The money spent by governments on space programs would be better spent on vital public services such as schools and hospitals.

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

In contemporary society, investing a large sum of money on space programs is favored by many countries. However, some people argue that the this money should be used in for public services rather than space missions. As for me, I agree with the latter claim from these peopletaking into considerationing two major reasons.

First of all, it is uncertain whether the outcomes of the an investment on in space programs will be beneficial to the national economy or the opposite may happen or detrimental to the economy. Admittedly, exploring the universe and exploiting the resources in outer space can provide the nation and the society with long-term profits, but the large expenditure will also become be a huge burdens for governments, thereby doing huge great harm to the economy in the short term. For example, the Soviet Unition once invested considerable money on the its space programs in order to compete with the U.S in the universeduring the Cold War, which involved created the government in endless financial problems for the government, contributing to the eventual fall of this superpower. Therefore, the large fortune sums of funding given to space missions exploration may turn out to be disastrous to the economy and stability of the nation.

By comparison, expending more money on public service is bound to improve the public well-being, as the social equality may be achieved gradually with more improved facilities addedand services. For instance, in many developing countries such as India and China, the shortage of educational resources causes unfair distributions of opportunity in the society. Children in big cities receive education from qualified public schools, whereas those living in poverty-stricken areas can hardly barely afford to attend these institutions, thus causing great differences in the learning standards among the youth. Such a gap can even be widerwiden when these young people step intothen compete in the job marketss, twhereby increasing the socioeconomic inequality in the society. Nevertheless, if the government spent more money on building standard schools in backwards—less privileged regions, this inequality can could be reduced to a large degree.

In conclusion, regarding the possible negative effects caused by huge expenditure on space missions programs as well as the positive transformation that may be supported enabled by the money saved, I am in firm belief that more money should be given to those public service like building more schools than the space exploration or exploitation. (40')

Task achievement: 8

Cohesion/Coherence: 7

Vocabulary: 7

Grammar: 7

Overall: 7

**Comment [Dave1]:** A little informal – better to say 'As far as I'm concerned' or From my point of view...

**Comment [Dave2]:** Good! Usually safer to write about both sides, but it is ok to write about one

**Comment [Dave3]:** Very nuanced idea, very clearly and well-written – good!

**Comment [Dave4]:** Missions is a more specific word – better to say exploration/research/programs

**Comment [Dave5]:** Great use of a weak claim – most students would make too strong of a claim here – great!

Comment [Dave6]: Good but a little informal

Comment [Dave7]: conditional

**Comment [Dave8]:** Great ideas –very clear and strong language throughout.

**Comment [Dave9]:** Great ideas, well-support, very close to a 9.

**Comment [Dave10]:** Easy to follow, good referencing, linking words and substitution. Small mistakes especially towards the beginning.

**Comment [Dave11]:** Lots of good collocations, accurate – keep it up!

**Comment [Dave12]:** Good complexity but many small mistakes could bring this down to a 6.

## TRANSLATED BAND DESCRIPTORS HOWTODOIELTS.COM

Band Score	Task Achievement (Opinion and ideas)	Cohesion and Coherence (Organisation and linking of ideas)	Lexical Resource (Vocabulary and spelling)	Grammar: Range & Accuracy (Grammar and punctuation)
9	Fully answers all parts of the question.     Overall opinion - very clear, consistent and fully explained throughout the essay.     Ideas - well-supported, very suitable and very relevant.	Organisation - very clear and very easy to follow throughout.     Linking of ideas - very good throughout.     Paragraphing - very natural.	Wide range of vocabulary, used very naturally and very flexibly     Mistakes are very rare and similar to a native-speaker	Wide range of grammar, used very naturally and flexibly     Mistakes are very rare and similar to a native-speaker
8	Answers all parts of the question very well.     Overall opinion - clear, consistent, and well-explained throughout the essay     Ideas - well-supported, suitable and relevant.	Organisation - very clear and logical throughout.     Linking of ideas – good throughout.     Paragraphing - very good.	Wide range of vocabulary, used naturally and flexibly to explain exact meanings     Rare mistakes with incorrect words and collocations     Rare mistakes with spelling and incorrect form of words	Wide range of grammar.     Mistakes are very rare – most sentences are 100% correct.
7	Answers all parts of the question well.     Overall opinion - clear, consistent and supported throughout the essay.     Main ideas - relevant and clearly supported.     Supporting ideas – some are too general or less relevant.	Organisation - clear and logical throughout.     Linking of ideas - overall good but occasionally linking phrases are repeated or missing.     Paragraphing - good, with one clear topic for each	Good range of vocabulary, sometimes used naturally and flexibly to explain exact meanings. Some good use of more natural collocations. Rare mistakes with incorrect words, spelling and/or incorrect form of words.	Good range of complex grammar.     Many sentences are 100% correct.     Rare mistakes with punctuation
6	Some parts of the question are not answered fully.     Overall opinion – relevant and supported but may be unclear, inconsistent or repetitive.     Main ideas – relevant but not always clearly supported.	Organisation – clear and logical overall but not throughout      Linking phrases – some good      use but some are incorrect or      robotic.     Referencing - may be unclear or      incorrect.     Paragraphing – not always      logical.	OK range of topic vocabulary. Tries to use less common and more natural vocabulary, sometimes successfully. Some mistakes with incorrect words, spelling and/or incorrect form of words but meaning is always clear.	A good range of complex and simple grammar.     Some mistakes but meaning is nearly always clear.     Some mistakes with punctuation.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman