

Question #1: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

It is better to have broad knowledge of many academic subjects than to specialize in one specific subject.

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #1:

Planning Future Ahead

College time is probably one of the most important times in a student's life. I believe this is so not only because we are students and we get our education at colleges but also it is a place where we actually shape our future by making our decisions now. Therefore while we are studying at college, we should think ahead and focus on what we expect from 'our' future.

In the country I live in, many students takes the national university entrance exam and after they receive their scores couple of months after they took the exam. Then comes the decision process, in which you are supposed to determine your college and department. As we might all guess, a student may not perfectly choose the department he wants to be educated in since he is quite young and inexperienced. The trend is that if you have higher scores, you are just placed to a college and a department you have selected.

Let's imagine a case in which the student is not satisfied with the department and field he has been placed. Since it is not always possible for students to be transferred to other departments, he will probably have to keep on with the field that he is supposed to study. However, if he keeps his area of study broad, he can have the chance to study about different topics he has been interested in and maybe he can continue his studies further away in time.

The question of whether having a broad knowledge of many academic subjects has also something to do with the year you spent in college. For instance, if you are an undergraduate student, it might also be a good idea to study wide range of topics coming from different disciplines. This would help you get a better understanding of yourself so that in turn, you can further define what you really want to do in future, whether to study in a different field, whether to join the work life or to go on further studying the subject in the prospective cycles of your education life.

Having a broad knowledge about many academic subjects may also come in handy when you are hired for a job that requires you to collate your vast amount of knowledge coming from different areas. Based on my experience, I can say that most multinational companies do have this tendency of hiring people who have broad knowledge about many academic subjects. These companies believe that they can use the manpower *in terms of intellect* in various areas depending on the time and their need. Hence as time goes by, these people in turn can have greater experience on various work-related subjects than their colleagues who have less broad knowledge about these academic topics and become more qualified and desired employees.

Nevertheless, studying wider range of topics and having a broader knowledge of many academic subjects might not be a good idea if you are a graduate student. This is because the aim of

graduate education is that you need to specialize on one topic of your interest that you can study it thoroughly, collect specific data and carry out your research based on these gradual steps. In the end, you *as the real knowledgeable person about this topic* are supposed to come up with a conclusion that would make a difference in the academic world. When we say difference, it is not always meant to be that you are supposed to prove something new, but you can also contribute with your findings - on this very specific subject for sure.

All in all, we should be careful about what we expect from our future to determine whether to study wide range of academic subjects and have a broad knowledge as a result. Having all these in my mind, I believe that the ideal solution to this complexity will be making use of an appropriate combination of these approaches while we have time and then plan our future studies accordingly.

Question #2: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Young people enjoy life more than older people do.

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #2:

Whether or not young people enjoy life more than older people do is an interesting question, and I for one disagree with that statement. First and foremost one has to understand that enjoying oneself does not necessarily have to mean enjoying similar things. With that in mind, it becomes clear that older people do not necessarily enjoy life less than young people do.

First, let's look at two different rather popular activities for both, the young and the old. How about sports - sports is a rather popular pastime activity for the younger generation. But it's also an important part of older people's lives, a point that is supported by the fact that certain activities that have fascinated the older generation first but have now moved on to include the younger generation as well (without of course losing any importance to the older generation, it's like a side-by-side activity) do exist. Sports can therefore be enjoyed by both, the young and the old, and does not leave anyone behind. If you don't feel like jumping down a cliff into the ocean then don't - there's other activities like running, ice-skating or, the one I referred to above to illustrate an activity moving down the generational ladder rather than up: Nordic walking.

And what about a very different pastime activity that both, the young and the old enjoy: going out and enjoying oneself with friends. While the youth have bars, pubs and clubs to enjoy itself, the older generation usually prefers locations with less noise and more atmosphere, yet not necessarily less fun. If one enjoys a nice restaurant or a dance then age doesn't really matter - a 90-year old can enjoy himself next to a 30-year old and both will be having a blast.

Yet another point I would like to make is money and time. It's a known fact that older people, especially retirees, statistically have more money to spend than younger people, who might have to support an entire family of four or more on one single income, do. And unfortunately, in our society money equals fun. A very good example is travelling, which in our society is just another word for seemingly endless enjoyment all over the world. Travelling is quite expensive though, a family of four will not be able to afford a Caribbean cruise on a ship, nor will it have time or money for an extended cruise or travels that last longer than a week or two. With more time on their hands older people can usually sit back and relax, enjoy their free time in foreign countries or even at home with their friends.

