economic incentive to continue advancing technology as the industry is now worth trillions of dollars. The drivers of technological innovation are constantly on the prowl for what new purpose technology can possibly fulfil and a greater understanding of the human psyche is not low on the list. There have already been instances of technology attempting to replace humanity's ability to understand human emotions, such as the use of AI in call centres to analyse the customer's voice and provide prompts to call centre workers to demonstrate greater empathy and use a softer tone. In trying to make

Nuance is achieved through a long-vs-short term evaluation of the situation.

A clever bit of insight shown here in

<p>humans more 'human' by systematically analysing and quantifying abstract emotions and prompting 'appropriate' responses, technology ironically makes humans more robotic. Over time, it is likely that humans may grow reliant on this kind of technology to understand others, rather than tapping into the intrinsic ability to empathise. With a lack of use of this ability, it then weakens. Therefore, it is too myopic to claim that technology can necessarily reinforce our humanity.</p>	<p>recognising the irony that lies behind humans using tech to be 'human'</p>
<p>Rather than simply allowing our innate human traits to waste away, technology directly challenges our humanity by reducing our capacity for empathy. The Internet may have eliminated distance as a consideration in communications, but in doing so, it has dehumanised strangers that we meet on the Internet. Instead of conversing face-to-face as one would do in the real world, the digital realm reduces a person to mere text and images on the screen. This has caused humans to cease to perceive others on social media as humans too, but has instead created the perception that these online strangers are abstract entities that exist for the sole purpose of creating content for consumption. With this loss of recognition of others as human beings, our capacity for empathy shrivels. Furthermore, the anonymity that the Internet provides enables greater cruelty online as it is harder for one to be made accountable for one's actions if his true identity was concealed. All these factors give rise to more unkind behaviour on the Internet and a distinct loss of empathy that manifests as cyberbullying. According to a survey conducted by Channel News Asia in 2017, 3 out of 4 teenagers in Singapore have experienced cyberbullying. This demonstrates the extent of the problem. In a more extreme case, South Korean actress Sulli committed suicide in 2019 after receiving many online hate comments and essentially being cyberbullied to death. The above examples demonstrate how the features of the Internet directly reduce our capacity for empathy. Therefore, technology challenges our humanity.</p>	<p>Thoughtful ordering of points that starts with more 'distant threats' and moves on to the more immediate ones.</p> <p>Clearly delineates how tech can dehumanise and links this to how empathy is then compromised</p> <p>While relevant, a more global example would demonstrate breadth of knowledge.</p>
<p>Beyond simply affecting our empathy, technology also challenges our humanity in terms of our creativity. The Internet is an unbelievably large repository of content that anyone can have access to. This allows anyone to sample content and gain inspiration from others to integrate into their own work. The scale of the Internet essentially incentivises copying as it reduces the effort needed to create content as it is much easier and faster to sample than to independently generate ideas. Over time, the Internet may breed a reliance on sampling and other forms of copying which diminishes humanity's intrinsic ability to be creative. Another way that technology disincentivises genuine creativity is the proliferation of analytical algorithms. Such algorithms are able to efficiently analyse trends to see what is popular and guide the direction of content creation. To content creators, it is helpful to capitalise on trends to build a larger audience at a faster pace. However, overuse of analytics results in a significant portion of new content created being soulless copies of an original, highly successful work. The popularity of 'Minecraft Manhunt' videos on YouTube highlights this phenomenon. While the original series was started by YouTuber Dream, its immense popularity spawned an entire subgenre of Minecraft content on the video-sharing platform inspired by the premise of the original. In this case, while other content creators may not have had access to the actual algorithms used to analyse the popularity of the videos, they were able to note the results of the analyses. When the algorithm calculated viewership statistics and concluded that the original series was very popular, it began recommending the videos to a large number of people. As a result, other creators would be able to note the popularity of the series and begin to create similar videos to capitalise on their popularity. However, most of these spin-offs are hardly any different from each other, pointing to a lack of creativity to</p>	<p>Clear use of connectors.</p> <p>Tech's role in affecting creativity is systematically unpacked early in the paragraph (from the second sentence). Current and clearly relevant examples are selected.</p>

<p>conceive of unique spins to put on individual videos. Evidently, the use of technology to gain access to a large amount of information and insight into trends has negatively impacted humanity's creativity as a whole. Although drawing inspiration from others or even outright copying is not a phenomenon limited to the digital age, the proliferation of technology that enables this behaviour has made this issue larger than ever. As such, technology challenges our humanity by disincentivising creativity.</p>	<p>Attempt at nuance lends greater depth to a well-developed paragraph</p>
<p>Furthermore, technology has also challenged our humanity by making us much less sociable. One obvious culprit of this is digitalisation and the reach of social media. The fast-paced nature of social media hooks us and diverts our attention away from others. As a result, we are less inclined to socialise than to remain glued to our phones. Although social media can arguably also be used as a tool to socialise, be it through private messaging with old friends or forging new friendships with strangers, the majority of people use it to simply consume content passively. Studies by the American Psychiatric Association have shown that people who use social media for more than two hours a day are much more likely to feel loneliness. This is because when one's time is consumed by social media, one cannot benefit from social interactions. However, social media is not the sole perpetrator of this loss of social interaction, as automation and AI are aspects of technology that are also responsible. At this stage of development, many blue-collar jobs in the service industry have been substituted for robotic or computerised replacements, in response to a general manpower shortage in the industry. In doing so, a significant amount of human interaction is removed from our daily lives. While social media reduces our willingness to socialise, automation and AI reduces our opportunities for social interaction in our day-to-day transactions. For instance, many convenience stores in China and those owned by Chinese firms such as Octobox have completely replaced human cashiers with technology. For instance, in Octobox stores, the entire store is not run by a single human. Instead, handprint scanning technology is utilised to prevent thefts and payment is done at an entirely automated kiosk. Many restaurants are also increasing the usage of robot servers. Evidently, technology has had a detrimental impact on social interactions and over time, the loss of these interactions can cause us to shun socialising. In making us less sociable, technology challenges our humanity.</p>	<p>How is socialising something that defines humanity? This needs further unpacking.</p> <p>Repetitive use of signposts.</p>
<p>In conclusion, technology has had detrimental impacts on our capacity for empathy, creativity and sociability, all of which are traits that are fundamental to what makes us human. Although the Fourth Industrial Revolution driven by technology may appear to reinforce our humanity by forcing us to rely on it more to stay relevant in the job market, this will not hold in the long run as technology advances to be even more sophisticated. Nevertheless, technology is not necessarily a force to be feared. Utilised well, it can complement our lives for the better rather than change it for the worse. However, we must be careful not to develop an over reliance on it, lest it challenges our humanity itself. Given that it has already begun to do so, it may appear to be a cause for concern. Nevertheless, with conscious effort on our parts to actively engage with our human traits, we can slow this trend and perhaps reverse it.</p> <p><i>(Bethanie Low Xiao Hui, 22-O4)</i></p>	<p>Conclusion effectively ties reasons cited in the essay together and ends with a relevant call-to-action.</p>

9 'When it comes to saving the environment, the outcome is the only thing that matters.' Discuss.