Which, as my final point, is what I think the most important factor of enjoying oneself. Friends are the salt in the soup, and while older people don't tend to have more friends than the younger generation (true, I don't have any hard evidence to support this, but it has been my general observation in my immediate environment), they usually tend to have closer friends that they have known for decades. Sharing ones life with a life partner or a good friend is what makes life worth living to some people, and in order to do that age doesn't matter - attitude matters.

I think I have made my point clear that I do not think that younger people enjoy life more than older people do. From the outside and from a rather superficial point of view this might seem to be

the case, given that according to the media - which unfortunately is made mostly for young people - only young people seem to enjoy life on TV and in the movies. It's a certain stereotype that the movie industry has been presenting us for many years and it seems to have attached itself to our society where age equals boredom and loneliness. Personally I think that if I had a time machine and would be able to look at a 20 years older me I would discover, that the older me would still be having fun in life and enjoying itself just as the young me does right now.

Question #3: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Young people nowadays do not give enough time to helping their communities.

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #3:

In the modern era, where it is an era of Technology and Science, the upcoming young generation is faced with enormous challenge. They have to preserve their cultural, social roots and at the same time keep abreast with the latest technological developments to have a decent standing in the society. I personally feel, in between these challenges the young people nowadays do not have enough time for helping their communities.

The first thing that comes to my mind, as a part of young generation is to get a good education, good job and be stable economically. In the modern competitive world, it has become so tough to keep up with this challenge that almost all of the time is eaten up concentrating on this single goal. A youngster in modern era, is most consumed with this challenge that he forgets his commitments to the community to where he belongs. If I consider my own example, I find myself guilty of the same thing, I am so much engrossed in my studies and thinking about future that I am not able to devote much time to the community. I personally want to devote time to help the community where I was born and brought up, and give something back to the society, but at the moment I think of that I find myself constrained by my socio-economic condition and the inability to do so.

One of the major factors which I have noticed in the upcoming younger generation, is the loss of values and feeling of belonging to the community where they live in. They consider it just any other thing in their life, and are mainly concerned with their enjoyment and their life. As the facts in a lot of newspapers in India suggest, that a majority of upper class youngsters, who are not constrained economically and financially, prefer going to night clubs and parties to community helping, or trying to help anyone in general. I don't have to go much farther to find examples of such cases, if I look around my college, and students with not much financial constraints would at any time prefer to go to a club or a movie to enjoy rather than to help anyone.

Even in today's modern world, I do find some young people willing to take up the challenge and improve the society which they are a part of. A very good example of this would be YFE (Youth for Equality) organization formed by university students, in Delhi, India, to fight against the reservations in the educational system on the basis of caste, which was imposed by Govt. of India. Seeing their example, I am sure that some of the youths contribute to the society and country. The only concern is that such number of organizations and people are very less compared to the total number of youths in the country.

If we look at the personal life of an average life on a youngster today, in most of the cases we will find that they are not very emotionally stable themselves. They are very much confused about what to do and what not to. In the modern generation, in most of the cases with both the parents working, the kids who form the young generation do not get to know their value system. In absence

of guidance of their parents, they usually do not understand their responsibilities towards the society, country and moreover to humanity in general.

I would conclude that, in general young people do not give enough time to help their communities, but the reasons for this are varying and are different for every young member of the modern society. For some people it might be the socio-economic constraints, for others it might be due to the loss of values. I firmly believe if given the right direction and guidance, the young generation would realize that what they are missing on and definitely give more time to help their community, society, country and humanity.

Question #4: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Most advertisements make products seem much better than they really are.

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #4:

Today the most challenging area in the business sector is `marketing`, which is how to advertise your product so that it will flourish among the competitive products and then be sold. As the challenge increases, the main actors in the sector try to come up with innovative ideas in order to survive in this cruel world of business. These main actors are advertisers, who actually present the product to the comment of the buyer. Through a considerable amount of time, energy and money spent on the analysis of the sector eventually has begun to create its `own` marketing strategies. The most tricky and thoroughly successful strategy is to introduce an advertisements that make products seem much better than they really are. This method of `disguise` brings one of the hottest issue in the sector: Violation of the ethical considerations. Some advertisers and the companies who hire them think that there cannot be any rules for this game. They claim that they do not insist on the customers to buy the product that is advertised with having told that it has the best features compared to similar products. So it is up to the customers whether to choose buying the product or not. On the other hand, some companies emphasize the importance of the some set of ethical values that set the sector in a balance so that it will last. Among these two different perspectives, I think the exclusion of ethical considerations would not harm the sector or the so-called balanced,