<p><i>Paragraph development is of uneven quality, last 2 bps were less clearly articulated and supported</i> <i>Structure could perhaps be more thoughtfully constructed and/or signposted to demonstrate to your reader the logical development of your argument</i></p>	
<p>The earth is dying. In recent years, news headlines that report record-breaking temperatures in certain regions of the world, or extreme natural disasters have become increasingly commonplace, and the people of the world are becoming increasingly aware that the environment is in dire need of saving. We need to prevent the potentially irreversible damage that is about to be done to the environment, with animal species about to go extinct, coastal cities on the verge of being submerged, and the planet getting too hot for humans to live on. With the threat of global extinction looming ahead, some feel that we should do everything within our power to save the environment, disregarding any harm done in the process of it. Others feel that we should take practical and ethical concerns into consideration when making decisions about saving the environment. I feel that the outcome is not the only thing that matters when it comes to saving the environment, as we should consider the potential harms of our actions and ensure that everyone is on board to save the environment.</p>	<p>Relevant hook which segues into the issue at hand.</p> <p>A measured and clearly articulated stand.</p>
<p>Critics might argue that the climate crisis needs immediate drastic action to solve, so we should focus purely on the outcomes of stopping global warming, pollution and species extinction without bearing in mind the potential costs of their actions. Many scientists predict that many Pacific islands such as Samoa and Tonga would be fully underwater by 2040, and more animal species would go extinct in the years to come. Taking a utilitarian point of view, the only way to save the environment effectively is to enact huge changes such as shutting down the fossil fuel industry, disallowing carbon-emitting factories from polluting the environment and switching to sustainable food sources that do not occupy space that could be used for natural greenery. Big changes are needed fast in order to mitigate the potential consequences of not solving the climate crisis, and we do not have time to think twice about the decisions we make to save the environment. By considering anything else other than the practical benefits of our actions to save the environment, the window of time we have before the harm done to our earth is irreversible shortens, and the chances of us being able to enact change before it is too late only becomes slimmer. Many activist groups believe that radical change is necessary to save the environment. They do not consider the impacts to humans and the way we live in hopes of being able to solve the climate crisis quickly before any harm is done to the environment, and they believe that the urgency of the problem would justify ignoring any other negative consequences to humans when solving the climate crisis.</p>	<p>Clearly delineates what actions should be taken to engender an outcome.</p> <p>Urgency conveyed in the word choice and reasoning drives home the idea of why the focus should be on the outcome.</p> <p>The final part of the paragraph is rather repetitive. An example might have been more effective.</p>
<p>However, the practical costs of our actions still have to be considered when making a decision about how to save the environment. We should not ignore how our effort to save the environment could be detrimental to the human race, and focusing solely on the outcome of saving the environment takes on an idealistic but unrealistic standpoint. When making decisions with regard to the climate crisis, some decisions made would drastically alter the lives of humans. For example, fully shutting down the fossil fuel industry could leave countries scrambling to find alternative sources of power in a short span of time. Less developed countries with less financial resources would find it difficult to conduct research and provide electricity to its citizens, leaving them stranded without power. Even though we are able to</p>	<p>Overall: While relevant, paragraph could emphasise our lack of readiness for such drastic action.</p> <p>Reasonable illustration but this could be more in-depth and more compelling</p>

<p>reap the practical benefits of lowering pollution levels, it would result in millions of people being left without electricity. Treating the outcome as the only thing that matters may allow the environmental crisis to be solved more quickly and effectively, but it has the potential to cause immense harm to people worldwide and it makes the future a lot less desirable for humans to live in. The harm done to humans should matter to us since we are the ones who will have to suffer the consequences in the future, so the outcome of saving the environment cannot be the only thing that matters.</p>	<p>Questionable. Near future v in the long term?</p>
<p>People's receptiveness to our efforts to save the environment also matters – if people worldwide are all willing to make change and get accustomed to lifestyle transformations, only then will we be able to reap the benefits of saving the environment. Humans tend to react adversely to change, especially if it is forced on them, since we would see no good reason or justification to adjust our lives so drastically. Even if we are able to successfully save the environment by lowering global temperatures or patching up the hole in the ozone layer, people are likely to revert back to their old, environmentally harmful ways, resulting in yet another environmental crisis. It is important and necessary for people to be agreeable and receptive to the idea of changing our lives to protect the environment, in order to ensure that our efforts are sustainable in the long run, and we would be able to exist on earth for years to come without having to save the environment again. Being fixated on only the outcome would result in people being unwilling to change their behaviours in order to be more environmentally friendly, which would cause our effort to save the environment to be in vain. In today's world, people are already pushing responsibility to others to solve the climate crisis. Conservatives believe that environmental issues are a liberal problem and that the responsibility is on them to solve it. If we do not put in effort to get people on board to save the environment, people would continue to shirk responsibility to others and it would be impossible for us to truly save the environment.</p>	<p>Overall: A less strong focus on the outcome and what it means for us, but nonetheless a good point with key links made to the question. Paragraph does also need more substantial and concrete support from illustration</p> <p>Is saving the environment a good enough reason?</p> <p>Why, though? Not as convincingly explained</p>
<p>Lastly, our ability to solve the problem also matters in saving the environment. Throughout the world, many environmental activist groups are advocating for change but they are unable to take action because they have no jurisdiction. Although they are able to voice out their opinions, they are not able to effectively enact change. To save the environment, those with the ability to solve the problem such as governments and large corporations that harm the environment would have to take action. Those that believe that the outcome is the only thing that matters are of the opinion that as long as we achieve the desirable outcome of saving the environment, the method does not matter. However, it is important that those are able to solve the problem are proactive in taking steps to save the environment, since they are the only ones that can save the environment. If only the outcome mattered, a scenario where protestors stormed oil production facilities and shut them down to stop pollution would be desirable, but in our current context we must rely on those with the ability to solve the problem to take action.</p>	<p>In relation to the outcome?</p> <p>There is some validity in the ideas put forth, and there is recognition of the real limitations that our activists are faced with today. However, the para is rather underdeveloped and needs significantly more development to be effective in answering the question.</p>
<p>In saving the environmental crisis, people often believe that as long as we are able to save the environment, the final outcome of a habitable world is the be-all end-all. However, what also matters is that we try to mitigate the harm done to the human race, especially more vulnerable groups, and that we are able to live sustainably in the future. Our effort to save the environment cannot come at the expense of people's lives, and can only come from those who are able to make change. Thus, it is not only the outcome that matters, but rather how we save the environment and also who we harm along the way. <i>(Ashton Chia, 22-A5)</i></p>	<p>EXP</p> <p>A concise summary of the conclusion. A projection into the future might elevate this conclusion.</p>

10 Consider the importance of stories to your society.

<p><i>Ideas are confidently and fluently expressed. There is a clear focus on the question, and a balanced discussion offered. More nuance and depth of analysis (e.g. clearly specifying the features of stories that are being referred to and exploring the extent to which they give rise to the important outcomes put forth) will enhance the response.</i></p>	
<p>When <u>you</u> think of stories, <u>you</u> may imagine fairy tales with fantastical plots and bizarre mythical creatures. But moving away from magic and fantasy, you might discover how stories are in our everyday lives. Be it our personal stories, religious stories, or the stories that are taught in our very classrooms, they have become a common mode of communication amongst people. Critics might believe that stories lack importance in modern day society, as they distract us from the more pressing issues at hand. However, I believe that stories ultimately still hold a large importance, especially in Singapore, due to their historical and cultural significance that builds our social fabric.</p>	<p>Well crafted introduction, but candidates should refrain from addressing the examiner ('we' is a more appropriate way to draw the reader in).</p> <p>Clear stand and reasons, well contextualised to SG.</p>
<p>Detractors of this argument might postulate that <u>stories</u> hold little to no value amidst the ever-changing global landscape that Singapore has to navigate. There is no doubt that the world is replete with societal issues, and Singapore, though being a geographically small country with few natural resources, is no stranger to it. Climate change, food insecurity and poverty are several issues out of the many global problems that Singapore has to play a part in, whilst juggling our own local challenges. Thus, it might be apparent that <u>stories</u> are not able to help us ameliorate these issues. For example, rising sea levels due to global warming poses a substantial threat to the future of our nation, and at a cursory glance, stories would hold little significance in our journey to combat this threat and generate solutions. Stories are assumed to be <u>mere recounts of the past</u>, and in a country that has to constantly refine our technical skills to face both local and global issues, it thus seems that story-telling is rather useless in Singapore's modern context. However, I suggest that we look past the technical value of stories, and instead appreciate them for their societal value and its ability to bring people together.</p>	<p>What kind of stories?</p> <p>Setting the context</p> <p>This could be further unpacked</p> <p>Any examples?</p> <p>Consistent signposting of the opposing view and a clear transition statement enhances coherence.</p>
<p>Firstly, from a historical lens, stories are important reminders of our country's previous hardships and successes, allowing us to better appreciate Singapore's history as a society. Stories transport us back to the past, sharing a plethora of experiences from different lives we would never get to experience. They take us through the ups and downs of the building of our nation, teaching us to appreciate the society and security we have today due to the sacrifices and passion of our forefathers. For instance, stories from the <u>Japanese Occupation</u> back in World War II, reminds our society of the importance of having a self-sufficient defence force, which rules our national efforts in our defence till this date, such as through National Service and the celebration of Total Defence Day. Other historical stories, like <u>Sang Nila Utama</u>, share with us the origins of certain national emblems, <u>helping to shape the collective identity</u> of our society. Therefore, stories encourage the appreciation of Singapore's history, and thus have the capacity to unite the people with a common identity and a sense of societal belonging.</p>	<p>Identifying the characteristics of the stories that make these possible would lend to elaboration.</p> <p>Citing evidence that shows the extent stories "shape the collective identity" would make the argument more convincing</p>
<p>Secondly, the cultural and religious significance that stories hold point us to its importance in</p>	