Now, it would be beneficial to grasp an example and see how the two different approaches handle the case. Soap is an important product in the FCGM (Food and Consumption Goods Market) and probably we are encountering dozens of advertisements on how well `their` soaps are. Before going any further, it is incredibly crucial to state the goal of each company regardless of its scale, sector, private or public status: To make profit; make more money. Remembering this goal, it would be easily concluded that any department in the company seeks to contribute to this profit in a way that department performs. For the marketing department, the way is to advertise the product best so that it will be sold and company will get a profit in return. If you target to make more money, back to example, you have no choice other than selling your soap brand. And if you lack of some quality or price specifications, the only choice to follow is waiting for you: To lie to the buyer; or in a more kindly way, to exaggerate the features of the products. Any marketing department and advertisers have not the luxury of betraying the ultimate goal of the company. So it is extremely logical to exaggerate the features of the products in order to make your products seem much better than they really are when you cannot meet some crucial specifications such as quality which is one of the traits of the products customers are seeking to buy,

On the other hand, the ethical dimension of the issue is still a big question mark for those who see the ethical and moral values much more prior and important to making profit,

In conclusion, it depends on your conscience to lie to your customers or not. I agree that most advertisements make products seem much better than they really are; however, due to the reason I stated above, this kind of a marketing strategy just serves to what it is supposed to. If I would be an

advertiser and meet a case like this one, I totally go with `lying to the customer and doing the best for my company`, Besides, I would not be offended as a mere customer and not feel betrayed by the company I trust.

Question #5: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

In twenty years, there will be fewer cars in use than there are today.

Use reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #5:

In 20 Years, there will be fewer cars in use than there are today

With the constant advancement of technology in our world today, many solutions to problems we face today can be solved. Certain issues that can be seen to have always been discussed and debated over, time after time can probably come to an end. Through advancements of technology and the convenience that cars seem to have brought to human beings, it came hand in hand with a number of issues that are widely discussed today. First of all, there is the pollution issue that rises or declines with the usage of cars. Next, there is the depletion of scarce resources that we use to fuel our cars. Last but not least, is the cost of purchasing a car and the gas to fuel it. It is because of these issues, that there is a high chance that in twenty years there will be fewer cars in use than there are today.

Pollution contributes to the usage rate of cars within a country. Take Bangkok, a city that is polluted and notorious for its traffic jams as an example. People living in Bangkok are probably immune to the amount of pollution that they breathe and interact with everyday. Tourists however, are a different story in terms of the pollution rate in Thailand. Some complain of bad skin, some claim of constant coughs, some complain on blurred vision with the amount of smoke on the streets. When the pollution rate of a city is so high, there will be a reduction in the amount of cars that are used. The government will most probably bring out policies that control the amount of cars through means of indirect tax on cars and the amount of roads that they allow to pass through at a given time period. In this case, it would just be convenient for people to travel through modes of public transportation. When there are tax on cars, lesser people will purchase cars, and for convenience purposes, more will use public transportation. Thereby, reducing the amount of cars that are being bought and driven on a daily basis.

Following that would be the depletion of scarce resources of gas. The escalating oil prices have made headlines more than once in any form of mass media worldwide. The Thai government had subsidized the oil price from rising in Thailand for quite a while, and this allow the Thais to continue their transportation as they wish. However, after the Thai government ceased to subsidize the oil price, did public modes of transportation like the subway become overcrowded. With the gradual depletion of scarce resources like that of oil that fuels the car in which we drive in, the costs for the scarce resource will rise. When a price of a good rises, this will discourage the consumers from purchasing such a product. It can be seen that oil fuels cars, so without fuel for cars, there will be adequate reason to purchase or use more cars. In this case, the amount of cars that are used today and in twenty years time will most likely have decreased substantially.