<p>our multi-racial society. The melting pot of cultures we have today is a result of the immigrant communities coming together to build a nation of their own, a trait that is uniquely Singapore. However, we cannot ignore the fact that upkeeping a harmonious society is no easy feat, as evident in the 1964 Racial Riots, as well as the many microaggressions that our different racial groups might unfortunately still experience today. With Singapore's need to build a fair and equal society, "regardless of race, language or religion", stories come into play as a vehicle of cultural appreciation, educating our people of the diverse cultures and traditions present in Singapore. For example, during festive periods schools or <u>public spaces</u> often share the stories of the respective culture's festivals and practices, such as "The Great Race" during the Lunar New Year, or the origins of Deepavali, Hari Raya and many more. In recent years, there has also been an increase in awareness surrounding the Orang Laut, an indigenous group of people in Singapore whose traditions have slowly died amidst the rapid advancement of Singapore. Descendants of this community have come together to share their family's stories on <u>social media platforms</u>, and even through literature. In a society that is built from people originating from such vast backgrounds and cultures, stories have thus become a bedrock for our multicultural society, helping us better understand one another, consequently <u>safeguarding our social fabric</u>.</p>	<p>Setting the context</p> <p>Specify what these public spaces are and how they can share stories</p> <p>Elaborate on the stories and evaluate how effective this sharing is to better show importance.</p> <p>Evidence?</p>
<p>Thirdly, stories are a crucial tool for fostering a sense of camaraderie in the people, especially for Singapore that so heavily depends on our human resources. Each person has their own unique personal story, and sometimes we fail to recognise that certain experiences or hardships are in fact common amongst the crowd. Stories are hence important in helping the people of our society relate or empathise with one another, highlighting the social value stories innately possess. The 2021 National Day Parade saw the animations of certain people's personal stories, such as Zubir Said, the composer of our national anthem, and how he grew to love music. Such sharing of personal stories helps to colourise our perspectives in the lens of other people, acting as a connecting point between people of differing backgrounds. Furthermore, as part of the government's efforts to boost morale during the long-drawn Covid-19 pandemic, they also shared the stories of a multitude of volunteer workers who have stepped up to show support to the frontline workers, migrant workers and Covid-19 patients, sharing the value of kindness through these inspiring and heart-warming stories. As Singapore's only natural resource is the people themselves, it is imperative for our society to build empathy and feel a sense of connectedness with each other, enabling us to move forward as a nation together. Thus, stories are important in uniting people, playing a significant role in bonding our nation in light of our need to progress together as a society.</p>	<p>Well contextualised to Singapore features.</p> <p>Thoughtful analysis evident in recognising something we often fail to recognise.</p> <p>Very well crafted paragraph - clear point, development of reasoning and apt illustrations.</p> <p>The significance of stories (not merely their existence) is well argued.</p>
<p>In conclusion, Singapore's need for constant growth amidst the unpredictable global landscape requires technical skills that stories may not necessarily be able to provide. However, the significance stories hold in a historical and cultural context, and their ability to spark a sense of camaraderie between people, makes them a foundation of building mental resilience and flexibility in our society. Stories are crucial in maintaining our social stability, something we should always strive towards as "one united people".</p> <p>(Andrea Wee, 22-01)</p>	<p>Recap of key ideas.</p> <p>Strong ending; the reference to the national pledge is apt and will benefit from being explicitly signalled (as the reader may not pick up the reference).</p>

11 'We are collectively responsible for addressing poverty'. Discuss.

<p><i>This essay is consistently relevant. The key term 'collective responsibility' was clearly addressed and an understanding of different stakeholders was evident. There was a good range of examples (though not all were relevant). There is room for improvement to strive for greater depth of evaluation to flesh out the nuance of the question.</i></p>	
<p>Living in tiny cramped spaces, picking up trash in hopes to find items to sell or use and resorting to eating mud that is dried up and topped with salt and pepper, many would have never heard of such living conditions, much less experienced it. However, this is the reality of people living in the Haiti slums. These are the kind of living conditions that many people living in poverty see and experience daily. While not everyone living in poverty lives in such poor conditions, one commonality we see in these people is that they do not have the ability to get out of this vicious cycle of poverty by themselves. Whether these people live in slums and survive on mud cookies or are homeless beggars, hopeful that some kind soul would give them food, these people are unable to get out of poverty without the aid of those in better positions. Thus, poverty can only be successfully addressed if we, as a collective, take control of our actions and take responsibility for our actions. Be it the government, the community or individually, we need to ensure that we stop perpetuating the vicious cycle of poverty, but instead provide avenues for them to seek help and money to better their standards of living.</p>	<p>Clear stand and context</p>
<p>Some may argue that people living in poverty should be the ones getting themselves out of poverty as they, themselves, are the reason that they live in poverty. Since poverty is not brought about by us, we should not be expected to address the issue of poverty. Furthermore, those who live in poverty are often seen as last and hence, undeserving of aid from the better off. Due to ideas being ingrained in our minds since young, many believe that hard work simply translates to success and money, so the failures of these people living in poverty can be attributed to their own laziness. Thus, many believe that only those living in poverty should bear the responsibility of addressing poverty.</p>	<p>Relevant topic sentence and valid explanation. Could be improved by contextualisation - what caused their poverty? How did they get themselves into this?</p> <p>Relevant examples missing.</p>
<p>However, people in power often can be blamed to some extent as we perpetuate the vicious cycle of poverty by creating problems for these people. People in power, like the government, not only have the ability to better the lives of people living in poverty, they also have the power to take away from these people. Thus, we cannot say that we have absolutely no part to play in landing these people in poverty. For example, due to the many complaints of the middle-class locals in Lagos, Nigeria, the government decided to evict people from slums over and over again, forcing people living in poverty to resort to relocating multiple times. This led to them being unable to settle down and focus on seeking education or jobs, leaving them stuck and stagnant in their search for better lives. While we do not directly impact these people, our actions can affect and change their lives significantly. Since we have some part to play in perpetuating poverty, we should take responsibility to provide aid for them.</p>	<p>Need to be specific on who these people in power are - what kind of government are we talking about here? The explanation should come before the example to maintain coherence.</p>
<p>Furthermore, we, as the richer, more well to do people in the society, have the ability to help raise awareness about poverty. While not everyone can provide the money to change the conditions that people living in poverty are in, we have the voice that can convince those in power to do something. Living in a mostly democratic world, the people are given a voice, a voice that is heard by the government and that is our ability. Consider the 21st century skills that are taught in Singapore schools, many learn to have empathy and to put ourselves in</p>	<p>The definition of 'we as the richer' needs to be clearer - how rich must one be, before we consider ourselves to have this ability to raise awareness? Explain how this relates to 'collectively responsible'</p>

<p>others' shoes. Similarly, we should learn to empathise with people living in poverty and voice our concerns to those who have the ability to enact real change . By doing so, the government would feel more obliged to provide resources and aid as well as enact laws and regulations in favour of those stuck in poverty. For example, the Pakistan government had the power to assign more teachers to schools in slums so as to better the quality of education in these schools, in turn, improving quality of living for the people living in these slums. Thus, since the collective effort of us and the government can greatly affect how much more we can do for those living in poverty and we have the ability to do so, it is imperative that we bear the responsibility for addressing poverty.</p>	<p>Example addresses the idea of collective responsibility. But the contextualisation can be clearer. What is the link between the point and the Pakistani government?</p> <p>The example and the concluding thought could be more coherent.</p>
<p>Individually, we should also bear the responsibility for addressing poverty as we have the moral obligation to do good to others. It is the objectively right thing for us to reach out to those living in poverty and lend a helping hand as they, at the very least, are still humans with feelings. While we come from extremely different backgrounds, people living in poverty are still innately humans who crave for the same things as us. Hence, it is only morally right for us to do our best for them. For example, Values-in Action groups like the Youth Corps reach out to those who live in poverty, not for benefits that they receive but simply to give back to those in need. I believe that it is important for us to do what is morally right, to bear the responsibility for addressing poverty as these people deserve the same respect and dignity that we receive.</p>	<p>Relevant topic sentence that uses the human factor to justify collective responsibility</p> <p>Could use a stronger example since this is a group while your point is about individuals</p>
<p>Thus, we as a collective must work together to address poverty as we do have some part to play in perpetuating the vicious cycle of poverty, have the ability to help get people out of poverty and have the moral obligation to do good to others. Therefore, I implore you to empathise with those living in poverty, to put yourself in their shoes and begin to bear the responsibility for addressing poverty as it is only with everyone's cooperation and effort that we can successfully address poverty.</p> <p>(Tan Charmaine, 22-E3)</p>	<p>Effective conclusion with a summary of points and call to action</p>

12 'Play is merely for children.' How far do you agree?