Last but not least is the better alternatives that our technology is coming up with. On a day-to-day basis, there are advancements of technology seen everywhere. Even after the rising gas costs,

countries turned to alternatives of gas. In a few years of course, it can most probably be assumed that gas will run out so another alternative will have to be thought of. Now with the convenience of public transportation in the sense that it is more efficient, less time consuming and cheaper in terms of gas and maintenance price of the car. Most people will be turning to public modes of transportation as opposed to private modes of transportation in travelling in cars. More and more people are becoming educated, and this has increased in the awareness of the environment. People will then try to reduce the amount of pollution by using less of products that produce pollution by finding other alternatives like that of using public modes of transportation. In this case, because cars produce a significant amount of pollution to our world, the amount of car purchases will have decreased quite a deal. Hence, it can probably be seen and assumed that within 20 years, there will be fewer cars in use than there are today.

With escalating oil costs and pollution, gradual depletion of scarce resources, better technology that can come up with alternatives and environmental friendly people, the amount of cars that will be purchased in the next few years will be gradually declining. Therefore, it can be assumed that in 20 years time, there will be fewer cars in use than there are today.

Question #6: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

The best way to travel is in a group led by a tour guide.

Use reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #6:

Touring should be done with a touring guide. Primarily a tour guide is necessary to cover all the places planned; to keep the time always intact as it is a most vital factor in all the tours; communication skills; general knowledge about the places of our visit etc.

First and foremostly the coverage of all places can only be achieved if guided appropriately. Tours are not planned frequently and if given an option the option should be utilized to the fullest extent. Basic idea of any tour itinerary will have the places of visit. Coverage of all the planned places is very necessary for it to become a very successful one. Without appropriate guide the coverage cannot be achieved or in better words it is difficult to achieve. Tour guide will know the operational hours of any place. Consider you liked to visit a park, a boat house- everything has operational hours and knowing all the operational hours is very difficult. Though the information can be gathered prior to the tour, all the information thus gathered may not be very true. There might be false information if the information was obtained from the internet media or a old paper clipping. A tour guide will obviously know about the operational hours, best time to visit and cost of the visit.

Second important factor is the place of stay. Choosing an accommodation is the most important aspect of any tour. Accommodation should be cost effective, near to the places in the itinerary and the environment should be very good. Choosing an accommodation all by ourselves without a guide may seem plausible but there is no guarantee that the place selected would have all the qualities as enumerated above.

The next factor would be communication skill. Consider you are touring on a place where they speak a foreign language which you haven't come across. Language plays a major role while going to new places as without that it would be an unseemingly task of covering all the places in the itinerary and reaching the destination in time. Speaking about the time - time is a very important factor. Even if the tour was planned with buffer times it might not be possible to reach a place due to various practical reasons. Tour guide will solve all those problems.

Climate and other conditional factors to your favorite destination is important. We may have decided on places based on various sources. May be from our friends, our relatives and from the great Internet and other media. All the information may not be correct about the climate. Say you are going for a fall drive. You will know the place is better in fall. Without any guidance the exact practical scenario cannot be predicted. It has really happened to me. I was once on a trip to "Vermont" for the fall scenic drive. Though i knew the colour of trees would be awesome pretty less i knew about the time at which the leaves will shed. Hence always in any tour a touring guide is mandatory. Assistance always make things easier. It will not be a bad idea to grab an option if it is available.

I would like to state a personal experience wherein we planned for a big trip to a hill station without a tour guide. There were fifty people in number and we planned to visit number of places.

Because of the lack of a tour guide we managed to visit only fewer places and that too we couldn't spend much time in all places. As there were even girls in the trip we chose a better accommodation on the first day and second day we settled with a mean place. First day stay was very expensive as it was too luxurious to stay and second day stay was so mean that people could even barely sleep. Next most worrying and disgusting thing was we couldn't get food as we thought. People like various kinds of food and it was a hard time to satisfy all the people.

Thus for any tour a touring guide is mandatory. Tour guide as described about will have a vast knowledge of the places we visit and he/she would make the best out of our plan. To really see the value our money tour should be enjoyed with a tour guide.

Question #7: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

It is more important for students to understand ideas and concepts than it is for them to learn facts.

Use reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #7:

I strongly agree that students should learn the ideas and concepts of anything rather than learning only the facts.

The points which I will cover are as below:

- Ideas and concepts reveals the actual knowledge of the student.
- Facts could be an illusionary knowhow about the subject.
- Conceptual knowledge makes a deep impact on the colleagues and professors and to attain more of the credits.
- Facts could be somewhat useful or maybe considered for time being but ideas generating the facts would be the ones every individual is interested to know.
- Importance of deep knowledge in today's competitive world.
- Conclusion

As a saying goes on:

"Half -Knowledge is dangerous".

The very friends of a man are always "WHO", "WHY", "WHAT", "WHERE". And these all leads us to know the ideas and concepts behind every invention, every fact, every rule, every quote, every event that occurs or happens. I would not be wrong if I say that I usually like to carry these four questions with me when ever I move to unknown place or to any interesting place.

Well, starting up with the essay I would like to stress on the point of "Complete - Knowledge". I suppose that this term is mentioned by me just to make my point self-explanatory. In fact, I would say that a person with knowledge is the one appreciated everywhere.

And the matter is simply that a student will be able to get more of the grades and could get more attention if he has the collection of various innovative ideas accompanied with the facts told by him.

Now for example, a student preparing for any of the project presentation will have to elaborate and present his knowledge and research related to the topic of the project. And in this case it would definitely be the best part for the student to collect the facts related to his project and to make them know how they were possible? Wouldn't that be a fantastic thing done by the student to make his classmates introduce with a new topic and in an educational way?

Of course it would be! But I am not completely disagreeing with the point that knowhow of facts is also important sometimes.

"As I believe something is better than nothing". But usually facts turns out to be an illusionary concept with no basis to support. This may lead a student to a condition of "Nowhere".

But surely, a student will be able to get more of the accolades, extol, credits, grades on his complete and deep knowledge based on facts and figures.

Today's competitive world demands knowledge with deep roots to sustain in the developing and fast -growing companies. Every day new inventions and creations are forcing the companies to seek great minds to get in their company and in lieu to this great minds, always an actual knowledge is required.

Still, a student should for sure attain as much knowledge as possible only to survive and to rise in this competitive world and prove his worth. He should gain more and more facts and work out the ways through which these facts have been developed. His research probably would then be the most attractive part of his resume for a company to hire him.

Hence, knowledge is important and somehow with a base and so ideas, concepts and facts together be the best part of having sound knowledge in a student life.

Question #8: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Successful people try new things and take risks rather than only doing what they already know how to do well.

Use reasons and examples to support your answer.

Response #8:

It is not arguable that if one wants to be successful, one must seek for new things so that one can be differed from usual and common people. When one just opens business, one can be hardly successful if the one only tries to use system that is already exist in the world. It might be safe to operate business with common systems and to produce famous products for profits and money; however, that business will not grow beyond the any other companies or businesses. To be successful, it is important to try new stuffs even though it seems risky. This contention is lucidly manifested in history of Mc. Donalds and book 'Le Papillon'.

The owner of Mc. Donald, Mr. Kropper, once started business with just restaurant as usually as any other common restaurants. However, the owner thought that it did not bring him lots of profits. He wanted to use new system of selling his foods to people. McDonald came up with the an idea about fast food. It began to produce hamburgers rapidly to follow the trend of time period of his days. People were started to open up the new business, they did not have much time to spend in the restaurant with eating. Mc. Donald made food faster so that busy business people could pick up the ordered food, pay and leave to their places. It was once very successful. Kropper still did not satisfy with this policy. As the usage of cars increased, he once more thought of faster way to pick and move, 'Drive-Thru.' People liked it and nowadays, Mc. Donald is one of the famous restaurants that is worldly known. It was pretty risky policy to develop during that time. Other members of the company rejected this idea because people might not come to his restaurant with great pleasure. However, Kropper had insight to see further future and to try new things. He was one of the successful people who tried new things with risks.

In the book 'Le Papillon', written by Bernard Werber, it flocculently clarifies that trying new things get you new world. Protagonists of this book are sick of their world because of the corrupted medias and selfishness of people. There are several protagonists, but one of the protagonists who is scientist first comes up with the idea of escaping earth project. Not many people in the world would not fund him project, who illustrates people that did not like risks. However, another protagonist, rich businessman steps up and gives the funds for projects. Any other businessman or scientists think that plan is too risky and impossible to become real life. The project required budget is spiked high that it is very risky for businessman to funds all the money for project. However, the project is very successfully done as a result. When the protagonists get to leave the earth with the spaceship, people those who opposed his idea and risks do not get to leave the earth. It is great success for those who try new things and take risks for their future.

The game that I currently play even shows that it is good to have risky quests for greater rewards. Important fact is that trying the risky way for more experience and greater success rather

than just keeping things that already know how to do well just as appealed clearly in the history of Mc. Donalds and in the book "Le Papillon."