<p><i>Barring OA1 (which misinterpreted , relevant points were raised. There was a good attempt to address 'merely' and why play is needed. However, a clear explanation of what traits of play benefit adults was lacking and examples were mostly hypothetical/vague.</i></p>	
<p>The word 'play' may come off as a childish term to some. We often associate the word with children, thus many may feel that play is merely for children. However, the word 'play' simply means to engage in fun, stress relieving activities where people enjoy themselves whilst doing so. Play can come in various forms: physical or online games, leisure activities and any form of entertainment. We often hear the phrase 'child's play' to categorise 'play' as a children's activity. Play, however, is open to anyone from all walks of life and is not merely for children. Though I understand some may argue that all children do is play and play is essentially their 'job', I ultimately believe play is also beneficial to all as it actively allows one to relieve stress and improve mental well-being, as well as tie family bonds.</p>	<p>Clear stand and context</p>
<p>Society today shares the sentiment that "all children do is play", whereas adults tend to focus</p>	

<p>more on work and providing for the family. In their early years, children live with no stress and have all the time to explore and adventure. Such innocent and pure beings live life to the fullest, without worrying about commitments or bills to pay. This is why people think that play is merely for children, as these clueless little ones have nothing to lose and nothing to worry about. Such mindsets are even confirmed by childcare centres, where parents leave the kids and trust them to the hands of the caretakers while they go to work. In most childcare centres, take Sparkletots and even Club Rainbow for instance, the curriculum for children revolves around a whole day of what adults define as “play”: building blocks, participating in events, going on learning journeys, just to name a few. Even in their early education years, children only do simple things that make them happy. Furthermore, the aim of such centres is to develop critical thinking skills, communication and instil values, all through play.</p>	<p>There seems to be a misunderstanding of the question: saying that ‘all children do is play’, but the question is ‘play is only for children’. Limited relevance</p>
<p>However, with that said, just because children are blur and have nothing to worry about, they are not the only ones entitled to play. Anyone has the right to enjoy life at any age and fun does not limit to childhood days. Happiness can be expressed everywhere by everyone. not just children. It may seem that ideally, adults are the 'workaholics' and solely focus on work, but in reality, adults too like the idea of play by having the freedom to do something they love. Play is subjective and is unique to each individual. Despite having to worry about adulthood, some may enjoy the work they do, some may enjoy the company of others and some may find joy in the little things in life. All these can be considered ‘play’, as long as people are having fun in doing whatever they do.</p>	<p>Valid TS but this seems to conflate fun and happiness with play. More concrete explanations and examples would help distinguish play from fun and happiness</p> <p>Contextualisation of argument can be clearer</p>
<p>I believe that play is not just merely for children but for everyone due to the benefits it brings. Firstly, play helps to reduce stress and improve mental well-being. In our globalised world today, many live fast paced lives and overexert themselves in the competitive society. The will to excel and outperform others drives people to work longer hours and even study hard enough to clinch the limited spots for any specific qualification. I assume this is why others think play is not for adults, for in our developing and rapidly advancing society today, there is no room for play. Though others may think this is how society should look like, in reality, our society will take a fall instead. Too much studying or work will ultimately cause someone to burn out. This is with regards to a face-to-face forum held at the National Museum of Singapore, where young adults expressed the stressors in life to DPM Lawrence Wong. Common responses were stress due to school and work, and he had promised to further look into the issue, while explaining that advancement is necessary for Singapore to grow in the globalised society. To counter this, play is essential. Taking the form of leisure, play enables one to take time and people's minds off work and studies, and can effectively serve as a reminder to take breaks and enjoy the little things in life. One way that play can evidently improve one's mental well-being is through the co- curricular activities in school, where students commit a fraction of their time to engage in activities they are passionate in. This has significantly improved the well-being of students by taking time off studies to play with their friends. Not only is this applicable to students, but to working adults as well. Therefore, play is stress relieving and is meant for anyone of any age.</p>	<p>Relevant TS and good attempt at unpacking context, but it is still too lengthy. Identifying and explaining which traits of play can then combat these issues would clarify the argument</p> <p>Play ≠ leisure. The specific traits of play need to be addressed</p> <p>Example is valid though explanation is needed as to what these have to do with play</p>
<p>Apart from eliminating the stressors in life, play can also build stronger family bonds and a healthier society as a whole. As children play, we often see their parents entertaining them as well. Imagine the scene of a neighbourhood playground, you would see children running around on the sandpit, some of them climbing up the slides and some screaming as they play</p>	<p>Witnessing play is not the same as play. How exactly are family bonds strengthened by play? What form of play allows for this? Chasing</p>

<p>a simple game of catching. As you look at the bigger picture, parents stand around the playground, intervening wherever they have to. They carry their children in their hands and swing them around to simulate airplanes and superheroes. With this, it is evident that parents do take time to play with their children, challenging the common belief that adults have no room for play. Studies have shown by multiple researchers and even parents themselves that parental involvement is crucial for a child's growth. Children who have grown up in healthy families are said to be more empathetic and inclusive in society. That said, play is meant for families. With families supporting and engaging in play together, it eventually strengthens family bonds. By strengthening family bonds, society could also eventually become healthier and more inclusive as children would grow up to be more humble and kind members of society. Therefore, play could strengthen family bonds and even promote the betterment of society.</p>	<p>the 5Ws1H here would elevate this paragraph's line of reasoning</p> <p>Example needs more specific details</p>
<p>All in all, I disagree with the claim that play is merely for children. I acknowledge that different people have different roles to play, however play is meant for everyone. People need to remember to appreciate the world around them and live life to the fullest. As the saying goes, "You only live once", we must enjoy ourselves whenever we can and not leave the good times locked away in our childhood.</p> <p><i>(Helena Ding, 22-U3)</i></p>	<p>Simple yet functional conclusion.</p>

AQs: 2023 JC2 MYE Paper 2

In response to 2023 JC2 MYE Examinations Paper 2:

Denzel Chung makes significant criticisms of adopting a mindset of tolerance towards immigrants.

How far do you agree or disagree with his observations? Illustrate your arguments with examples drawn from your own experience and that of your society.

Response 1

Response offers a deeper level of evaluation through strong contextualisation and understanding of the claims selected. This is consistently achieved throughout the response. A strong conclusion that coherently ties ideas together in a measured fashion lends to overall quality.

I largely agree with Chung's observations when applying them to my society.

Firstly, Chung postulates that "When immigrants are reduced to the status of a mere machine, it becomes terrifyingly easy to dispense with them or dismiss them if circumstances render it necessary." Given my personal observations of how Singapore treats our migrant worker community, I largely agree with this statement. Migrant workers in Singapore have mostly taken over jobs such as construction workers or cleaners, and I believe many Singaporeans have begun to overlook the immense contributions they have made to our nation-building process. These jobs are perceived to be lower-ranking, and coupled with the fact that Singapore has a rather fast-paced culture where everybody strives to perform their best in academic or professional settings, this has engendered much condescension towards migrant workers. Sentiments that migrant workers are 'illiterate' are still common in my society, showing how we often objectify them as mere workers and disregard their efforts and hardships. Furthermore, one of the greatest outbreaks of Covid-19 in Singapore originated from the migrant worker dormitories. This unfortunately highlights our society's lack of care towards their wellbeing amidst the Covid-19 pandemic. Though efforts were made to support them, such as better housing infrastructure and volunteer work to boost their morale, these efforts were only done later after their outbreak, revealing how society had somewhat forgotten about them until it was too late. Therefore, I agree with Chung, as my society mostly takes the migrant worker community for granted.

Make clearer links to the TR here (dismissing and dispensing of workers)

Relevant EV with some link to the TR

Apt example with links to how dismissive we are of foreign workers

Secondly, Chung raises a perspective that "immigrants should behave more like native-born locals", which later down the road might result in "a fundamental, unresolved mismatch of mutually-misunderstood cultures". Though Singapore might not be fully accepting towards our migrant worker community, I believe that we do not actively enforce the expectation on them to conform with Singapore culture, thus I disagree with his observation here. As Singapore has always been a multi-racial society consisting of a variety of cultural backgrounds and religions, being tolerant of other cultures has become part and parcel of many of our lifestyles. We may not necessarily fully understand a culture different from ours, but I think that over the years we have grown to simply tolerate other traditions, for the sake of maintaining our racial harmony. This also applies to our migrant workers, hence the view that they should follow the cultures of the locals is not extremely prevalent. This can be seen through migrant construction workers or domestic helpers having their own gatherings that

Nuance

Relevant evaluation that relates to the nuances included in this paragraph

Nuance

Example works, but is

do not conform with the social norms in Singapore, yet nobody actively goes against them. Therefore, though locals and immigrants do have different cultures, Singapore has mostly turned to tolerance and we do not force full integration of cultures.	rather simplistically evaluated. Is it true that such gatherings have continued undisturbed?
In conclusion, I mostly agree with Chung given the sheer extent to which we disregard our migrant worker community. Though we do not force them to fully integrate into our exact culture, I believe that migrant workers have become 'invisible' to us, as the Singaporean culture of keeping to ourselves has limited our efforts in trying to understand and empathise with the immigrants in our midst. (Andrea Wee, 22-01)	Lucid conclusion with strong synthesis of ideas Insightful

Response 2

<i>The strengths of this response lie in the thoughtful acknowledgement that tolerance serves as a stepping stone for society to move towards acceptance, and the attempts at intra-paragraph balance in the second body paragraph.</i>	
Chung argues that adopting a mindset of tolerance towards immigrants is detrimental as it forestalls the efforts to connect with and learn more about them while also dehumanising them and promoting the idea that they are machines to get the job done. In Singapore's context, we are an immigrant society and hence I disagree that tolerance undermines efforts made to learn more about immigrants, however I agree that some immigrants are treated as mere machines to boost the economy to some extent.	Identification of claims being used in the response lends to overall coherence, but the stand could be more clearly articulated.
Chung argues that strengthening tolerance towards immigration forestalls efforts to connect with immigrants, engage with them or learn more about their culture and heritage. Immigrants' backgrounds are irrelevant as they are seen only for their value and hence it makes getting to know them unnecessary. I disagree with this argument as this is not very applicable to my society where active efforts are made to promote cultural understanding. Singapore is an immigrant society made up of four main groups, Chinese, Indian, Malay and Others including groups like Eurasians. It is this diversity that causes cultural misunderstanding or insensitivities to escalate into aggression and conflict, hence potentially threatening the social fabric or cohesion of society. This then causes us to prioritise understanding of the different cultures of different immigrant groups to prevent such incidents from occurring. There are hence many efforts made to connect with different immigrant groups and find out more about their cultures through avenues like Racial Harmony Day which is celebrated on the 21st of July in all schools to celebrate differences and promote understanding, until any sentiments of tolerance transform into a deeper understanding and appreciation or hence acceptance of immigrant cultures. A mindset of tolerance can hence still spur curiosity and serve as a space or middle ground for people to learn about immigrant cultures before acceptance is possible. Hence, while Chung's argument does hold some validity, it is not applicable to Singapore's context.	Relevant idea Explanation acknowledges the part tolerance plays in this Evaluation of the SG context, but make the links to tolerance. Attempt to nuance is not very effective here as it causes some confusion to the reader An insightful observation. Links to this should have been consistently established at the EV and eg stage
Chung also argues that a mindset of tolerance dehumanises immigrants, reducing them to the role of a machine to do what needs to be done. As people see immigrants as merely a tool to boost the economy, they are treated as such and beared with due to this value. I agree with this argument as some migrant workers in Singapore have started raising questions about	

<p>their ill treatment and lack of human rights, making this argument somewhat applicable to my society. In Singapore, due to the fact that we are a knowledge-based economy, Singaporeans tend to not prefer blue-collared jobs as they are generally low paying jobs. Coupled with the fact that there is an increasing sense of entitlement amongst younger generations, migrant workers tend to take up jobs like construction. These workers are then only seen for their value as workers who build infrastructure and are housed in extremely cramped and poor living conditions. They are seen as machines to aid the economy and hence there have been ongoing debates about the treatment of such migrant workers that is a result of a mindset of tolerance - as it gives rise to them being perceived as mere machines. That being said, there have been many attempts to boost the welfare of such migrant workers, thus proving a shift from the perception that they are only machines. For example, there are frequent donation drives to gather welfare packs and resources for such migrant workers. During the start of the Covid-19 pandemic, schools from all around Singapore collaborated with community centres to collect welfare packs for such migrant workers. While some of them are still housed in poor conditions or may be seen by some as outsiders who have the sole purpose of working and doing what needs to be done, it is worth acknowledging that recent efforts have been made to improve the welfare of such migrant workers and move away from the dehumanisation of them, proving a tolerance mindset may not be that detrimental towards immigrants.</p>	<p>Relevant EV that is systematically developed and linked to the claim selected.</p> <p>Balance attempted, but consider rewriting this line for nuance: That being said, there is a new trend emerging...</p> <p>The link to how tolerance has helped change mindsets could be more clearly established</p>
<p>In conclusion, adopting a mindset of tolerance towards immigrants need not necessarily be a bad thing in Singapore's context where efforts are made to promote understanding of different migrant cultures or to improve the welfare of those generally dehumanised or perceived as machines to boost the economy.</p> <p><i>(Christine Chen, 22-16)</i></p>	

Essays: 2023 JC1 MYE Paper 1

3 'An unregulated press is dangerous.' How far do you agree?

A number of valid points raised with some degree of evaluation that could go deeper - look out for where suggestions for greater depth of evaluation are raised in the comments. A more balanced discussion will also help strengthen the argument.

News and information about current affairs pervades our lives. News, unlike the past, is not confined to our daily newspapers, but has taken to the internet and social media where various press companies, such as the New York Times (NYT), the British Broadcasting Network (BBC) or Today Online inform users about current affairs and disseminate information. Indeed, the ease with which news can be disseminated has made it hard for these companies to be regulated, to ensure that they do not release false or heavily controversial views which could be dangerous, causing social or political unrest and division, or even physical violence. Lack of regulation could also leave the press to spread false information, harming citizens' interests. These detrimental impacts are amplified in Singapore due to our small, easily influenced population and unregulated news could wreak major havoc, which is why I agree with the statement.

Clear stand with some accurate unpacking of key terms but balance needed.

An unregulated press could be left to induce controversy in times of political tension or otherwise, causing social unrest and causing people to turn on one another. Press companies would act in their own self-interest, and may capitalise on this period of tension to obtain more views or push their own ideologies by publishing controversial views. This would therefore stir up more resentment and hate between the relevant parties and cause division. This could be seen in the United States when the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement gained traction in 2020, and many press companies were seen releasing commentary articles about the state of race and racial harmony in America, which further added fuel to the fire. Though some articles were able to give a nuanced take on the subject, many, due to the lack of total regulation, simply added to the controversy to gain more views. As a result, the people in America became more enraged, which led to more divisiveness as well as a lot of physical violence as some looting occurred and many were harmed by police intervention. Freedom of speech in the USA allows press companies to release controversial or sensationalised news that could be simply meant to anger or evoke strong reactions out of those who read it, which can clearly lead to devastating situations and a divided society. In Singapore, due to our small population, this division would be intensified and would certainly be harmful.

Clear claim made. The transitional phrasing from intro to para 2 can be better.

Relevant example. There is a need to explain that this movement could also be ideologically motivated.

Be careful not to ascribe too much blame to the press as US racial tension has deep roots. Apt use of SG context to nuance the argument.

A lack of regulation of the press could also leave them free to release misinformation to the public, which would cause innocent citizens to act and make decisions in a manner that would be detrimental to them and society. Blatantly untrue information could turn people against one another or the government and could cause them to harbour resentment against those parties. In Singapore, the government has identified this major issue of rampant misinformation and has flagged it as incredibly dangerous, so much so that they introduced the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act (POFMA) which flags untrue information published by Singaporeans and press companies in Singapore and requires them to

Claim is correct. But the development of reasons can be clearer.

Clearly argued with apt examples but laying out the roots of misinformation in relation to regulation i.e. deluded people/foreigners who want to advance their

add a correction. This regulation has certainly allowed Singapore to identify some misinformation and not take it to heart, reducing unnecessary mistrust of the government. The fact that the government took this issue into their own hands clearly shows that lack of regulation could cause serious damage and would be harmful to the citizens.	own agenda.
Some sceptics hold the view that regulated media, rather than unregulated press, would be even more dangerous as it could lead to censorship. POFA has been known to occasionally flag commentary or opinion articles, or even citizens' comments about the government as misinformation; this leads them to believe that the Singapore government is trying to ban or delegitimise views which portray an unfavourable image of them in order to maintain a good image and trust with the citizens. Furthermore, a popular Singapore newspaper, The Straits Times, is regulated by the government and has been noticed to very seldom publish articles that portray the government in a negative light. This would lead citizens to have an extremely distorted view of the government where people are blinded by their lack of information due to the manipulation of the news. They are hence unable to make informed decisions and would defer to the government more as they have a good impression of it. However, what these sceptics fail to realise is that this grand level of censorship is an extreme. In reality, the government would not condone censorship and manipulation of the news much as their goal in the long term is to get Singaporeans to trust them and maintain that trust. It would therefore be in the interest of the government and publications themselves to tell the truth. Hence, rather than regulated press, unregulated press may be more dangerous as it could cause the public to distrust the government due to untrue information.	While this para is accurate and well written, the balance point for this essay is NOT the danger of over-regulation (of which there are many) but rather whether it is NOT dangerous to have no/minimal press regulation.
Although some regulation of the press is always necessary to prevent unnecessary harm like social unrest or spread of misinformation, regulation of the press could easily go to the extreme and enforce censorship in the pursuit of regulation. Furthermore, different people's views of the 'correct' amount of regulation are all subjective and will always invite criticism. Although news regulation is important, it is not the only factor in how people view the world and make decisions, as their receptiveness and ability to take in and process information plays a huge role in their decision making and actions. However, for the layman, having access to an unregulated press could cause unrest among citizens and cause them to make harmful decisions, as well as not having trust in the government due to false information. (Nayomika Shashidhar, 23-E6)	

6 'Celebrity culture does more harm than good.' Discuss.

<i>There was a clear structure to the essay. Good signposting phrases used. The logical sequencing of ideas made it easy to read. Ideas were sound and insightful. Arguments were well-illustrated. More attention could be given to comparing and evaluating the harm versus the benefits of celebrity culture. There should be a more consistent focus on what celebrity culture meant.</i>	
Accelerated development of information technology in recent years has greatly widened the permeation of social media platforms in our daily lives, which has therefore facilitated the expansion of celebrity's influence and power. The ease of accessibility to content produced by	Effort to interpret key terms and scope of the

<p>or about these individuals made famous by their actions, contributions or familial ties has widened mass involvement in celebrity culture. Given celebrity culture's presently large yet continually rising influence, it is crucial and timely to evaluate whether celebrity culture – characterised by the obsession over those who possess immense clout, does more harm than good. I am firmly rooted in my belief that celebrity culture stands to benefit corporations who exploit the power wielded by these famous individuals to further their economic gains. However, celebrity culture is more so a destructive force than positive one when considered from the viewpoint of celebrities who severely lack privacy and space, as well as consumers of celebrity culture who are manipulated and influenced to adopt attitudes of superficiality and unhealthy behaviour.</p>	<p>question</p> <p>Balanced stand and overview of points articulated</p>
<p>Proponents of the view that celebrity culture does more harm than good often argue that celebrity culture possesses immense potential to inspire and empower the masses, taking into account celebrities' wide reach. Celebrities who have attained commendable success in their respective fields can function as sources of encouragement and inspiration to young, impressionable minds, who will be spurred on by their idols' poignant stories of success to similarly pour in the time and effort to chase their dreams. This is well-illustrated by Singapore Olympic Gold Medallist Joseph Schooling, who rose to fame following his historic win at the 2016 Rio Olympic Games Men's 100-metre Butterfly finals. He has propelled numerous Singaporean youths to strive for sporting excellence even amidst a society where sporting achievement is perceived as subordinate to academic attainment. Beyond that, celebrities can galvanise supporters into action to alleviate pressing global issues. Swedish youth activist Greta Thunberg, who shot to fame following her appearance at the World Economic Forum where she vividly proclaimed "the Earth is on fire", has demonstrated conviction and passion that has inspired countless youths across Europe to join the climate fight through means such as 'Fridays for Future' protests demanding greater accountability and involvement of governments in environmental conservation. Oscar-winning actor Leonardo DiCaprio has also utilised his Instagram page to spread awareness on the need for environmental protection, positively influencing and inspiring his fans to take small, tangible steps towards a sustainable lifestyle. Evidently, celebrities wield much power to extend positive influence over impressionable young minds, leading many to conclude that celebrity culture is a vehicle for social change, and hence does more good than harm. However, I believe that it would be presumptuous to derive such a conclusion. Such a view is myopic and naive, given that celebrities have utilised their sizeable influence to more negatively impact and influence the masses.</p>	<p>Introduction of opposing perspective that is well reasoned.</p> <p>Celebrity culture is less widely exemplified here in the discussion of individual celebrities' feats</p> <p>The rebuttal regarding this view could have been developed.</p>
<p>Celebrity culture is heavily centred on providing unwavering support to and seeking to emulate celebrities – many of whom promote excessively materialistic lifestyles and unhealthy body images. Blame for the proliferation of superficial mindsets throughout society is often pinned on celebrities, because many celebrities portray unrealistically glamorous lifestyles. The Kardashians – arguably the most successful and influential celebrity family of the 21st century – display habits of extravagant spending on designer clothing and handbags, fine dining and parties, travel to exotic destinations, and flashy cars or luxury homes. This has placed a worrying overemphasis on the acquisition of material goods as feelings of envy fuel audiences to crave such extravagant lifestyles – which is unattainable and simply out of reach for the average individual. This diverts attention to and concentrates individuals' efforts on obtaining these luxury goods – wasting time and effort which could have been channelled to more meaningful pursuits. Even more strikingly, celebrity culture, which is mainly dominated by slim individuals, have led to the formulation of an ideal beauty standard. This inevitably places immense stress on individuals who subconsciously wish to look like the celebrities they worship, through means such as disordered eating once showcased by famous model Bella</p>	<p>A closer link to celebrity culture can be made by considering how the media, fans/ fanclubs heighten this power</p> <p>The dismissal of the</p>

<p>Hadid. While it must be acknowledged that some celebrities such as female singer Lorde or Rihanna have been active in championing body positivity notions of unrealistic body ideals stand due to their widespread promotion. Effectively encapsulated by results published by the British Psychological Society that highlights how British youths are increasingly worried about growing up in a world where the skinny are valued and glorified, celebrity culture has perpetuated unhealthy ideals that negatively impact the masses' psyche.</p>	<p>positive impact of celebrities is rather sweeping as it is not substantiated.</p>
<p>Additionally, celebrity culture has promoted unhealthy and unsustainable spending habits among fans. Many fans, especially those of the younger demographic, have repeatedly showcased the immense desire to satisfy, celebrate or affirm their celebrities overpowers rational thinking. This is evident in how young Korean Pop fans are overly-invested in their idols – both financially and emotionally. This has culminated in shocking excessive expenditure on Times Square billboards with photographs of their worshipped celebrities, or even the Chinese BTS fanbase raising hundreds of thousands of dollars to paint a Jeju Air plane with celebrity Jimin's image in celebration of his birthday. It thus grows clear that celebrity culture has morphed into hyper obsession on fans' part. While this derives them immense short-term joy, these unwise financial decisions feed into the habit of unregulated spending that is highly wasteful and unsustainable in the long-term, so celebrity culture does more harm than good.</p>	<p>Clear topic sentence with a clear link to harm drawn.</p> <p>Reasoning and the impact on fans explained</p> <p>Suggests this is part of a broader culture'</p>
<p>When evaluating the effects of celebrity culture on celebrities themselves, I firmly believe that celebrity culture inflicts more pain than reaps benefits for these celebrities. It is undeniable that the wealth accompanied by one's ascend to stardom has been greatly enjoyed by celebrities like Taylor Swift, Jennifer Lopez or Drake, who are equipped with the financial means to lead more comfortable lives with monetary gains associated with their rise to fame. This fame, however, has also aggressively stripped these celebrities of privacy, whose words and actions are monitored and reported by the media, seeking to quench consumers' insatiable thirst for updates on the lives of celebrities. A hallmark of celebrity culture – paparazzi – has repeatedly and consistently infringed on the privacy of celebrities throughout modern history. The stalking of celebrities to capture candid photographs of them has resulted in the death of Princess Diana, whose life was lost in a fatal car crash attributed to the desperation to escape trailing paparazzi. Till today, celebrities like Kanye West or Ariana Grande face immense frustration in being unable to engage in day-to-day activities without being captured on camera. Evidently, our hyper obsession with celebrities' personal lives which dominates celebrity culture negatively impacts celebrities themselves, and can be said to cause more harm than good.</p>	<p>Balance attempted. It will help to explain here and above how celebrity culture magnifies/ amplifies the actions of celebrities.</p>
<p>It therefore grows clear that the stakeholder which stands to benefit the most from celebrity culture is in fact corporations and businesses, who can tap on the vast reach of celebrities to expand marketing strategies aimed at boosting profits. Multinational corporation Nike has partnered with NBA star Michael B Jordan to successfully and rapidly drive up sales of their basketball sneakers. Creation of a line of Air Jordans to appeal to Jordan's large pool of fans have granted Nike great exposure as a brand and increased sales. Additionally, brands such as Hugo Boss and Milo were quick to engage the aforementioned Joseph Schooling in endorsement and sponsorship campaigns following his victory and hence growing popularity. Evidently, celebrity culture has provided businesses and brands worldwide with the opportunity to capitalise on celebrities' influence on their fans to promote their products through partnerships and sponsorships. From the viewpoint of self-serving corporations focussed solely on the acquiring of profits, celebrity culture causes more good than harm.</p>	<p>Sound conclusion, linked to the topic sentence and question.</p> <p>The underlying idea is sound. But the claim to whether celebrity culture brings more harm than good can be clearer.</p> <p>There is a need to explain why celebrities still court fame despite the harms. The evaluation between harm vs benefit is undeveloped.</p>
<p>On a whole, it is increasingly evident that the long-term harm inflicted on fans, celebrity</p>	<p>Functional summary of the essay. The final</p>

culture far surpasses its positive impacts, which is typically confined to a minority of stakeholders. Given that celebrity culture does more harm than good, it is essential for us to take a step back to re-evaluate how celebrity culture, which has transformed into a powerful force in modern society, can be better utilised for net good.

(Nicole Tedja, 23-U5)

comment on taking a step back to re-evaluate celebrity culture could have been developed to provide a strong conclusion to the essay.

AQs: 2023 JC1 MYE Paper 2

In response to 2023 JC1 MYE Paper 2:

The reading passages cover a range of views about the impact of social media on society. How far do you agree that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society?

Response 1

Relevant text references were raised and discussed, with a good attempt at balance and mostly apt examples to support claims. The final body paragraph will benefit from greater focus on one text reference rather than citing multiple claims that could not all be reasonably addressed. Signposts are used well to show the connection between ideas, adding to coherence.

Social media is an indispensable part of Singapore's society. It is a tool for communication, a vehicle for the sharing of ideas, and ultimately aids in curating a more connected society. However, it has its disadvantages too. With a veil of anonymity, it is easy to get away without bearing consequences. Hence, I agree to a large extent that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society.

Clear contextualisation to SG (Ev)

Balanced stand.

Detractors may argue that social media provides several tangible benefits such as facilitating global connectivity. In Passage 2, the author brings forth the idea that people can "share their ideas, opinions, and experiences with others from different parts of the world". It is undeniable that social media's ability to transcend geographical boundaries bridges the physical distance between people. In 2020, during the circuit breaker in Singapore, social media platforms like Instagram and Twitter proved themselves to be a crucial part of maintaining contact with friends and family, even when it was hard to meet up physically. In schools, online immersion trips are organised from primary school to enable students to indulge in another country's culture and customs without having to travel out of the country. Such immersion usually entails a day for interaction between students from both countries, connecting people that may have otherwise been unable to interact without the help of social media. Hence, through conversations about one's day or the sharing of one's own culture with others globally, social media positively impacts our society by bringing people together.

Counterargument is well signposted, giving rise to a balanced response.

Apt examples to support claims (both during and outside the pandemic) with good development of how social media is used in the SG context.

However, what this argument fails to consider is that the content shared during such interactions may not necessarily be beneficial. In some cases, the proliferation of extremist views that can possibly lead to negative repercussions. Since social media has the ability to reach the masses within short periods of time, many terrorists take to social media to spread their own ideas to others. In Singapore, there has been a growing trend of radicalisation in teenagers. While searching for information online, one can chance upon news that intrigues one to find out more about something. Through this, many teenagers in Singapore have been exposed to people encouraging them to join ISIS, and have even developed the urge to harm those in their society in the cases of self-radicalisation reported. Hence, although being able to share one's opinions in a clear advantage of social media, some people, as the author of Passage 3 has mentioned, "[abuse] the platform to spread anger and hatred", and can hence generate negative impacts from then on.

The text reference and reasoning are woven well together

Attempt to articulate CU; however, is the claim of a growing trend adequately supported?

In addition, Hertz claims that "social media has also become a home to bullying on a distressing scale", and I agree. The author of Passage 3 also mentions that when used negatively, "social media brings out our hurt inner self", which in turn negatively affects

This TR is not well engaged here and perhaps this section can

<p>society's collective well-being as a whole. With the use of social media, perpetrators can hide under a veil of anonymity and shame others online mercilessly. Since their identity remains hidden, they are not afraid of having to deal with the calamitous consequences that follow, and do not consider the feelings of the victim since no one would know the identity of the person behind the screen. Online bullying is a serious problem that persists till this day in Singapore. In Passage 1, Hertz brings up the idea that bullying through the use of social media can be "streamed into [their] homes and bedrooms", and is "permanently etched" into the digital footprint of its victims. Due to the severity and extent of negative impacts, the Ministry of Education in Singapore has acknowledged the need for a nationwide effort to address cyberbullying in schools. This is supported by the introduction of cyberbullying as part of the Character and Citizenship Education curriculum that starts from primary school education. By starting to educate students from an impressionable age, these lessons aim to deter students from taking advantage of social media to cyberbully others, as well as impart knowledge on how to react to being cyberbullied, and the associated negative implications. Thus, this illustrates how social media facilitates such bullying which takes a toll on one's mental health so much so that action has been instigated in order to reduce the prevalence of such occurrences.</p>	<p>be omitted. Alternatively, there is potential for this idea to be a good point of evaluation in a separate paragraph (exploring the extent to which the impact is as severe as "hurt inner self" implies)</p> <p>Apt use of a nationwide programme to support the claim that a problem is prevalent.</p>
<p>In conclusion, while social media is indeed useful in our lives, it is apparent that it brings a fair share of negative impacts to the table too. Henceforth, I stand firm in my belief that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society.</p> <p>(Zoe Teng, 23-A3)</p>	

Response 2

<p><i>Better planning and consolidation of points will help with more logical, insightful arguments. Relevant arguments were raised. But do be careful to tie up the loose ends of unnamed sources and insufficient info/elaboration. Safe, unambitious language.</i></p>	
<p>I agree that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society.</p>	
<p>In Passage 1, the author argues that social media is making the world more hostile, less empathetic and less kind which all results in a significant toll on our collective well-being. (Lines 12-14) Since little regulation is done on social media, people are free to post anything they want on social media and this gives rise to discrimination and the whole idea of cancel culture. One example in my society would be the example of a post on Mothership talking about a 40 year old man who did not return his tray in a hawker centre. As soon as that story was posted, people started commenting on how he was irresponsible. However, what they only found out later was that he had a disease that causes him to lose his memory frequently. This lead to a misunderstanding and is just one of the many examples of how the world is becoming more cruel because of social media. These types of hurtful comments cause victims who may be understood to become depressed and leaves them a permanently bad impression online. Thus, social media has a negative impact on society's behaviour.</p>	<p>Clear identification of author's claim.</p> <p>Some attempt to evaluate the nature of social media. However, the SG context can be clearer to show why the author's idea relates to cancel culture in SG.</p>
<p>Echo chambers are another way that social media has had a negative impact on society. Passage 1 explores the idea that social media platforms are consciously designed to keep viewers scrolling. Not only is this making society inefficient as people spend their time just</p>	<p>Relevant idea but the contextualisation to SG can be better to help understand the impact</p>

<p>watching Tik Tok instead of working, it also creates a sense of frustration and desire to become what one sees on social media. No one wants to post things they are embarrassed about, hence everything on social media is a highlight reel about the special things people do and carefully tailored to you. This makes our own mediocre lives seem boring and gives us a bitter taste in the mouth whenever we withdraw from a scrolling session. This feeling is experienced by many in Singapore when a survey conducted in 2020 showed over 80% of participants dissatisfied after scrolling through social media. The scary thing is that this is not only happening to Singapore but globally since social media is so widespread.</p>	<p>of echo chamber.</p>
<p>The author in Passage 2 pointed out an opposing view saying that social media engenders a more inclusive society as it gives marginalised groups a platform to express their views. While this may be true to a certain extent, the cruel nature of social media means that these discriminated groups would not be respected. In Singapore, this is not really evident as the Singapore government stands by the idea of equality and democracy. However, in China, the social credit system discriminates anyone with a low social credit score, even preventing their rights to book a flight for example. As such, these minorities would not be able to stand up as they are already marginalised in the first place.</p>	<p>Some attempt to evaluate through comparison of context. The relevance to the author's point of inclusive society can be clearer.</p>
<p>In conclusion, while social media may be able to give marginalised groups a voice in some societies, it is definitely outshadowed by the other detrimental effects social media brings such as echo chambers and cancel culture. As such, I agree that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society.</p> <p>(Wei Xinyu, 23-U5)</p>	

Response 3

<p><i>The question requirements were well addressed as there was clear application of text ideas to the context of your society, and there was an evaluation of the positive and negative impact of social media. An effort was made to support claims, and greater attention to the quality of evidence will enhance the persuasiveness of your argument.</i></p>	
<p>Social media is present in all facets of the world, including in my country, Singapore. The impact social media has on Singapore is significant considering Singapore is a relatively new state, which means it is susceptible to external influences. However, I argue that as a regulated tool, it has more positive than negative impact on individuals and society, thus I largely disagree with the presented claim.</p>	<p>+/- semblance of balance</p> <p>Clear stand, if abrupt; contextualisation to Singapore evident.</p>
<p>In paragraph 2 of passage 2, the author claims that social media breeds inclusivity through connecting the excluded and included. I largely agree with the relevance of this claim. Despite Singapore being a small nation, the visibility of the marginalised or excluded is less evident. This is due to the majority of the city-state being prosperous, which is by design, so as to make any potential instability less obvious to appeal to foreign investors we rely on. Because of this, the ability of social media to allow those well-off to see the stories of the excluded is so important. Documentaries made in Singapore and posted on Youtube, a social media service dedicated to videos, such as those by Channel News Asia about the mentally impaired or the less wealthy, allow for well-off citizens to see the inequality, internalise the moral implications, encouraging them to do more for these individuals. This societal moral persuasion is especially important as Singapore is not a welfare state; the government</p>	<p>Clear text reference and stand</p> <p>+ Apt SG context</p> <p>EV: evaluation of <u>how</u> important</p> <p>- Anecdotal attempt at evidence</p>

<p>focuses on improving the country's economy and lets the benefit trickle down to us. If the government does not do enough for these people, it is up to the citizens to sign up to non-profits like food from the heart to support our society and its underrepresented individuals. Social media's benefit is to make more aware volunteers, which is especially relevant in Singapore</p>	<p>Promising ideas and reasoning; better support for claims about the impact of social media will make the argument more persuasive.</p>
<p>In passage 1, paragraph 3, the author claims that social media can cause the world to be more aggressive and less compassionate. While I agree that without government intervention, this can have an extremely negative impact, due to effective intervention by Singapore's Government, this impact is less relevant. Singapore as a country with many races, works to ensure that is enough social stability to focus on economic growth. However without this stability, our country may fall behind and as a result be not competitive enough to survive, as scarcity is a concern given our size. For example, when the Christchurch mosque shootings in New Zealand occurred, the shooter live streamed his act and posted his reasons, which influenced a Singapore youth to plan similar attacks out of racial supremacy, before he was caught and the news hit headlines. This could have potentially caused mass anger and tensions, impacting our stability, showing the potential negative impact. However the government recognises this and prevents social media from having an actual negative impact, by passing laws such as the Foreign Interference Act, allowing them to take down social media posts that pose a threat to the stability of Singapore. As such, most violent influences of social media are weeded out before they can physically manifest as the Government seeks social stability, and this negative impact is less significant to the Singaporean context.</p>	<p>Relevant text reference</p> <p>Balance, awareness of SG context</p> <p>SS</p> <p>+ Foreign and local comparison was done well here</p> <p>(-) Clarify what FICA aims to do and if it is the apt act to cite here.</p>
<p>As a whole, social media gives Singapore's society the ability to maintain their own welfare and equity, and with the Government intervening to prevent social media from causing instability, allows for more positive impacts than negative impacts, and thus I largely disagree with the claim that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society.</p> <p>(Lee Qin En Bryan, 23-U5)</p>	<p>The reference to welfare and equity is jarring as it was not discussed above.</p> <p>Recap of stand aids coherence.</p>

Response 4

<p><i>There is a good effort to provide balance and demonstrate evaluation. Supporting examples provided, but not all are clearly representative of SG society. Depth of evaluation will benefit from greater attention.</i></p>	
<p>Social media is a double-edged sword as it can be both a tool for users to spread positivity or raise awareness on social issues, and also a tool to spread hate and negativity. Singapore has high penetration rates of social media, and it is so pervasive that it finds its way into every aspect of our lives. Depending on how we wield the blade, it can be either beneficial or harmful to society. In my opinion, I largely agree that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society, even more than the positive impacts it may bring.</p>	<p>Some balance</p> <p>Varied sentence structure</p> <p>Generic observation that can be omitted.</p> <p>Stand responds to the question clearly.</p>
<p>In passage 2, the author opines that "social media also plays a vital role in creating a just society". I do agree that this statement is true only when the power of the masses online can help in pointing out the wrongdoings of a person, be it something that is immoral or illegal. By pointing out and pushing for the wrongdoer to correct the wrong or receive due punishment, it can create a more just society. One example is how in 2021, a Singaporean</p>	<p>Valid TR</p> <p>EV - conditional agreement shows good evaluation, awareness of context.</p> <p>Valid but cursory</p>

<p>known as the “Badge Lady” adamantly refused to wear her mask on countless occasions even though she was in public spaces. This came during a time when mask-wearing was mandatory as a result of the pandemic. Her thoughtless actions endangered others’ safety, but online criticism of her actions helped to signal that all of us should abide by the rules of a society. Another example is that of Dee Kosh, a local Youtuber, who was jailed for sexually assaulting minors. The backlash that came after ensured that he received the proper punishment for committing an illegal act. Therefore, social media can help in being the moral compass guiding a society, making sure that wrongdoers suffer the consequences of their actions and do not bring harm to others again, thus creating a just society.</p>	<p>example</p> <p>EV -explains implications of the actions Valid example</p> <p>Paragraph can demonstrate greater depth of EV, perhaps by evaluating how helpful “pointing out wrongdoings” is and if it is always done in the right proportion on social media?</p>
<p>However, I believe that the above argument is flawed because the online backlash on social media can become overwhelming and is unjustified when individuals who committed no wrongdoing also get criticised. This sometimes is also the case when online netizens impose their own rules and perceptions of right is wrong, but this could end up harming the victim. Just this year, Zoe Gabriel, a girl who shared her joy on TikTok at being able to own a Charles and Keith bag came under heavy fire for calling it a “luxury bag”. She was hardly wrong for sharing her own happiness, and the hurtful comments which she did not deserve to receive initially were unjustified, showing that social media users sometimes put people on their own scale of judgement, possibly perpetuating the flaming of even innocent individuals, making it an unjust society instead.</p>	<p>EV - balance and some depth of evaluation is shown</p> <p>Valid local example, but how representative is it of Singapore?</p> <p>Valid EV - context, but can be linked to SG’s circumstances; otherwise this comes across as a relevant but anecdotal account.</p>
<p>Lastly, <i>(it is argued that)</i> social media “both incentivises us to produce divisive messages and enables us to so easily find community in hate”. I largely agree with this statement since the unbridled freedom of expression that social media allows causes people to air their negative views online, knowing that there is a lower chance of them suffering the repercussions of doing so. It then becomes easy for people to use social media as a platform to direct their hate to certain groups of people, be it celebrities or racial groups. For example, in Singapore, people have used social media to spread racist and xenophobic remarks targeted at foreign workers. Using the hashtag #NIMBY, which stands for Not In My Backyard, Singaporeans expressed their dislike for foreign workers and placed the blame on them for the increased strain on our local public transport infrastructure due to the added population, rising housing prices and even expressed their hate at having to live with these migrant workers in society. Such remarks were so hurtful that PM Lee Hsien Loong had to express his worry at the comments in 2011’s National Day Rally Speech. Since Singapore is a multiracial and culturally diverse society, social media being used to perpetuate this cycle of hate through spreading negative views causes division in our community, making it hostile and showcasing our differences when we should instead be working together in harmony. Therefore, I agree that social media allows for people to use it in such negative ways, having negative implications for a society and its people.</p>	<p>Valid text reference</p> <p>Reasoning is well linked to the “design” of social media</p> <p>Valid example, but unclear link to the “design” of social media - it will help to explicitly signal anonymity / hiding behind pseudonyms. EV - significance of impact</p> <p>Relevant SG context and potential implications that may arise discussed (CU).</p>
<p>In conclusion, I strongly believe that social media has a negative impact on individuals and society since it can cause societal divisions, promote online hate culture, and influence a person’s wellbeing.</p> <p><i>(Hannalyn Ng, 23-E3)</i></p>	<p>A recap of some points covered; a more balanced conclusion that explains why the first paragraph’s ideas is outweighed by the latter two points will be helpful for cogency and balance.</p>